

Rethinking I-94 Phase 2 Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting

Date: 7/17/2023 (2-4 p.m.)

Location: 395 John Ireland Boulevard, St. Paul (MnDOT Central Office, Conference Room G13 and G14) and Zoom Meeting

Meeting Summary

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

- Jack Corkle (WSB) welcomed attendees and reviewed technical instructions for Zoom attendees.
- Mike Hughes (Hughes Collaboration) reviewed the agenda with meeting attendees. Due to hybrid nature of meeting, he reviewed how to ask questions and make comments both in-person and on Zoom.

- MnDOT Commissioner, Nancy Daubenberger, welcomed PAC members and provided opening comments:
 - Provided information on how comments could be included in the meeting summary if participants were unable to attend or speak during the meeting due to time constraints.
 - Explained that the alternatives presented today are higher level alternatives and focus on aspects such as roadway type, transit type, and lane configurations.
 - Noted that MnDOT has listened to the comments provided from communities near I-94 and stakeholders that use I-94
 - Noted that MnDOT would like to know what was missed and what else should be considered.
 - More complex and detailed questions will be addressed in the future.

2. Schedule

- Mike Barnes, MnDOT Metro District Engineer, reviewed the schedule:
 - Explained what has been done up to this point to get us to the release of alternatives and explained that the project will be in Scoping for the next year. The Scoping Document/Draft Scoping Decision Document (SD/DSDD) is anticipated in 2024.
 - The Scoping Document does not select the alternative but does narrow the range of viable options.
 - The alternatives presented today will be at a high level and not go into detail.
 - The Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will select a preferred alternative, take 3-4 years to complete, and will include a visual quality analysis.

- The Tier 2 environmental documents will determine what the project will look like in more detail and analyze potential impacts in more detail than the Tier 1 EIS. Funding sources and construction dates are not known at this time.
- Following today's presentation, the alternatives will be shared with our Community Leaders group and the public. We will further refine alternatives based on public comments and feedback.

3. Rethinking I-94 Transit Study Update

- Charlie Zelle (Metropolitan Council Chair and PAC Co-Chair) provided comments:
 - Chair Zelle thanked attendees and discussed the importance of public engagement when exploring different types of transit opportunities.
 - Noted that the transit study was a collaborative effort between the Metropolitan Council, Metro Transit, MnDOT, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Other project partners also provided important input, including Hennepin and Ramsey Counties and the Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. The study outcomes have also been reviewed by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
 - Noted that the study considered a variety of transit types and modes and resulted in clear recommendations that have informed the project alternatives.
 - Chair Zelle reminded attendees that the role of the PAC is to be partners in the Rethinking I-94 endeavor and to support the process in the following ways:
 - Guide policy and funding decisions that pertain to this project
 - Review recommendations from the Technical Advisory Committee and provided input on public engagement
 - Help identify important community issues
 - Assist in communicating with your constituents on the project decision points and help drive public participation.
 - Provide further input as requested by MnDOT.
- Robert McHaney (The Goodman Corporation) gave an overview of the transit study:
 - The study included different alternatives for transit, including different stations:
 - Bus shoulders in a portion of the corridor were converted to traffic lanes to move traffic after the collapse of the I-35W bridge. The "minimum" idea studied is to reconstruct the bus shoulder that was there previously so there is a continuous connection between downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul.
 - In addition to bus shoulders with express bus, we looked at different versions of transit in managed lanes, including highway BRT, to understand the implications for travel time and other factors.
 - The impacts of having different numbers of stops/stations were studied: no stops, one stop, three stops, or five stops.
 - An at-grade roadway with BRT and three stops was also studied. After modeling other ideas, it was determined that three stops best balances ridership and travel times.
 - Discussion of rail alternatives:

- Noted that rail modes were not originally recommended for further study. Commuter rail and high-speed rail would not serve their intended purpose within this project area due to the short distance and lack of other rail connections between the downtowns.
- Noted that the public showed interest in light rail and asked for the study to evaluate its value in this area.
- Noted that the Green Line ridership has been slowly returning and average weekday ridership was approximately 25,400 in April 2023. There is capacity to accommodate additional riders in the future regardless of the alternative selected for I-94. Pre-pandemic daily Green Line ridership was 50,000 and 2040 projected ridership is 71,000.
- Results from the Metropolitan Council’s ridership forecasting model indicated that the demand for additional LRT in the corridor is low – well below pre-pandemic ridership on the Green Line and substantially below projected future ridership. Study found that BRT would generate 3,550 daily riders and light rail would generate 6,800 daily riders. Based on these projections, the study concluded that a new light rail line would not generate enough additional ridership to be warranted in the corridor.
- Noted that the end goal of the study was to recommend transit ideas for combination with highway ideas.
- The transit ideas were evaluated in comparison to the no build (2019) using a range of factors including:
 - Performance
 - Accessibility via Transit
 - Proximity to Transit Stations/Stops within Project Corridor
 - Connectivity to Transit Stations/Stops within Project corridor:
 - Environmental
 - Complexity and cost
- Robert McHaney reviewed key findings:
 - Suggested three locations for stations with highest ridership: Snelling, 25th/27th and Dale. Locations are not final. Specific transit connections will be evaluated later in the process.
 - Engagement themes: Fast, frequent, and reliable service along the corridor.
 - Study outcomes: Five transit ideas and three preliminary stop locations that are reflected in the alternatives.

Mike Hughes opened floor up to PAC members to ask questions or make comments on study.

Rep. Kaohly Her (HD-64A): Asked how the I-94 boulevard option was part of the transit study.

Mike Hughes: Will be addressed in next section.

Rep. Samantha Sencer-Mura (HD-63A): Asked presenters if they were taking land use into account when thinking about increased ridership with the at-grade option. Noted that increased land use options would lead to more ridership.

Robert McHaney (Goodman Corporation): The study was required to use Met Council model's land use assumptions.

Rep. Sencer-Mura (HD-63A): Are we missing something by not considering a rail option with at-grade options?

Melissa Barnes (MnDOT): Additional options could be considered later in the process.

Russ Stark (Mayor Melvin Carter's Office – St. Paul): Noted that he did not get a sense of potential ridership from the presentation and noted that the at-grade option was one that had some interest.

Chris Meyer (Senator Omar Fateh (SD62) Office): Was a below grade subway option considered?

Melissa Barnes (MnDOT): No.

Celeste Robinson (Council Member Robin Wonsley): Expressed support for VMT reduction and noted that she supported climate equity and racial equity anchoring the goals. Are there plans to do renderings for all the options?

Melissa Barnes (MnDOT): We do have renderings, that's next in the presentation. Noted the presentation did not repeat purpose and need, goals, evaluation criteria, etc. for the sake of time since they have been presented previously.

