

2030 TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN AMENDMENT

*REPORT FOR THE FEBRUARY 7 THROUGH MARCH 21, 2013
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD*



April 18, 2013

Comment Overview

The 2030 Transportation Policy Plan Public Comment Report summarizes the comments received on the proposed amendment to the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan to include the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway, to include additions and an extension to the 2030 Potential Arterial Bus Rapid Transit routes, and to identify the need for study of bus rapid transit and streetcar alternatives on West Broadway Avenue in North Minneapolis. The proposed amendment was adopted for the purposes of public comment on January 23, 2013 and Metropolitan Council hosted the public comment period from February 4 through March 21, 2013.

Metropolitan Council hosted an open house-style public meeting on the amendment on March 7 from 5:00 to 7:00 PM at the Robbinsdale City Hall and 50 people attended. A public hearing on the amendment was held at 5:00 PM at the March 11 Transportation Committee meeting with testimony provided by 13 people including residents, representatives from North Hennepin Community College, and a member of the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority.

The materials attached identify who commented, summarizes the comments, and provides a response. There is also an index of all comment contributors with an identifying number attached. When people made similar comments, a generalized comment was included in the comment summary. Each comment is accompanied by the identifying number for the persons or groups who made the comment. Comments were grouped into three categories:

- Comment Group 1: General comments on the proposed plan amendment are identified as issues 1a through 1u
- Comment Group 2: Comments on the proposed plan amendment regarding the Bottineau Transitway are identified as issues 2a through 2oo
- Comment Group 3: Comments on the proposed plan amendment regarding Arterial bus rapid transit are identified as issues 3a through 3k

A recording of the public hearing and a written record of the comments submitted by letter, fax, email, or comment card is available from the Metropolitan Council Data Center.

List of Comment Contributors

ID	Organization	Name
1	North Hennepin Community College	Connie Sherman, Director of Disability Access Services
2	Transit for Livable Communities	Kathleen Murphy
3	Resident	Rachel Roff
4	Resident	Daniel Sussman
5	North Hennepin Community College	Janet McClelland, Interim Director of Marketing & Communications
6	North Hennepin Community College	Sue Smith, Counselor
7	North Hennepin Community College	Kay Scow, Teacher
8	Resident	Kelly Ritter
9	North Hennepin Community College	Jason Schoch, Graphic Design Faculty
10	Resident	Lisa Norby
11	Resident	William Steacker & Robin Price
12	Resident	Michael C. Libby
13	Resident	Lyle & Darlene Clemenson
14	Resident	Robin Price
15	Resident	Elaine Wynne
16	Resident	Melody Tilton
17	Resident	Andrew Ritcher
18	Northside Residents Redevelopment Council	Ishmael Israel, Executive Director
19	Resident	Jeannine O'Hara
20	Resident	Jim Markeson
21	Resident	Ann Beckman
22	Resident	Dan Rogan
23	Resident	Bill Blonigan
24	Resident	Constance Bonniwell
25	Resident	Dawn Golembeck & Josh Golembeck
26	Resident	Chad Westerlund
27	Resident	Andrew Flosdorf
28	Resident	Jim Bendtsen
29	Resident	Joe Anton
30	Resident	Cathy Abboud
31	Resident	Andy Snope
32	Resident	Pat Jordan
33	Resident	Brent Gisslen
34	Resident	Ron Stoffel
35	North Hennepin Community College	John O'Brien, President
36	Resident	Corrine McCarthy
37	Resident	Norann Dillon
38	North Hennepin Community College	Beth Steen, Math Instructor
39	Resident	Ronald Williams
40	Resident	Stephen Dent

List of Comment Contributors

ID	Organization	Name
41	Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority	Linda Higgins, Commissioner
42	Resident	Robert Mattison
43	Transit for Livable Communities	Barb Thoman, Executive Director
44	City of Golden Valley	DeDe Scanlon, Council Member
45	Downtown Minneapolis Transportation Management Organization	Lee Davis, Chair
46	Resident	Tom Schmitt
47	Resident	Myrna & Steve Aldrich
48	Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing	La Shella Sims, Organizer
49	Resident	Jeanette Sheppard
50	Resident	Stacy Rodriguez
51	Resident	Kelly Jones
52	Resident	James Merrida
53	Resident	Janeya Jackson
54	Resident	LaKeshia Vance
55	Resident	R. Slinger
56	Resident	Bernice Halberg
57	Resident	Rachelle Jones
58	Resident	Bernard Coner
59	Resident	Debra Powe
60	Resident	Bradley C. Jones
61	Resident	Jolene Packerd
62	Resident	Janell Coleman
63	Resident	Paula Bennett
64	Resident	Cora Kromer
65	Resident	Rebecca Wentz
66	Resident	Aurora Morafka
67	Resident	Marrkell Mackontee
68	Resident	Randy Wind
69	Resident	Kierra Blake
70	Resident	Renee McDonald
71	Resident	Rebecca Nathan
72	Resident	Rebecca St. Martin
73	Resident	Anthony Amos
74	Resident	Nicholas Willis
75	Resident	Jane Jones
76	Resident	Beulah Verdell
77	Resident	Bryan Stubbs
78	Resident	Larry Jones
79	Resident	Rosetta Henderson
80	Resident	Jonathan Reid
81	Resident	Jennifer Burdonnice