4. Alternatives Development Process

- Jack Corkle (WSB) presented the alternatives development process including different pairings of roadways and transit ideas.
 - Alternatives development process
 - As noted previously, the transit study identified several options for consideration to pair with roadway ideas to form complete alternatives.
 - We also tested several different roadway ideas to understand general trends and what could work with the different transit ideas.
 - The alternatives reflect different pairings of roadway and transit ideas that should be feasible and implementable based on the space available for construction.
 - Roadway ideas testing:
 - The purpose of the ideas testing was to determine what would happen in and around I-94 at a high level with different roadway types and numbers of travel lanes. We wanted to understand general implications of different options and the potential for congestion on the supporting roadway network.
 - We held a series of workshops with agency staff and project committees to guide and inform the ideas testing and alternatives development process.
 - We are presently in the Scoping stage of the project and are using the Met Council's Regional Transportation Forecasting Model. This model provides a high-level overview of travel patterns. It does not get into detailed information. Additional work in the Tier 1 EIS will provide more detail on how traffic and transit move within the corridor.

- Noted that more details will be determined later in the process.
- Reviewed key takeaways:
 - Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) measures usage of a roadway based on the number of cars using it and the distance they travel. It was used for ideas testing and will be used to evaluate all the alternatives, along with other traffic criteria, in the Tier 1 EIS.
 - Person hours and vehicle hours of travel measure how long it takes people and cars, trucks, or buses to travel through the project area. Person hours traveled (PHT) is similar to vehicle hours traveled (VHT), but accounts for vehicles with more than one person. Both PHT and VHT measure delay and will be considered in both the Scoping stage (stage we are currently in) and in the Tier 1 EIS (next stage in the process). These measures, along with others, were also used to test the roadway ideas using the regional model.
 - In general, alternatives that increase capacity (more travel lanes, managed lane) will increase the amount of vehicle miles traveled. They will also reduce person hours of travel and vehicle hours of travel.
 - Alternatives that reduce capacity (fewer travel lanes) could decrease the amount of vehicle miles traveled. They will also increase person hours of travel and vehicle hours of travel.
 - In general, alternatives that increase capacity (more travel lanes, managed lane) will provide more reliable travel times than those alternatives that reduce capacity (fewer travel lanes).
 - The regional model indicates alternatives that reduce capacity will result in substantial reduction in the number of trips on I-94. In some cases, it is cut in half. Some people will adapt, and trips will not be taken, some may change when they travel, some may change their mode of travel or destinations, but not all of those trips will go away.
 - Each alternative will have tradeoffs that will need to be balanced in the evaluation process.
 - Traffic measures are not the only criteria that will be considered when evaluating alternatives and making decisions.
 - There are many other criteria including other project needs, potential project impacts and items from the project's Statement of Goals, including criteria and measures for Livability.
- Jess Karls (WSB) reviewed background information on the alternatives.
 - As noted previously, we are in the very early stages of discussing alternatives. There is not a preferred alternative at this time. The current alternatives are draft and will be refined as the project progresses and we learn more information and receive input and feedback from the community.
 - While the current graphics give a general representation of what the roadway would be, they are not drawn to scale. There will also be some variations based on location and the amount of space available for construction. For example, today

- there are frontage roads in some areas next to the freeway and in some locations there are not. Further details will be defined as the study progresses.
- At this stage, we are attempting to understand what alternatives best serve the transportation needs of the surrounding communities and businesses, as well as others that use I-94 as part of their travel.
 - We are trying to understand where there may be challenges and want to hear from the public on what is important. Have we missed anything that should be considered?
 - We want to hear your thoughts on how these different alternatives may impact you and your community and serve your transportation needs.
 - Changes to overpasses, interchanges, and ramps have not been determined and no landscaping or corridor enhancements have been identified. Details on these improvements will be identified later in the process.
 - MnDOT respects the work done to date by Reconnect Rondo and congratulates them on receiving federal funds for further planning and environmental documentation activities. These efforts will be considered in the decision-making process for the project alternatives. MnDOT looks forward to continued coordination and collaboration with Reconnect Rondo moving forward.
 - There are currently ten alternatives. The alternatives have been named based on their function and roadway type.
 - It is important to note that “A” and “B” do not indicate a preference. These letters have been added to group similar alternatives and create space for future alternatives that could be developed. For example, “Reduced Freeway – B” or “At-Grade – C” could be added based on additional feedback and testing.
 - Some of the alternatives also have additional sub-alternatives that reflect potential transit stop options, as you’ll see shortly. Based on the transit study findings, up to three stops or stations are recommended.
 - Reviewed alternatives in detail:
 - General Maintenance
 - I-94 would remain as is. Existing transit service would continue.
 - This is the no build alternative.
 - Maintenance – A
 - Maintain the existing infrastructure. Existing transit service would continue.
 - The freeway would not be reconstructed. Maintenance A would allow for more in-depth maintenance activities.
 - The overall number of lanes would not change. Currently the number of general purpose lanes varies between 3 and 4 in both directions.
 - Existing express bus transit service (Metro Transit Route 94) would continue.
 - No changes to pedestrian or bicycle facilities.
 - No changes to interchanges or ramps along the freeway.

- Maintenance – B
 - Replace the existing infrastructure to current standards with consistent shoulders. This would allow transit to run on bus shoulders between downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul.
 - The freeway would be reconstructed with the same number of lanes.
 - Existing express bus transit service (Metro Transit Route 94) would continue. Current bus shoulders would be extended to connect downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul.
 - Some new/improved pedestrian or bicycle facilities could be provided if bridges are replaced.
 - No changes to interchanges or ramps along the freeway.
- At-grade-A
 - This concept involves the removal of the existing freeway, filling in the corridor, and constructing a new at-grade roadway featuring dedicated bus rapid transit (BRT) lanes in the center with three stops.
 - The freeway would be removed and replaced with a road that would have 2 lanes for all vehicles and 1 dedicated transit lane (for buses only) in both directions.
 - The overall number of lanes is reduced in some areas of the project corridor. Currently the number of general purpose lanes varies between 3 and 4 in both directions.
 - Transit will operate in the dedicated lanes in the center of the roadway. Stop/station locations to be determined.
 - There would likely be a mix of at-grade pedestrian and bicycle crossings (people would use crosswalks to get across the lanes of traffic) and pedestrian/bicycle bridges depending on the location.
 - New pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities along the north and/or south sides of the new roadway are possible.
 - Current interchanges and most crossing locations would be converted to intersections with the new roadway.
 - In some locations a bridge for railroad crossings, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, or local roadways may remain due to the terrain.
 - Current frontage roads/side streets may be removed or incorporated into the at-grade design.
- At-grade-B
 - This concept involves the removal of the existing freeway, filling in the corridor, and constructing a new at-grade roadway featuring dedicated bus rapid transit (BRT) lanes on the outside of the roadway with three stops.
 - The only difference from At-Grade – A is the location of the BRT lanes.
- Local/Regional Roadways-A

- This concept features a separation into two roadway systems, providing a separate local traffic roadway and freeway space for through trips. The local system provides transportation options for local traffic, while the regional system offers limited access for regional traffic and includes transit on the shoulder.
 - The freeway would be reconstructed and narrowed to have 2 general purpose lanes (all vehicles can use) and a bus shoulder in both directions.
 - Two-way local streets will be constructed on each side of the freeway, with speed limits expected to be lower than the freeway.
 - Current frontage roads/side streets may be removed or incorporated into the local roadway design.
 - The overall number of freeway lanes is reduced throughout the project corridor. Currently the number of general purpose lanes varies between 3 and 4 in both directions.
 - Transit will operate in the bus shoulders. Stop/station locations to be determined.
 - Current pedestrian facilities would be improved, and additional pedestrian and bicycle crossings will be considered.
 - New pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities along the new local roadways are possible.
 - Current interchanges along the freeway would be modified or removed to improve mobility and safety. Most existing on/off ramps along the freeway would be removed.
- Reduced Freeway-A
 - This concept involves rebuilding the existing freeway to include 2 general purpose lanes and 1 managed lane (for buses, those that carpool, and those willing to pay) with bus rapid transit (BRT) in each direction. The BRT system could include up to three stops along the managed lane.
 - The overall number of lanes is reduced throughout the project corridor. Currently the number of general purpose lanes varies between 3 and 4 in both directions.
 - Transit will operate in the managed lanes with no stops; 1 stop at Snelling Ave; or 3 stops at 25th/27th Ave, Snelling Ave, and Dale St. (Final locations to be determined).
 - Current pedestrian facilities would be improved, and additional pedestrian and bicycle crossings will be considered.
 - Interchanges and ramps along the freeway would be studied to improve mobility and safety.
- Reconfigure Freeway-A
 - This concept involves rebuilding the existing freeway to include 3 general purpose lanes and 1 managed lane (for buses, those that carpool, and those willing to pay) with bus rapid transit (BRT) in

each direction. The BRT system could include up to three stops along the managed lane.

- The overall number of lanes stays the same throughout the project corridor. Currently the number of general purpose lanes varies between 3 and 4 in both directions.
 - Transit will operate in the managed lanes with no stops; 1 stop at Snelling Ave; or 3 stops at 25th/27th Ave, Snelling Ave, and Dale St. (Final locations to be determined).
 - Current pedestrian facilities would be improved, and additional pedestrian and bicycle crossings will be considered.
 - Interchanges and ramps along the freeway would be studied to improve mobility and safety.
 - Expanded Freeway-A
 - This concept involves rebuilding the existing freeway and adding 1 managed lane (for buses, those that carpool, and those willing to pay) with bus rapid transit (BRT) in each direction. The BRT system could include up to three stops along the managed lane. The total number of lanes will vary because the current number of lanes also varies.
 - The overall number of lanes will increase by 1 throughout the project corridor. Currently the number of general purpose lanes varies between 3 and 4 in both directions.
 - Transit will operate in the managed lanes with no stops; 1 stop at Snelling Ave; or 3 stops at 25th/27th Ave, Snelling Ave, and Dale St. (Final locations to be determined).
 - Current pedestrian facilities would be improved, and additional pedestrian and bicycle crossings will be considered.
 - Interchanges and ramps along the freeway would be studied to improve mobility and safety.
 - Expanded Freeway-B
 - This concept involves rebuilding the existing freeway and adding 1 new lane (for all vehicles) and extending the bus shoulder in each direction. The total number of lanes will increase.
 - The overall number of lanes will increase by 1 throughout the project corridor. Currently the number of general purpose lanes varies between 3 and 4 in both directions.
 - Transit will operate in bus shoulders. Current bus shoulders would be extended to connect downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul.
 - Current pedestrian facilities would be improved, and additional pedestrian and bicycle crossings will be considered.
 - Interchanges and ramps along the freeway would be studied to improve mobility and safety.
- Presented alternatives conclusions:

- Reminded committee that we are still in Scoping and will be for the next year.
- Reminded committee that there is not a preferred alternative at this time. The current alternatives are draft and will be refined as the project progresses and we learn more information and receive input and feedback from the community. At the end of Scoping we will have a narrowed range of potential alternatives to study in the Tier 1 EIS.

Mike Hughes opened up the discussion for PAC Member comments/questions.

Council Member Mitra Jalali (Ward 4 – St. Paul): Noted that in February 2021, the Council and mayor passed a resolution expressing opposition to reconstruction or expansion of the freeway. Strongly opposed reconstructing the freeway as is, and strongly opposed expansion even if expanding for transit, but supported increased transit options. Asked why is expansion on the table if the goal is climate resiliency and equity.

Melissa Barnes (MnDOT): Noted MnDOT is currently looking at the universe of all alternatives, but the evaluation criteria will be applied and some will be eliminated. Barnes explained that the project’s purpose and need includes mobility and that the alternatives presented today are high level. Barnes confirmed Council Member Jalali’s comment (see above) that MnDOT received a copy of the February 2021 resolution.

Commissioner Rena Moran (District 4 - Ramsey County): Asked the presenters if when they were thinking about I-94 expansion they were also taking into consideration environmental, climate justice, and sound pollution for surrounding residents. Noted that people do want to get to where they are going as fast as possible but wanted sound barriers and the wellbeing of residents to be taken into consideration as well. Said they liked the highway where it is and would like to see sound barriers as well as other environmental considerations applied.

Russ Stark (Representative for Mayor Melvin Carter – St. Paul): Echoed Council Member Jalali’s comment that the City does not find expansion acceptable. The diagrams do not show what might be possible with the different options such as the potential for different land uses in the at-grade alternative. The City cannot say what is possible unless they know how much land is available and what the land is like. Some of the alternatives show upgrades to walking and biking access, which they support. They said they would like to see how different sections will be put together, and wanted frontage roads to feel like they are part of neighborhood. They emphasized land use and a need to illustrate what is possible in future iterations. They also explained that they wanted to see what the alternatives look like across the corridor and not just one part, though they said they recognized that is hard to do.

Rep. Sencer-Mura (HD-63A): Said they were excited by at-grade options, particularly B, which appears to be the most pedestrian friendly option. Echoed Russ Stark’s call for more visuals in the future. Asked what the next steps in moving the alternatives forward would be.

Melissa Barnes (MnDOT): The alternatives need to meet purpose and need to move on to Tier 1 EIS to be studied further, which is where more of the details will be discussed and microsimulation of traffic will take place. Reminded everyone this is very high-level look at alternatives and potentially they could all move forward pending the evaluation of alternatives.