List of Comment Contributors

ID	Organization	Name
82	Resident	Paul Cooper
83	Resident	Robert M. Peterson
84	Resident	Cristian Sanchez
85	Resident	Tamara Ward
86	Resident	Tom Cheever
87	Resident	Kiesha Steele
88	Resident	Kona Steele
89	Resident	Donald Campbell
90	Resident	Monique Royster
91	Resident	Michael Mau
92	Resident	Theo Griffin
93	Resident	Amaris Edwards
94	Resident	Kory LaCroix
95	Resident	Isaiah Solomon
96	Resident	Bobby Floyd
97	Resident	Capria Jackson
98	Resident	Cynthia Mantiller
99	Resident	Dennis Morgan
100	Resident	Angel Dominguez
101	Resident	Alyssa Woiak
102	Resident	Remonica Williams
103	Resident	Alice Ferguson
104	Resident	Dana Lynch
105	Resident	Shytonyal Daws
106	Resident	Daman Hassan
107	Resident	Scelena Williams
108	Resident	Edward Brown
109	Resident	Deirdre Glary
110	Resident	Stephanie Steele
111	Resident	Nakirah Clasberry
112	Resident	Perry Price
113	Resident	Lynda Nwonye
114	Resident	Scott Pressen
115	Resident	Kimbery Harris
116	Resident	Chad McNult
117	Resident	Audriann Thompson
118	Resident	Tonya Killebrew
119	Resident	Amanda Nelson
120	Resident	Sherita Olasande
121	Resident	Elvira Lynn Jarrett
122	Resident	Kashayla McCray
123	Resident	Bernard Brown
124	Resident	Ricky Gallagher
125	Resident	Maggie Jones

List of Comment Contributors

ID	Organization	Name
126	Resident	Vivienne Patton
127	Resident	Chom Ngeurn Soudaly
128	Resident	Daneequa Nelson
129	Resident	Rena Davis
130	Resident	Alvin Kendrick
131	Resident	Robert Yang
132	Resident	Philip Sheridan
133	Resident	Stephen Mathins
134	Resident	Marisol Centeno
135	Resident	Carmen Killingham
136	Resident	Thurmon Farmer
137	Resident	Taasha Conry
138	Resident	Arthur Irons
139	Resident	James Allen
140	Resident	Ronald Jorman
141	Resident	Jerome Watson
142	Resident	Kelly Jaimez
143	Resident	Eric Morris
144	Resident	Wanda Hayes
145	Resident	Tyrone McCoy
146	Resident	V.J. Smith
147	Resident	Thuan Nguyen
148	Resident	Lillie L. Smith
149	Resident	Tennille Jennings
150	Resident	Neng Ma Yang
151	Resident	Keira Benson
152	Resident	Nanette Ba
153	Resident	Sharon Byne
154	Resident	Kevin Roy
155	Resident	Marquitta McCray
156	Resident	Adrian Carter
157	Resident	Faisal Mohamed
158	Resident	Daniella Turner
159	Resident	Sharon Miler
160	Resident	Unidentified
161	Resident	Unidentified
162	Resident	Twanette Bordemp
163	Resident	Amirah Ricel
164	Resident	Laisha Williams
165	Resident	Tiffany Jeriha
166	Resident	Jerry Ellis
167	Resident	David McGarret
168	Resident	Jaime Gratno
169	Resident	Stanford Barnay

List of Comment Contributors

ID	Organization	Name
170	Resident	Demmay Thomas
171	Resident	Jon Peterson
172	Resident	Helen Hines
173	Resident	Rebecca Maedu
174	Resident	Saharazoxi Wagner
175	Resident	Helena Garcia
176	Resident	Rebecca St. Martin
177	Resident	Ariana Peters & Allen Zubert
178	CTIB	Counties Transit Improvement Board
179	Resident	Stephanie Steek
180	Resident	Deanna Baker
181	Resident	Rosemary Froehle
182	Resident	Martha Chateleine
183	Resident	Ekta Prakash
184	Resident	Toni Collins
185	Resident	Souliyahn Keobounpheng
186	Resident	Kari Derksen
187	Resident	Tia Keobounpheng
188	Resident	Staci Horwitz
189	Resident	Michael Goenner
190	Asian Media Access	David Kang
191	Resident	Shaneen Moore
192	Resident	Mindy Fine
193	Resident	Laurel Hirt
194	Resident	Makeda Zulu-Gillespie
195	Resident	Jens Beck
196	Resident	Troy Kester
197	Resident	Brenda Bell Brown
198	Resident	Stephen Grisham
199	Resident	Eric Roerish
200	Resident	Paul Bauknight
201	Resident	Penthea Colburn
202	Resident	Ariah Fine
203	Resident	Dacia Durham
204	Resident	Steve Lomen
205	Resident	Kris Brogan
206	Resident	Michelle Lewis
207	Resident	Tom Schmitt
208	Resident	Beverly Proepes
209	Resident	Tom Mathias