Celeste Robinson (Representative for Council Member Robin Wonsley): Told the PAC that boulevard conversion is what Ward 2 supports, and what Councilmember Wonsley supports. The at-grade scenarios most closely align with what they would like to see though that does not always mean walkable and/or transit friendly. Said they would like to see more green space, and non-highway at-grade quality. Said that residents want an at-grade boulevard, not to completely remove the highway. Recommended inviting an expert to next PAC meeting on highway removal. In order to screen options, health, climate equity, noise, and environmental criteria need to be discussed for the boulevard option.

Commissioner Angela Conley (District 4 - Hennepin County): Echoed Celeste Robinson. Said their residents want a boulevard, especially along the Riverside area. They do not support expansion, which the commissioner called detrimental and dangerous. Said they supported removal for climate and equity, said expansion was counter to goals. Said the highway needed to be removed. Said residents want to walk, breathe, and take transit. Emphasized they were in favor of an at-grade roadway that is more a boulevard conversion and incorporates transit. Agreed that an expert should come in. Emphasized that residents want a slowdown and not an expansion of the highway.

W. Toni Carter (Metropolitan Council): Said they were not prepared to have a preferred option and does not think that is necessary at this time. Echoed thoughts shared by others around the goals. Expansion is not an alternative that fits with the goals. One size may not fit all of I-94, encouraged MnDOT to think about how we can meet the goals along the way in line with community vision. There may be different ways of meeting vision along the corridor. Wanted to add flexibility, not complexity to the plan by suggesting different parts of the corridor could look different. Noted that reconfigured freeway could work better for east side than at-grade, which could be better for the west side. Asked if there is flexibility in the vision along the way as long as they work together and if there was capacity to have flexible configuration.

Mike Hughes: Yes, there are many potential options.

Commissioner Rena Moran (District 4 - Ramsey County): Likes Maintenance B alternative. Asked for clarification on which of the alternatives was closest to the boulevard option.

Melissa Barnes (MnDOT): At-grade A and B are the closest to the boulevard options.

Chris Meyer (Senator Omar Fateh (SD62) Office): Thanked staff for including for at-grade options and noted they are the Senator's preferred option. Stated that BRT lanes on the outside (At-Grade B) would probably be better. Senator Fateh was hoping for a subway option, disappointed it is not included. Echoed Rep. Samantha Sencer-Mura's comments.

5. Upcoming Public Engagement

- Renee Raduenz (MnDOT) presented MnDOT's plans for public engagement on the alternatives.
 - A Community Leaders meeting will be held on July 18, 2023.
 - MnDOT is looking to engage youth organizations, elderly, and disability community.
 - MnDOT will be presenting information at several upcoming neighborhood group or association meetings.
 - MnDOT will be presenting at the City of St. Paul's City Council Organizational Committee meeting on July 19, 2023
 - MnDOT is looking to engage the business community and tentatively has scheduled an engagement with the St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce to present information on the alternatives. MnDOT is also engaging businesses along the I-94 corridor.
 - MnDOT will engage people online and in-person open house events to be announced.
 - MnDOT will be making a survey live online.
- Rep. Sencer-Mura (HD-63A): Suggested a field hearing might be coming up in the fall.

6. PAC Member Update

- Mike Hughes encouraged people to reach out to the project team if they have more comments to share with the team, comments to shared from their communities, or know of additional opportunities for community engagement MnDOT should be aware of.

7. Next Steps

- Commissioner Daubenberger reminded attendees that the project will be in Scoping for the next year, and that an official public comment period on the Scoping Document is anticipated next spring. They noted that the next PAC meeting would likely occur in the winter.

Open Comment

An open comment period was held at the end of the meeting. Comments shared are summarized on the following pages. Additional written comments submitted during and after the meeting are included in later sections.

Note: Comments below are transcribed summaries based on oral comments.

- **Elizabeth W.F. (virtual)**
 - Lives in Seward with her new baby and is a health demographer at the University of Minnesota. Both health and health equity should be key criteria for this project, but she saw only transportation objectives rather than saving lives and rapidly changing climate. Half of air pollution is from cars, which harms babies brain development and lungs. Even electric cars cause pollution from brakes and tires. Cars driving into neighborhood streets is dangerous. There is no form of freeway that will not harm people's health. A

health assessment should be robust enough to include these harms, as well as noise, and speed of cars. She supports making health a priority, and supported highway to boulevard conversion options.

- **Keith B. (ReConnect Rondo) (virtual)**
 - Thanked MnDOT and Met Council for opportunity to see alternatives. Recognized over the process that it will be narrowed down but wanted to emphasize one size does not fit all, we all have common climate, housing, economic aspiration, and we should look at things in context of communities along the corridor. Pointed out the universal benefit of healthy communities. Looked forward to more direct feedback from community members. They have a gathering on August 17 to discuss the alternatives.

- **CJ L. (BikeMN) (virtual)**
 - Was looking for information on sustainability and environmental goals on the project. Said he would challenge the proposals because they do not speak to those priorities, the projects focus on moving more people and moving them faster is contradictory to MnDOT's own goals of reduced vehicle miles travelled. Not sure how increased capacity is related to environmental equity goals.

- **Ian B. (virtual)**
 - Lived in Frogtown, said they were looking forward to taking the I-94 corridor and making it into something that does not harm our communities. Feels that there are obvious alternatives that are missing such as subway option, one that makes it possible to continue, like a heavy rail subway, outwards towards Wisconsin. Communities that way have a rail coalition because that want a regional rail connection between Eau Claire and the Twin Cities. They would support a boulevard conversion with heavy rail subway underneath, people are excited about that in his community. Said this would still provide a way to get to core of Twin Cities in a low carbon manner.

- **Ted R. (virtual)**
 - Minneapolis resident, St. Paul native. They frequently crossed the freeway, said it serves as the biggest barrier to crossing St. Paul. Said it was the hardest thing to do. Their experience along the corridor was not using the corridor. They used the Green Line instead because they did not want to sit in traffic and pollute communities. Supports boulevard option, maintaining and expanding highway signs communities up for health, financial, and safety burden, and long-term burden of climate disaster. They encouraged holistic outlook.

- **Scott B. (Union Park District Council) (virtual)**
 - Expressed that I-94 is a barrier in the community. They would not consider walking one mile to Target. Family livability is nonexistent, would not visit friends north of the highway without a car. Currently use I-94 to get to work. They are in favor of the boulevard conversion, make single vehicle transit less appealing to discourage car use and make other modes less appealing. Noted Maxfield school, an elementary school

along the corridor. Said children need to be considered, alternatives of 14 lanes and pollution leads him to think communities of color and young people are not being taken into consideration. Does not think that the scale of the graphics is right and wanted more information on land use. Disagrees with purpose and needs, people should be taken into consideration. Hopes Capitol grounds are considered, should be more accessible.