Committer ID	Issue	Comment	Response
OVERALL COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT			
2, 12, 22, 23, 31, 41, 43	1 a	Supportive of the Transportation Policy Plan amendment.	Support acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
10, 19, 31, 33, 41, 44	1 b	Supportive of mass transit.	Support acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
31	1 c	I would like to see Golden Valley connected to the expansion of transit.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Golden Valley, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
31, 85	1 d	Expanding transit creates jobs; jobs to build a transit system and jobs created by infrastructure and business development adjacent to transit.	Support acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
12	1 e	Disappointed to see nothing in the plan that would allow a person to take a bus from Highway 100 in Brooklyn Center to 494/100 interchange.	Revision #5 and Figure 7-39 of the proposed amendment includes Arterial Bus Rapid Transit on Penn and Emerson-Fremont Avenues North and connecting to Brookdale Center (Highway 100 in Brooklyn Center). If the Potential 2030 Arterial BRT system proposed in the plan is implemented, Arterial BRT service would be provided between Highway 100 in Brooklyn Center and the 494/100 interchange area. No change to the proposed amendment.
175, 191, 200	1 f	I do not support a trolley on West Broadway.	Revision #5 of the proposed amendment states, "Alternatives Analyses are ... proposed on the West Broadway corridor in Minneapolis and Robbinsdale. These detailed corridor analysis will determine if other bus or rail improvements, such as streetcar are viable ..." Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
187, 188, 195, 199, 203, 206	1 g	Support for streetcar (trolley system) on West Broadway Avenue because of its ability to enhance the quality of places, breakdown the streetscape, and permanent presence.	Revision #5 of the proposed amendment states, "Alternatives Analyses are ... proposed on the West Broadway corridor in Minneapolis and Robbinsdale. These detailed corridor analysis will determine if other bus or rail improvements, such as streetcar are viable ..." Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
194	1 h	Support for trolleys in North Minneapolis, but concern over impacts of a dedicated lane.	Revision #5 of the proposed amendment states, "Alternatives Analyses are ... proposed on the West Broadway corridor in Minneapolis and Robbinsdale. These detailed corridor analysis will determine if other bus or rail improvements, such as streetcar are viable ..." Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.

Committer ID	Issue	Comment	Response
18	1 i	Concern about implementing streetcars on West Broadway Avenue in North Minneapolis due to winter climate.	Revision #5 of the proposed amendment states, "Alternatives Analyses are ... proposed on the West Broadway corridor in Minneapolis and Robbinsdale. These detailed corridor analysis will determine if other bus or rail improvements, such as streetcar are viable ..." Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
182	1 j	Concern about ticket vending machine security in North Minneapolis.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
26, 182, 202	1 k	Support for "green" transportation - for construction and operations (less pollution, less invasive, fewer vehicles, etc.).	Support acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
184	1 l	There is a lack of evidence regarding transit's ability to support business growth and jobs.	In November 2012, the Itasca Project published a report called, "Regional Transit System Return on Investment Assessment" (http://www.theitascaproject.com/Transit%20ROI%20exec%20summary%20Nov%202012.pdf) that documents business benefits of building the planned transit system. Transitway system benefits to businesses include access to an additional 500,000 employees, support in attracting employees, and support for higher density development and greater customer access. Benefits vary for specific businesses. No change to the proposed amendment.
186, 192, 193, 195, 197, 202, 203	1 m	North Minneapolis supports and deserves quality transit improvements that promote investment, attract businesses to North Minneapolis, and provide access to other destinations.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
187, 198	1 n	Concern for traffic safety in North Minneapolis, especially when introducing new modes of transit.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
188	1 o	Concern about lack of a simple, coordinated approach to transit planning in North Minneapolis through which the public can easily provide meaningful input and that effectively supports other economic revitalization efforts to transform the lives of individuals.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
191	1 p	Opposes bus rapid transit and trolleys because they do not provide clear benefits over light rail transit.	Bus rapid transit, streetcars, trolleys, and buses are capable of providing transit service on streets with limited right-of-way because they operate in mixed traffic in general purpose lanes, which minimizes impacts on adjacent property and lowers capital costs. When these other modes better meet a transit project's identified purpose and need, these benefits can be significant as compared to light rail transit. No change to the proposed amendment.
194	1 q	Metro Transit should set targets to hire people from North Minneapolis who are of color, formally incarcerated, or who receive public assistance to market, build, run, and maintain the transit system.	The Metropolitan Council must comply with or surpass federal and state hiring requirements as a condition of securing federal and state funding for the development, construction, operation and maintenance of the region's transit system. To promote and achieve workforce diversity on its major transit projects the Metropolitan Council's Office of Equal Opportunity engages in pre-project outreach to network with community residents, organizations and businesses to increase awareness of the business and employment opportunities. Small and community based business owners interested in participating in the building of transit projects can contact Pat Calder at pat.calder@metc.state.mn.us or 612-349-7463 to learn about becoming a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise. Individuals interested in participating as construction workers on our transit projects can contact Leo Jackson at leo.jackson@metc.state.mn.us or 651-602-1842 or visit www.lrtworks.org to self-register for a construction employment opportunities listserv. Lrtworks.org also contains specific information about getting a job in construction for people formerly incarcerated, women, people of color and students. Residents interested in positions with the Metropolitan Council prior to construction and during transit operations can visit our website where transit jobs are regularly posted (http://metro council.org/About-Us/Organization/ Employment.aspx).
196	1 r	Questions likelihood of trolley system.	Revision #5 of the proposed amendment states, "Alternatives Analyses are ... proposed on the West Broadway corridor in Minneapolis and Robbinsdale. These detailed corridor analysis will determine if other bus or rail improvements, such as streetcar are viable ..." Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.