- **Jared K. (virtual)**
 - Expansion should never have been an option, lives in corridor with asthma. Disappointed that regional rail is being tossed out for no reason, said MnDOT would regret this decision. Liked at-grade A and B as long as speed limits remained low, such as 40-45 mph for busses, and 20-25 mph for cars.
- **Nahid K. (Highway 252 Task Force and Equity and Health Neighborhood Advisors for the Highway 252/I-94 Project) (virtual)**
 - Said the goal of MnDOT is to rebuild and expand the freeway, connect to Highway 252/I-94 project in Brooklyn Park. Said the real agenda was to turn everything into a freeway and that funding has been allocated for expanding a freeway. Freeways are all MnDOT does. Only agenda is expansion. Said it is in the MnDOT playbook. Said script always includes safety, reducing crashes, and addressing congestion and advancing mobility, it is all the same each time, each of those and others can be refuted if you look at the facts and the data. Freeways do not make roadways safer. They increase traffic numbers and crash costs.
- **Charles F.L. (Minnesota Environmental Justice Table) (virtual)**
 - Resident of St. Paul and member of the Minnesota Environmental Justice Table, wanted to say that health and well-being of BIPOC communities is too much of an afterthought, and it appears they are zoned for extraction. Agencies have looked the other way rather than using their power to fix the situation. MnDOT should prioritize these issues, encouraged highway removal. Stated that they want more highway removal options so people can prioritize what they want.
- **Pat T. (St. Anthony Park Community Council) (virtual)**
 - Member of the St. Anthony Park Community Council. Speaking about climate future, pointed out extreme heat and bad air and low rainfall. Said they opposed expansion. Said government should reconnect communities along the corridor, want to decrease VMT, easiest to achieve in St. Paul and Minneapolis. Noted that more highway leads to more demand and more negative consequences.
- **Elizabeth B. (Our Streets Minneapolis) (virtual)**
 - Supported boulevard conversion and urged MnDOT to have a subway or rail line. Buses cannot be the only solution; they get stuck in traffic. Do not add another lane, only adds to traffic. Understands ridership demands, but if you build it people will come, will save lives, and time in traffic. Should include more bike lanes and prioritize people over cars.

- **Darwin S. (virtual)**
 - Resident of Twin Cities near I-35, rides public transit. Said I-94 is congested, said buses were stuck on shoulder. Public transit needs to be built for future capacity. Supported a modal shift and said status quo not acceptable. I-94 could reduce car dependency. Trucks use I-694. Said boulevard would be amazing but also need longer term solutions. Supported a regional rail between St. Paul and Minneapolis. Supports At-Grade option A, but with a transit trench.

- **Jeremie E. (virtual)**
 - Newly appointed to St. Paul Recovery Act Reparations Commission. Grew up in Rondo. Emphasized that there would not be an I-94 if Rondo boulevard were not taken down, encouraged PAC to keep in perspective what was lost. Support At-Grade A or no build options, not concerned with rebuilding I-94. A whole community was displaced and disenfranchised the first time, keep it in perspective when thinking about what goes the community. Said they understand there needs to be changes in accessibility and said that changes are out of the question on the east side. Reconstruction or building a boulevard would not be good for the east side of the corridor.

- **Lisa N. (virtual)**
 - MnDOT has apologized for building I-94. Rondo was destroyed but right now every community on the highway is being affected by pollution, especially communities of color. The future is more important, prioritizing cars would be a mistake in light of climate change. If the climate crisis and negative health effects are not taken into account now and we miss the opportunity someone who is a child right now will have to apologize for it. Cannot rebuild the highway the way it is. Said they wanted more safety on surrounding streets, pedestrians, and biking.

- **Peter W. (virtual)**
 - Minneapolis and St. Paul opposed expansion, as do elected officials along the corridor. Pointed out that new legislation could change the scope of the project and the considerations going into it. Are ridership numbers so low in this narrow project area that putting light rail in this corridor off the table?

- **Mary M.M. (virtual)**
 - Lives in St. Paul. Said fixing I-94 is a moral imperative, that we must reduce carbon. Alternatives need to repair all of highway harms. Stated that traffic demand and induced demand are real. Want tunnels for transit and train, a trench for transit, boulevard conversion, housing, green space options, and bike lanes. I-94 is the most consequential project in climate change and public health project. Does not want the options constrained to highways, encouraged MnDOT to be more creative with options, go back to the drawing board, and update the models.

- **Jesse C. (virtual)**
 - Supported a heavy rail option. True regional rail often connects stops within a few miles of each other, as well as the outer areas. Now is cheapest and best time to build it. Wanted high speed train between Minneapolis and St. Paul, an intra-city rail line that would connect different transit types. Wanted to see regional rail evaluated, disappointed by how quickly rail was dismissed and expansion got more consideration.

- **Joe H. (Our Streets Minneapolis) (In-person)**
 - Is a student and resident of St. Paul. Health, economic, and environmental issues need to be addressed as well as access. Said they felt that students are underrepresented. Rethinking needs to add climate, environmental justice, and racial considerations to plans. Finds expansion insulting and supports boulevard option.

- **Jose Z.C. (Our Streets Minneapolis) (In-Person)**
 - Said he supports boulevard option, wanted MnDOT to return stolen land, and for MnDOT to take into consideration the racial prejudice that the original I-94 was built on. Must decolonize the project corridor and protect the community. Allow the community to rebuild their neighborhood in the same way that white people have been allowed to. Rebuilding and capping the highway is not what is needed. Called the highway an emblem of white supremacy.

- **Alex B. (Our Streets Minneapolis) (In-Person)**
 - Traffic assumptions presented today for both removal and expansion do not track with what we've seen in other projects across the country. Expanding highway would not reduce congestion or travel time. The Houston highway got worse after expansion. Traffic is a concern and should be a consideration on boulevard, but traffic has not been an issue in other places with highway removal, encouraged people to walk and take transit more. Pointed to I-95 collapse in Philadelphia as an example of people working around not having a highway.

Questions Posted During PAC Meeting Using Q&A Function

Note: Comment text is presented exactly as submitted. Spelling, grammar, and punctuation have not been modified.

- **Elizabeth W.F.**
 - Are the details of the modeling that was done available? I'm very interested (as someone whose movement patterns throughout the cities would be very, very different than they are now if there were fast public transit between the two downtowns, or the UMN campus and downtown St Paul, for example).

 - What assumptions about ebike growth, and how it will change mobility choices under these various options, were made in the modeling? It seems like this is a moment where options for alternatives to individual vehicles are rapidly expanding and backwards-looking modeling that doesn't take that into account would really miss the moment. It seems really plausible that by the time any ground is broken on this project (let alone

through the life of the road), the context might be quite different than it is today. I'm very curious about how MnDOT is approaching this.