Committer ID	Issue	Comment	Response
201	1 s	Concern about property, safety, and noise impacts of transitways, including impacts on parks.	Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway. The Draft EIS will evaluate the impact of light rail transit on property and buildings near the proposed Bottineau Transitway, including noise and safety impacts and impacts on parks. No change to proposed amendment.
202	1 t	Opposes diesel train storage facilities in the North Minneapolis Harrison neighborhood where there has been significant planning for the Basset Creek Valley development.	The Transportation Policy Plan does not propose locating diesel train storage in North Minneapolis. Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Metro Transit, and MnDOT leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
207	1 u	Opposes streetcars and trolleys because of additional infrastructure needed to support the overhead electric wires to power the vehicles.	Revision #5 of the proposed amendment states, "Alternatives Analyses are ... proposed on the West Broadway corridor in Minneapolis and Robbinsdale. These detailed corridor analysis will determine if other bus or rail improvements, such as streetcar are viable ..." Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT REGARDING BOTTINEAU TRANSITWAY			
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 16, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 47, 178	2 a	Supportive of the Bottineau LPA.	Support acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
3, 4, 40, 182, 184, 185, 193, 201, 203, 208	2 b	Supportive of a Golden Valley Rd. station.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. Station locations are not part of the proposed amendment. The Metropolitan Council will decide station locations after additional information is developed through environmental impact review, engineering, and public involvement. No change to the proposed amendment.
11, 14, 42, 205	2 c	Opposition to Golden Valley Road Station because it offers little developable land and no economic/jobs development for Minneapolis or Golden Valley.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. Station locations are not part of the proposed amendment. The Metropolitan Council will decide station locations after additional information is developed through environmental impact review, engineering, and public involvement. No change to the proposed amendment.
4, 18, 48, 85, 179, 181, 183, 188, 189, 192, 194, 195, 198, 200, 202, 205, 206	2 d	Supportive of Plymouth Ave. station.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. Station locations are not part of the proposed amendment. The Metropolitan Council will decide station locations after additional information is developed through environmental impact review, engineering, and public involvement. No change to the proposed amendment.
171, 175, 177, 186, 187, 190, 197, 202	2 e	Supportive of Plymouth Ave. and Golden Valley Rd. stations.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. Station locations are not part of the proposed amendment. The Metropolitan Council will decide station locations after additional information is developed through environmental impact review, engineering, and public involvement. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 177	2 f	North Minneapolis must have Bottineau light rail transit stops at Penn and Plymouth Ave for needed access to light rail and the regional transitway system.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. Station locations are not part of the proposed amendment. The Metropolitan Council will decide station locations after additional information is developed through environmental impact review, engineering, and public involvement. No change to the proposed amendment.
6, 9, 35, 38	2 g	Supportive of a stop at North Hennepin Community College to provide students with access to school and amenities along the corridor.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. Station locations are not part of the proposed amendment. The Metropolitan Council will decide station locations after additional information is developed through environmental impact review, engineering, and public involvement. No change to the proposed amendment.
16	2 h	Land values would increase along the Bottineau route just like along Hiawatha because of all the construction of apartments, which are in high demand.	Comment acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
16	2 i	More apartments along the route would be a positive sources of income to the community and the county.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
16	2 j	I am supportive of increasing revenues while providing a service the community desperately needs and deserves.	Comment acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
20	2 k	If the Federal government provides a large amount of funding, the project is worthwhile and will benefit Minnesotans.	Comment acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
26	2 l	Bottineau would be a great alternative to driving to work, the airport, MOA or downtown.	Support acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
31	2 m	D1 seems to have the least impact given it is in an existing rail corridor	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway that will study and compare the impacts of light rail transit on the four routes considered for the locally preferred alternative -- Maple Grove (Alignment A) or Brooklyn Park (Alignment B) at the north end, and Golden Valley (Alignment D1) or North Minneapolis (Alignment D2) at the south end. The study will also include the central part of the route through Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and Robbinsdale (Alignment C) that is common to all alternatives considered for the locally preferred alternative. No change to proposed amendment.
39	2 n	Supports B-C-D1 alignment and recommends connecting bus rapid transit to Maple Grove and to Olson Memorial Highway/Trunk Highway 55 via Penn Avenue North and North Memorial Hospital in Robbinsdale.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, Maple Grove Transit and Metro Transit leadership. The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. The Transportation Policy Plan includes Arterial Bus Rapid Transit on West Broadway Avenue between Robbinsdale and Minneapolis, and Revision #5 in the proposed amendment includes Arterial BRT on Penn Avenue North. The Metropolitan Council and Maple Grove Transit will decide connecting bus service after additional information is developed through environmental impact review, engineering, and public involvement. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
40	2 o	Advocate for connecting bus service in Golden Valley.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. Connecting local bus service is not part of the proposed amendment. The Metropolitan Council and Maple Grove Transit will decide connecting bus service after additional information is developed through environmental impact review, engineering, and public involvement. No change to the proposed amendment.
40	2 p	Advocates for a green corridor on the D1 alignment including, for example, a bike path or Highline-like park features.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
14, 15, 17, 27, 30, 32, 44	2 q	Opposed to the D1 alignment.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
181, 185, 187, 191, 196, 199, 204, 205, 207	2 r	Oppose Bottineau alignment because of concern that North Minneapolis will not experience economic development because it will skirt North Minneapolis rather than providing more direct service in the neighborhood.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. Revision #5 in the proposed amendment identifies transit improvements proposed in North Minneapolis, including Arterial bus rapid transit on Penn Avenue and Emerson-Fremont Avenues North and study of Arterial bus rapid transit and streetcar on West Broadway Avenue. Arterial bus rapid transit and streetcars can operate in mixed traffic and general purpose lanes to minimize impacts on adjacent property. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
11, 14, 15, 21, 24, 30, 31, 32, 34, 42, 181, 185, 199, 204	2 s	The D1 alignment will be destructive to parks, wetlands and wildlife.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway that will study and compare the impacts of no transit project to light rail transit on the four routes considered for the locally preferred alternative -- Maple Grove (Alignment A) or Brooklyn Park (Alignment B) at the north end, and Golden Valley (Alignment D1) or North Minneapolis (Alignment D2) at the south end. The study will also include the central part of the route through Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and Robbinsdale (Alignment C) that is common to all alternatives considered for the locally preferred alternative. The Draft EIS will evaluate the impact of Bottineau light rail transit on parks, wetlands, and wildlife in the area. No change to proposed amendment.
11, 15	2 t	Opposed to the D1 alignment because of no true value to Golden Valley. The city is a "pass thru" to somewhere else.	Golden Valley has the opportunity to define the value of Bottineau light rail transit for the city, its residents and employees, its employers and businesses, and its environment. Potential benefits of Bottineau LRT and its connecting bus service include easy access to the regional transitway system, increased property values, economic development and redevelopment, expanded transit service for people who rely on transit, a new and reliable transportation choice, health benefits, transportation cost savings, greater access to labor force and customer base, and opportunity in the BNSF corridor to leverage watershed mitigation and stormwater best management practices.