- What everyone else is saying about the pedestrian experience is so true. It's a really short walk from my house to East River Flats, Cedar Cultural Center, so many great things that I'd walk to all the time if it didn't mean walking over 94. (And I do walk over 94 every time I walk to work.) A freeway that you're reluctant to cross really makes your experience of the city so much smaller.
- **Darwin S.**
 - Is there anyway that regional rail could be incorporated into the project? Create a true alternative at high speeds that metros of our size like Montreal (a smaller metro than ours) is doing with the REM project?
 - Have regional rail trains been evaluated for use, like the Stadler FLIRT or KISS, trains that are not locomotive push-pull operated but are modern multiple unit lines?
 - Have you considered the difference between commuter rail and regional rail and how there could be a more express rail service between the downtowns than light rail? It would be faster and more high-capacity as well, and would compete much better with driving. Frequent, high quality regional rail service exists within many dense urban areas in Europe and Asia and doesn't necessarily connect separate urban areas. The most urban sections tend to get the highest ridership as well and regional rail in the I-94 would absolutely get more ridership than the current Northstar route.
 - Is it possible this express BRT line could be an extension of the Gold Line?
 - Does MNDOT's traffic models account for induced demand that causes traffic to increase when roadway capacity is increased? And there is also the inverse - reduced demand that results in lower traffic volumes when capacity is reduced.
- **Scott B.**
 - Does MnDOT have a stance on the concept of "induced demand"? Does MnDOT acknowledge this theory? If not, what is the official stance?
 - Why were other options taken off the table completely, if the road expansion was left as a global option? I am not convinced that rail was studied holistically here, nor that the models adequately factored in changes in habits (driving less) and mode share (biking and transit more) resulting from at-grade options.
- **Nahid K.**
 - What are the Tiers of the EIS? What is Tier 1 EIS, Tier 2 EIS? Are there definitions or explanations online that I can look up?

- What is a visual quality analysis? I would like a full explanation and would appreciate a definition and details of what is involved; is there an online resource that I can look up?
- I am a member of MnDOT's Hwy 252 / I-94 project Equity and Health Neighborhood Advisors for the Equity and Health Assessment conducted by MnDOT's Sustainability and Public Health Division. For EHA Report #3, where we reviewed, evaluated and assessed the draft SDD alternatives for Hwy 252 only (but not I-94 through N Mpls and Brooklyn Center: major oversight). Assessment of aesthetics was discussed but ultimately aesthetics were not included because we (the EHNA) were told that MnDOT does not have a methodology to deal with aesthetics (presumably visual quality). Now it turns out that there is such a thing as a visual quality analysis that MnDOT does and is including for "rethinking" I-94 but it seems, NOT for the Hwy 252 / I-94 project, even though aesthetics and visual quality is very important for at least the I-94 portion in N. Mpls (as this area is currently very ugly, far more ugly than I-94 between Mpls and St. Paul.). Please provide full information on your visual quality analysis.
- Freeway construction, conversion and expansion induces more car (and truck) traffic. How do you model for public transit in terms of it inducing more use of public transit if / when it is constructed or expanded? "If you build it, they will come": how does that translate to public transit in terms of inducing more use of public transit? It seems the modeling about ridership does not account for this additional level of potential change in public transit usage.
- I would like to request that the project team look at policies and approaches (alternatives) that reduce truck traffic (especially diesel-burning large heavy freight trucks) on I-94 between downtown St. Paul and I-694 in Brooklyn Center in order to reduce air and other types of pollution.
- Following up on the issue of inducing traffic vs. inducing public transit, does MnDOT have a position, modeling or even theory on "traffic evaporation" when freeway or highway size is reduced; this should be seriously examined given all the issues involved in any sort of freeway construction, conversion, expansion, etc., for equity, health, environment, sustainability, etc., which are all matters that should be foundational and paramount to this and other projects such as the Hwy 252 / I-94 project through N. Mpls, Brooklyn Center and Brooklyn Park. The irreversible harms and fatal flaws of these freeway projects, especially all forms of pollution, should be exposed and publicly discussed, especially in our era of climate change, and the role of transportation in contributing to that through greenhouse gases and global warming. All freeway projects, whether construction, conversion, and expansion, just by being on the table, seem to egregiously ignore these issues, especially in urban and first-ring suburbs.
- Yes, where is the evidence that Equity, Health, Environment, Sustainability and Community Livability, etc., area actually and tangibly being prioritized and implemented

anywhere in this process? They are not in the Purpose and Need, which is entirely transportation focused, so how can the claim be made that the Equity, etc., priorities are important? Show us the evidence that they are being implemented in this or the Hwy 252 / I-94 project through N Mpls, BC and BP (essentially connected projects since the ultimate goal really is to rebuild and expand I-94 and turn Hwy 252 into a freeway, so it is expanded freeway all the way from downtown St. Paul to Hwy 610 in BP (all with EZPass toll lanes), including an heretofore not really publicly discussed eventual project between just west of I-35W to just north of I-394. These are all connected projects.

- MnDOT's only agenda is to rebuild I-94 as a freeway and expand it as well as put in EZPass toll lanes, all the way from downtown St. Paul through Minneapolis and Brooklyn Center, and then turn Hwy 252 (a local roadway) into a freeway to Hwy 610 in Brooklyn Park (also with EZPass toll lanes). The claim that there are no preferred alternatives and that no final decisions have been made is untrue; please check what tax funds have been allocated for this project; they make it clear that freeway expansion is the plan and goal. This is the case for the Hwy 252 / I-94 project; behind the scenes, big funds have been allocated for freeways, but in public the claim for years was no preferred alternative and no final decision. Behind the scenes, the project team was working towards getting only the 6-lane freeway conversion for Hwy 252 and expansion of I-94, but in public, supposedly a range of alternatives were being studied and presented to the PAC and public, all eliminated except freeway in draft SDD this spring.
- Hwy 252 / I-94 project team / TAC meetings show that they were working towards 6-lane freeway for Hwy 252 and expansion for I-94, and then mature late-stage draft of SDD found in summer 2022 showing only two versions of 6-lane freeway recommended to move forward, at same time as PAC review, community engagement work and Equity and Health Neighborhood Advisor work to evaluate range of alternatives was scheduled (I am a member). Then, this spring 2023, draft SDD released for public comment, having added 4-lane normal speed freeway only as a temporary, interim placeholder towards 6-lane freeway for Hwy 252, pending full funding for 6-lane freeway (which is not fully funded), which is stated twice in draft SDD. MnDOT has tried its hardest to prevent public comment to reject the 6-lane freeway for Hwy 252 and expansion of I-94, saying we can comment only on their freeway alternatives; we are not allowed to reject their freeway alternatives and expansions that they recommended.
- MnDOT has the same playbook to justify freeway construction, conversion, expansions: safety, congestion, mobility. It's the same for each project. MnDOT claims freeways are safer, even though the vastly increased traffic numbers result in increases in crashes and crash costs, not fewer (though they misleadingly claim that "rates" of these decrease). Congestion also increases because of redirected traffic and induced traffic. I-94 in N Mpls and BC, and Hwy 252 in BC and BP are congested for less than 1 hr a day, only during peak time. But MnDOT admits that within 7 years of turning Hwy 252 into a freeway, it will be fully congested for most of the day! Mobility is a claim, but reducing from 6 intersections to 2-3 interchanges belies that claim also. And then there are all the

equity issues resulting from around 210 properties being fully seized or partially encroached upon and invasive huge interchange structures upon residential neighborhoods of starter homes of majority lower-income, working class BIPOC.