Committer ID	Issue	Comment	Response
25	2 u	Would like to see environmental studies done because of known wildlife in the area.	Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway that will study and compare the impacts of no transit project to light rail transit on the four routes considered for the locally preferred alternative -- Maple Grove (Alignment A) or Brooklyn Park (Alignment B) at the north end, and Golden Valley (Alignment D1) or North Minneapolis (Alignment D2) at the south end. The study will also include the central part of the route through Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and Robbinsdale (Alignment C) that is common to all alternatives considered for the locally preferred alternative. The Draft EIS will evaluate the impact of Bottineau LRT on wildlife in the area. No change to proposed amendment.
11, 34, 36, 37	2 v	Oppose D1 alignment because of increase in property taxes.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
25	2 w	We hope we're not paying taxes we can't afford for more crime we can't afford.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
15, 19, 30, 36	2 x	Concern of decreased property values because of the light rail line.	Recent research published by the National Association of Realtors and American Public Transportation Association shows that properties located within one-half mile of public transportation lines with high-frequency service held their property values during the recession better than properties located farther away (The new Real Estate Mantra: Location Near Public Transportation, March 2013). The study looked at five U.S. cities including Minneapolis-St. Paul. No change to the proposed amendment.
25, 26, 30, 36	2 y	Concern of the vibration and frequency of trains would affect houses and buildings.	Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway. The Draft EIS will evaluate the impact of noise and vibration caused by Bottineau light rail transit on property and buildings near the proposed Transitway. No change to proposed amendment.
25	2 z	Would like to see decent fencing put up because of safety concerns with children in the area.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Hennepin County and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
11, 14, 24, 34, 37	2 aa	Oppose D1 alignment because of poor forecasting of transportation ridership/poor ridership projections.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County developed ridership forecasts for each alternative considered, found no significant difference in forecast ridership for the D1 and D2 routes, and determined the D1 route best meets the project purpose and need. No change to the proposed amendment.
11, 34, 37	2 bb	Oppose D1 alignment because of underestimation of "true cost" of the project. Cost overruns not factored in.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Hennepin County and Metro Transit leadership. Current capital cost estimates are appropriate, consistent, and comparable for each alternative at this point of project development. Cost estimates, which include contingency to account for unforeseen costs, are refined as more information is learned through environmental impact review, engineering, and public involvement. No change to the proposed amendment.
25, 34	2 cc	Concerned about the cost of the project. What is the return on investment other than light rail transit?	The Alternatives Analysis (AA) led by Hennepin County studied bus service, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and light rail transit and considered their cost-effectiveness as well as their ability to address growing travel demand, increasing traffic congestion, people who depend on transit, limited transit service to suburban destinations, and regional objectives for growth. The AA determined that although BRT would have a lower capital cost and a better cost-effectiveness, LRT along the B-C-D1 route best meets all aspects of the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
13, 28, 37, 42, 46	2 dd	Light rail is a poor choice. There are better options, like buses.	The Alternatives Analysis (AA) led by Hennepin County studied bus service, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and light rail transit and considered their ability to address growing travel demand, increasing traffic congestion, people who depend on transit, limited transit service to suburban destinations, and regional objectives for growth. The AA determined that although bus service would have a lower capital cost, LRT along the B-C-D1 route best meets all aspects of the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
13, 34, 37	2 ee	BRT is the most cost-effective option for the corridor. It is cheaper to build and operate.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that bus rapid transit is not an appropriate technology for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
13	2 ff	BRT can use the same corridor as rail. It can carry multiple routes on one line, such as local and express service.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that bus rapid transit is not an appropriate technology for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.