- And all the health, environmental, sustainability and related issues of the Hwy 252 / I-94 project, all the same as the "rethinking" I-94 project: majority BIPOC communities with huge health, socio-economic disparities, etc., and the environment of the Mississippi River, which most of us cannot even reach because of I-94 and Hwy 252.
- What is the role of the new MN Transportation Bill and also the MN Climate Action Framework in planning for "rethinking" I-94 and Hwy 252 / I-94? These need to be implemented retroactively, and not claimed, oh, they were already in the Met Council TIP and STIP, so the projects are grandfathered in without need for the Transportation Bill and Climate Action Plan to be applied to these two highway projects and others.
- Healthy citizens make for a healthy democracy.
- **CJL.**
 - Sounds like the existing transit infrastructure is assumed to be static/fixed, which is somewhat limiting. Is Met Council / Metro Transit working alongside mndot on these feasibility studies? For example, have you considered effects of changing existing Metro Transit bus routes to maximize ridership with different options?
 - i'd love to "be reminded" about how this project has been aligned to meet MNDOT's VMT reduction targets
 - Yes! Didn't catch this speaker's name, but "why is expansion even being considered?" is exactly the right question to be asking. Agree with all of their comments.
 - FYI, i've been trying to find the documentation on values and goals that were referenced earlier, and am not finding that specific information anywhere. Is there a better site for that than this: https://talk.dot.state.mn.us/rethinking-i94/news_feed/background ? Like the person who had asked for this earlier, I am interested in what are the project goals, and what are the values underlying those goals. Thanks in advance.
 - (the purpose and need link on that page is not working, i imagine that could have been a place for some of that info to be housed?)
 - Here is the draft Purpose statement from Oct '22:
Projects within the Rethinking I-94 program will accomplish the following:
 - Improve mobility for people and goods on, along, and across the corridor in a way that facilitates community connections for all modes
 - Enhance safety for people and goods on, along, and across the I-94 corridor for all modes
 - Address aging infrastructure condition within the I-94 corridor

- Support transportation objectives consistent with adopted state and regional (Met Council) plans
- From draft Purpose & Need doc:

“One common theme noted in the comments received from MnDOT’s early release of draft documents was that the purpose and need and statement of goals should identify environmental enhancements or improvements. Examples included reducing air and noise pollution, addressing greenhouse gas emissions, and reducing the amount and distance people drive in single occupancy vehicles. There has been a groundswell of community support for addressing greenhouse gas emissions as part of Rethinking I-94.”
- I have not found any documentation that Public Health benefits, Community Livability improvements, or Equity have been given any priority at all in this process, although I’ve heard project members say that these are important values — how/where is this showing up in the project??
- My comment is that this “Reimagining I-94” project has been remarkably unimaginative thus far. The only project goals I can find in any written documents relate to mobility goals, especially increasing capacity (induced demand!), and not at all related to health, environment, sustainability, equity, or other priorities that impact community livability. MNDOT already has VMT reduction goals, but that was not referenced by the project leaders one single time during this meeting nor as a priority in the project planning documents. IF these are actually priorities, and are being considered during all phases of this project, these should be presented each time the project is shared.
- **Pat T.**
 - Is the lack of projected ridership for light rail partly because of the dictated logical termini?
- **Keith B.**
 - Hi. Thank you for the transit update. I am Keith Baker of ReConnect Rondo and a member of the Rondo Roundtable a collective of 13 organizations working together to preserve and advocate on behalf of Rondo residents (elders, descendants, etc.) I will be reporting back to the Roundtable to update them and to invite MnDOT/Met Council to share this presentation to Roundtable partners.
 - ReConnect Rondo and the Rondo Roundtable look forward to reviewing and offering critique and ideas concerning the alternatives. There is an opportunity here; for the African American elders, descendants and Rondo residents. The voice of those most impacted by the construction of I-94 in Rondo must lead. Who leads matters and this should be seriously considered, in fact influence which alternatives will move forward. Thank you for allowing me to participate.

- **Lisa N.**
 - Do the measurements of travel reliability and vehicle and person hours traveled refer just to those traveling on the highway itself in personal vehicles, or does it include reliability and travel time for those using public transit as well?

- **Grant J.**
 - What plans are in place to address and fix the impacts of division that I-94 has caused on neighborhood communities?
 - Please refrain from adding car lanes, induced demand has proved that greater traffic follows from expansion and is an antiquated approach.

- **Joy S.**
 - Agree with safer frontage roads please! They are our neighborhoods!

- **Katherine S.**
 - I totally agree with CJ Lindor and Grant Johnson and so echo their comments. NO Expansion!

- **Elizabeth B.**
 - Want to emphasize that we need to think about giving people without cars more independence. Whether it's a choice, economic situation, or because they're a kid, they will have more freedom to travel. We need to prioritize people over cars on 94.

- **Colleen O.T.**
 - On behalf of Friends of the Mississippi River, I'd also like to share our support for a Rethinking I-94 that truly rethinks the freeway. The interstate is an environmental justice catastrophe that we cannot continue to perpetuate. I urge MnDOT to give the fullest consideration to alternatives that reduce VMT, improve community health and environmental quality, reconnect neighborhoods, and reduce auto dependency.

- **Stewart V.**
 - Would at-grade options entail restoring north/south connections for streets that are now severed by I-94 (eg. 22nd Avenue in Mpls, Chatsworth in St. Paul)?

- **Greta M.**
 - Have any alternatives been studied where the freeway is removed while maintaining the current topography? I'm interested in how working with the freeway cut can mitigate environmental impacts of construction in a boulevard conversion scenario. Thanks!

- **Charles F.L.**
 - Absoutlely agree with Commisoner Conley's comments!

- **Marya H.**
 - Ditto CJ's comment!

- **Walter E.**
 - Rethink I-94 should include consideration of putting the right of way underground through the entire metro in the manner of I-35 in Duluth. Lane addition need not be mandatory to move transitory traffic. Local needs must be prioritized.