Committer ID	Issue	Comment	Response
14	2 gg	The transitway could be part rail and part BRT. Rapid bus lanes could be close to the city and rail could be further out.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that bus rapid transit is not an appropriate technology for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
13, 37	2 hh	Given the high capital cost of rail and inflexibility of service, there will be a big impact on fixed and lower income households, the very people transit is supposed to help most.	The Alternatives Analysis (AA) led by Hennepin County studied bus service, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and light rail transit and considered their ability to address growing travel demand, increasing traffic congestion, people who depend on transit, limited transit service to suburban destinations, and regional objectives for growth. The AA determined that although bus service and BRT would have a lower capital cost, LRT along the B-C-D1 route best meets all aspects of the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
28, 37	2 ii	Light rail transit is inflexible and only serves a small percentage of the people who will be forced to pay for it.	The region's long-range transportation plan, the Transportation Policy Plan, states the region will invest in transit options, including a system of transitways, to provide travelers an alternative to highway congestion and identifies the Bottineau Transitway as a corridor to develop. The Alternatives Analysis (AA) led by Hennepin County studied bus service, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and light rail transit. The AA determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
13	2 jj	Why should taxpayers who never ride light rail subsidize those that do.	The region's long-range transportation plan, the Transportation Policy Plan, states the region will invest in transit options, including a system of transitways, to provide travelers an alternative to highway congestion and identifies the Bottineau Transitway as a corridor to develop. The Alternatives Analysis (AA) led by Hennepin County studied bus service, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and light rail transit. The AA determined that LRT along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
13, 28, 37	2 kk	This project is not cost-effective.	The Alternatives Analysis (AA) led by Hennepin County studied bus service, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and light rail transit and considered their cost-effectiveness as well as their ability to address growing travel demand, increasing traffic congestion, people who depend on transit, limited transit service to suburban destinations, and regional objectives for growth. The AA determined that although BRT would have a lower capital cost and a better cost-effectiveness, LRT along the B-C-D1 route best meets all aspects of the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
28, 34, 37	2 ll	The Twin Cities does not have the density to support light rail transit.	The Alternatives Analysis (AA) led by Hennepin County studied bus service, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and light rail transit and considered forecast travel demand. The AA determined that LRT along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
14, 15, 27, 30, 334, 42, 44	2 mm	A better alternative would be to have light rail on Penn Ave./W. Broadway	Light rail transit on the West Broadway/Penn Avenue North (D2) route was considered during the Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County, which found it would result in more property and neighborhood impacts, slower travel time, lower cost effectiveness, and more disruption of roadway traffic operations as compared to the BNSF (D1) route. Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway. The Draft EIS will evaluate the anticipated impact of Bottineau LRT on the West Broadway/Penn Avenue (D2) and BNSF (D1) routes. No change to the proposed amendment.
14	2 nn	New paths need to be considered, like out on Highway 55.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County studied routes west of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad corridor and determined other routes would provide better access for people who depend on transit and meet higher concentrations of origins and destinations. No change to the proposed amendment.
15	2 oo	There would be increased ridership if the route went down Highway 81 to Highway 100 and onto Highway 55 with various stops along the way.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County studied routes west of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad corridor and determined other routes would provide better access for people who depend on transit and meet higher concentrations of origins and destinations. No change to the proposed amendment.

Committer ID	Issue	Comment	Response
15, 30	2 pp	Another alternative would be to go down Highway 169 to Highway 55.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County studied routes west of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad corridor and determined other routes would provide better access for people who depend on transit and meet higher concentrations of origins and destinations. No change to the proposed amendment.
17	2 qq	Object to high density Section 8 housing.	Comment acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
24	2 rr	Hennepin County and government staff are trying to speed up the building process by eliminating legal requirements and pressing the feds.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County met local and federal requirements. As the Bottineau light rail transit project continues to advance, design and construction will continue to be compliant with local, state, and federal requirements. No change to the proposed amendment.
25	2 ss	The D2 route is horrible and would be too invasive in the neighborhoods.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway that will study and compare the impacts of no transit project to light rail transit on the four routes considered for the locally preferred alternative -- Maple Grove (Alignment A) or Brooklyn Park (Alignment B) at the north end, and Golden Valley (Alignment D1) or North Minneapolis (Alignment D2) at the south end. The study will also include the central part of the route through Brooklyn Park, Crystal, and Robbinsdale (Alignment C) that is common to all alternatives considered for the locally preferred alternative. The Draft EIS will evaluate the impact of Bottineau light rail transit on surrounding neighborhoods. No change to proposed amendment.
29	2 tt	Years ago we have a wonderful light rail system. Why was that taken out?	There are many historical accounts of the conversion of streetcar / trolley systems across the U.S. in the mid-20th century, including the Twin Cities. Publications by University of Minnesota Press, Twin Cities Public Television archives and the Minnesota Historical Society are three resources with detailed information. No change to the proposed amendment.

Committer ID	Issue	Comment	Response
29	2 uu	The safety record of the light rail is terrible. Nine people have been killed.	The Hiawatha light-rail line has a safety record comparable to other light-rail lines. Regarding major collisions, recent industry data shows that the line's safety record is more safe than average. Metro Transit consistently promotes safety as a shared responsibility to both customers and communities that interact with the line. No change to the proposed amendment.
29	2 vv	The trains I see operating seldom seem full. Also, I have lived along the tracks for 56 years and the busses are never full now.	A 2011 report by the Office of the Legislative Auditor confirms that the Twin Cities bus and light-rail system is at the top of the class among peer regions on efficiency and effectiveness measures. Part of the reason is high ridership. In 2012, customers boarded light-rail trains 10.5 million times. Bus ridership has increased an average of 3.4 percent per year since 2004 when the Hiawatha line opened. No change to the proposed amendment.
33	2 ww	Opposes B alignment to Target North Campus, a private business, and because it is outside the existing railroad right-of-way.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
33	2 xx	Advocates for transportation planners to make use of unexpected opportunities, like those created by the 2011 tornado through North Minneapolis.	Comment acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
24	2 yy	Opposes D1 alignment because of lack of support from adjacent property owners.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. No change to the proposed amendment.
24	2 zz	Concerned that Hennepin County has already started construction of Bottineau light rail transit, including construction of staging areas to support drilling for soil testing.	Hennepin County and Metropolitan Council have not started construction of Bottineau light rail transit. As the Bottineau LRT project continues to advance, design and construction will be compliant with local, state, and federal requirements. No change to the proposed amendment.
24	2 aaa	Transitways should be constructed with as little impact as possible.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
34	2 bbb	Concerned that Crystal and Golden Valley do not understand they've now approved the line.	The locally preferred alternative (LPA) is the transitway mode and general route that the corridor's cities, counties, and the Metropolitan Council recommend be considered for construction and operation. The selection of the LPA and amendment of it into the region's long-range transportation plan, the Transportation Policy Plan, is a first step in a project's typical six to nine years of competition for federal New Starts program construction funding. Prior to construction, the Metropolitan Council and its partners must complete many steps including station area land use planning, environmental impact review, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, construction permitting, and identify construction and operating funding. In addition, the Metropolitan Council must work with each city for municipal consent of the design, consistent with Minnesota Statute 473.3994. No change to the proposed amendment.
34	2 ccc	Concerned that Target Corporation is not contributing to funding of Bottineau light rail transit.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
34	2 ddd	Advocate for a more balanced funding approach, including recovering more costs through transit fares.	Comment acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
36	2 eee	Opposes Bottineau because of increased activity at station areas.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
37, 174, 209	2 fff	Opposed to light rail because transit development takes tax dollars away from other priorities like schools, public safety, parks and road maintenance.	Much of the funding for light rail comes from dedicated sources at the regional, state, and federal level that would not be made available for schools, public safety, parks, or road maintenance. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
44	2 ggg	Golden Valley residents feel that they were denied opportunity to participate and comment in the Bottineau light rail transit locally preferred alternative decision-making process.	Golden Valley has been represented and has actively participated on the Bottineau Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) since November 2009 (elected and appointed officials, and key business and institutional leaders), and on the staff-level Advise, Review, and Communicate Committee (ARCC) since August 2008. Golden Valley did not immediately appoint a representative to the Bottineau Community Advisory Committee, but appointed a representative in March 2012 in time to provide input on the locally preferred alternative decision. The City of Golden Valley transmitted its comments on the scope of the Bottineau Draft EIS on February 21, 2012, which identified a list of concerns that should be addressed during continued study of the D1 route. Nine meetings were held in Golden Valley between October 2009 and April 2012 seeking input on technical issues for the Bottineau Transitway, the full list of meetings is available from Hennepin County. Corridor-wide, Hennepin County has hosted 280 Bottineau Transitway meetings from 2008 through 2012 with over 4,900 meeting attendees and these have included 30 Hennepin County-sponsored public meetings and 72 corridor committee meetings (PAC, CAC, or ARCC). No change to the proposed amendment.
44	2 hhh	The transitway project development process is very confusing. The purpose of the amendment to the Transportation Policy Plan feels like a very final decision, and the status of Bottineau light rail transit is not clear to the general public.	The Metropolitan Council acknowledges transit planning and project development is complex and will continue working with its partners to make it easier to understand. The locally preferred alternative (LPA) is the transitway mode and general route that the corridor's cities, counties, and the Metropolitan Council recommend be considered for construction and operation. The selection of the LPA and amendment of it into the region's long-range transportation plan, the Transportation Policy Plan, is a first step in a project's typical six to nine years of competition for federal New Starts program construction funding. Prior to construction, the Metropolitan Council and its partners must complete many steps including station area land use planning, environmental impact review, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, construction permitting, and identify construction and operating funding. In addition, the Metropolitan Council must work with each city for municipal consent of the design, consistent with Minnesota Statute 473.3994. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
169, 172	2 iii	What affect will the light rail have on homes? Mainly worried about Penn Ave.	Light rail on Penn Avenue North (D2 route) was considered during the Alternatives Analysis (AA) led by Hennepin County and it is not recommended as the locally preferred alternative. The AA found the D2 route would result in more property and neighborhood impacts, slower travel time, lower cost effectiveness, and more disruption of roadway traffic operations as compared to the BNSF (D1) route. Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway. The Draft EIS will evaluate the anticipated impact of Bottineau LRT on homes along the West Broadway/Penn Avenue (D2) and BNSF (D1) routes. No change to the proposed amendment.
170	2 jjj	I believe this process should be a part of an election vote.	Comment acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
173	2 kkk	I'm worried about the construction and the traffic it's going to create. Are roads going to be tended to in case there is a need for a detour?	Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway. The Draft EIS will evaluate the construction and operational impact of Bottineau light rail transit on traffic operations. No change to proposed amendment.
191	2 III	Supports light rail transit on West Broadway Avenue.	Light rail transit on West Broadway Avenue was considered during the Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County and it was not identified as the locally preferred alternative because it would result in more property and neighborhood impacts, slower travel time, lower cost effectiveness, and more disruption of roadway traffic operations as compared to the BNSF (D1) route. Revision #5 in the proposed amendment identifies study of Arterial bus rapid transit and streetcar on West Broadway Avenue. Arterial bus rapid transit and streetcars can operate in mixed traffic and general purpose lanes to minimize impacts on adjacent property. No change to the proposed amendment.

Commenter ID	Issue	Comment	Response
196	2 mmm	Opposes proposed Bottineau light rail transit alignment because of concern that it further institutionalizes government lack of investment in North Minneapolis.	The Alternatives Analysis led by Hennepin County determined that light rail transit along the B-C-D1 route best meets the project purpose and need and should be the locally preferred alternative for the Bottineau Transitway. Revision #5 in the proposed amendment identifies transit improvements proposed in North Minneapolis, including Arterial bus rapid transit on Penn Avenue and Emerson-Fremont Avenues North and study of Arterial bus rapid transit and streetcar on West Broadway Avenue. Other initiatives include, Hennepin County's Penn Avenue North Community Works Project to identify and implement improvements to Penn Avenue North as well as Metropolitan Council's focus on creating living-wage jobs, building affordable housing, and adding millions of dollars to the local property tax base in North Minneapolis and along the Bottineau Corridor through Livable Communities Act (LCA) Grant Programs. LCA funded projects in the area currently total more than \$4 million. All these projects will help our communities grow and prosper. No change to the proposed amendment.
207	2 nnn	Opposes proposed Bottineau light rail transit alignment because it will force freight trains to divert along other routes and cause impacts along the other routes.	Designs for Bottineau light rail transit propose no change to freight train traffic patterns. No change to the proposed amendment.
209	2 ooo	Opposes Bottineau light rail transit because of the impacts of Hiawatha light rail transit and Central Corridor light rail transit on traffic operations and on street parking.	Hennepin County, the Metropolitan Council, and the Federal Transit Administration are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bottineau Transitway. The Draft EIS will evaluate the construction and operational impact of Bottineau light rail transit on traffic operations and on-street parking. No change to proposed amendment.

Committer ID	Issue	Comment	Response
COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT REGARDING ARTERIAL BUS RAPID TRANSIT			
18, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 177, 180, 181, 184, 187, 188, 198, 200, 202, 206	3 a	Supportive of the Met Council's decision to expand the arterial BRT/ streetcar to include North Minneapolis routes along Penn Ave., Emerson and W. Broadway.	Support acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
48	3 b	The Arterial BRT would direct people through North Minneapolis. A circulator bus would be much better to get people to destinations around the Northside.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Minneapolis and Metro Transit leadership. Arterial bus rapid transit is proposed as a way to improve transit connections between North Minneapolis and major activity centers throughout the region. Arterial bus rapid transit does not preclude improvements to local bus service. No change to the proposed amendment.
18, 181, 184, 188, 189	3 c	Concern about potential impact of bus rapid transit in a dedicated lane on general traffic operations in North Minneapolis.	Arterial bus rapid transit is proposed to operate in mixed traffic and general purpose lanes, not dedicated lanes. The impacts of Arterial bus rapid transit on general traffic will be evaluated in the future as projects advance. No change to the proposed amendment.

Committer ID	Issue	Comment	Response
18	3 d	Support for economic development in North Minneapolis potentially encouraged by bus rapid transit.	Support acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
196	3 e	Support for bus rapid transit, but concern about poor record for implementation.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.
199	3 f	Opposes bus rapid transit because of concerns it will contribute to general traffic congestion without providing economic development benefits.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with city, Hennepin County, and Metro Transit leadership. The impacts of Arterial bus rapid transit on general traffic will be evaluated in the future as projects advance. No change to the proposed amendment.
205	3 g	Concern bus rapid transit will not provide service on Lyndale Avenue.	Existing transit ridership on Lyndale Avenue is lower than on other near-by routes. The potential 2030 Arterial bus rapid transit routes identified in Figure 7-39 are higher priorities for implementation of Arterial BRT. No change to the proposed amendment.
205	3 h	Concern that more community engagement is needed to advance bus rapid transit.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Metro Transit leadership. The community will be invited to participate in additional engagement in the future as Arterial bus rapid transit projects advance. No change to the proposed amendment.
207	3 i	Support for bus rapid transit because it would be a model for the efficient boarding of all buses.	Support acknowledged. No change to the proposed amendment.
208	3 j	Concerned about the environmental impact and pollution control of BRT.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Metro Transit leadership. The environmental impacts of Arterial bus rapid transit will be evaluated in the future as projects advance. No change to the proposed amendment.
176	3 k	Please consider a Park & Ride, maybe at Brookdale.	Comment acknowledged and will be shared with Metro Transit leadership. No change to the proposed amendment.



390 Robert Street North
St Paul, MN 55101-1805

651.602.1000
TTY 651.291.0904
public.info@metc.state.mn.us
metro council.org