Comments Submitted Following the Meeting

Meeting attendees were invited to submit additional written comments following the PAC meeting via the project website or email address. Additional written comments submitted by attendees following the PAC meeting are provided below.

Note: Comment text is presented exactly as submitted. Spelling, grammar, and punctuation have not been modified.

- **PaulB**
 - I thought there was a survey online for those that didn't attend the public meetings, but I can't find that link. One comment - ensure there are no bottlenecks - the bridge at Snelling where one lane has to exit, only to add the lane back after the bridge is an example. Widen the bridge so all lanes can continue.

- **Elizabeth W.F.**
 - Hello! Since oral comments are not recorded, here is a written version of what I said in my two minutes:

I have a professional and personal connection to this question. I live mere blocks from 94, in Seward, raising a beautiful baby who breathes its air and hears its noise throughout every day of her life. Professionally, I'm a health demographer at the U, focused on modeling health equity.

From both of those perspectives, I want to urge that both health and health equity be key criteria for this project. I read the purpose and need draft document and everything I saw is about transportation objectives. I don't see saving the most number of lives or acting in a way consistent with our rapidly changing climate.

Something few people realize: about half of air pollution generated by traffic isn't from exhaust. It's from tire/road friction and brake pad friction. These release heavy metals into the air. They harm babies' brain development and all of our lungs. Electrification is crucial, but electric cars will be WORSE from this perspective because they are heavier. These pollutants reflect vehicle miles and vehicle speed, not vehicle time.

There is no form of freeway that won't create substantial health risks for everyone living nearby, and those risks will fall most heavily on the most disadvantaged communities living there.

A health assessment needs to be robust enough to include these harms, to include noise pollution (I can hear 94 right now; I always can), to include the effects on safety in the neighborhood when cars drive on our neighborhood streets in the driving mindset of the freeway they just left (as in Seward's 26th Avenue, where cars zooming off the freeway are the reason kids can't safely walk to school), to include the full range of health effects.

I support making health and climate key criteria, and I support a highway to boulevard conversion.

- **Wendy D.**

- Hello-

I am a resident of the EarthSheltered Townhomes, located on the Seward side of the designated "zone 2" in your community engagement project. We are located on 9th Street, on the 25th and Riverside exit, which is not optimal. The design of our complex is forward thinking, originally solar, and built to meet the challenges of our current climate crisis. As we all choke on the smoke of burning Canadian Forests, grateful to be spared the heat dome over the south and west of the country and the drowning in the northeast, I would hope the expansion of a major cause of the climate crisis- a massive concrete thoroughfare encouraging fossil fuel use is not on the table.

Despite engaging with Open Streets and Redesign since 2015, I am somehow new to the "rethinking" process, only finding out about last night's meeting this morning on MPR. I'm sure this is user error, but would like to know how as a resident directly on a dangerous exit of I-94 I could be part of this process.

Policy Advisory Committee Members

An "X" in the Present column denotes members attending the meeting virtually.

Present	Name	Organization
In-Person	Commissioner Nancy Daubenger (PAC Chair)	MnDOT
X	Chair Charlie Zelle (PAC Co-Chair)	Metropolitan Council
In-Person	Wendall Meyer	FHWA
	Mayor Jacob Frey	City of Minneapolis
X	Council Member Robin Wonsley (Celeste Robinson representing)	City of Minneapolis-Ward 3
	Council Member Jamal Osman	City of Minneapolis-Ward 6
In-Person	Mayor Melvin Carter (Russ Stark representing)	City of St. Paul
X	Council Member Russel Balenger (Dan Dodge representing)	City of St. Paul-Ward 1
In-Person	Council Member Mitra Jalali	City of St. Paul-Ward 4
X	Commissioner Angela Conley	Hennepin County-District 4
	Commissioner Kevin Anderson	Hennepin County-District 7
In-Person	Commissioner Rena Moran	Ramsey County-District 4
	Commissioner Mai Chong Xiong	Ramsey County-District 6
X	Council Member W. Toni Carter	Metropolitan Council-District 14
	Senator Bobby Joe Champion	MN Legislature-District 59
In-Person	Senator Kari Dziedzic (Abdihamid Badri representing)	MN Legislature-District 60
	Senator D. Scott Dibble	MN Legislature-District 61
X	Senator Omar Fateh (Chris Meyer representing)	MN Legislature-District 62
	Senator Zaynab Mohmed	MN Legislature-District 63
	Senator Erin Murphy	MN Legislature-District 64
X	Senator Sandra Pappas (Fatima Acosta-Mendoza representing)	MN Legislature-District 65
	Senator Clare Oumou Verbeten	MN Legislature-District 66
	Representative Esther Agbaje	MN Legislature-District 59B

Present	Name	Organization
	Representative Mohamud Noor	MN Legislature-District 60B
	Representative Frank Hornstein	MN Legislature-District 61A
	Representative Aisha Gomez	MN Legislature-District 62A
	Representative Hodan Hassan	MN Legislature-District 62B
In-Person	Representative Samantha Sencer-Mura	MN Legislature-District 63A
In-Person	Representative Kaohly Her	MN Legislature-District 64A
	Representative Samakab Hussein	MN Legislature-District 65A
	Representative Maria Isa Perez-Vega	MN Legislature-District 65B
	Representative Leigh Finke	MN Legislature-District 66A

Agency and Consultant Staff

An "X" in the Present column denotes members attending the meeting virtually.

Present	Name	Organization
In-Person	Michael Barnes	MnDOT
In-Person	Melissa Barnes	MnDOT
In-Person	Shelia Kauppi	MnDOT
In-Person	Jacob Loesch	MnDOT
In-Person	Jean Wallace	MnDOT
In-Person	Renee Raduenz	MnDOT
X	April Crockett	MnDOT
X	Jay Hietpas	MnDOT
X	Lisa Austin	MnDOT
X	Chris Krueger	MnDOT
X	Nissa Tupper	MnDOT
X	William Goff	MnDOT
X	Anna Varney	FHWA
X	William Lohr	FHWA
X	Amy Vennewitz	Metropolitan Council
In-Person	Jessica Hyink	City of Minneapolis
X	Adrienne Bockheim	City of Minneapolis
X	KC Atkins	Hennepin County

Present	Name	Organization
X	Brian Isaacson	Ramsey County
X	Robert McHaney	The Goodman Corporation - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
In-Person	Mike Hughes	Hughes Collaboration - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
X	Kaylee Tracy	Rapp Strategies - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
In-Person	Sean Oyaas	Rapp Strategies - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
X	Jon Chiglo	WSB - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
X	Jack Corkle	WSB - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
In-Person	Austin Hauf	WSB - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
X	Sammantha Watson	WSB - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
X	Ryan Earp	WSB - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
X	Ryan Delwiche	WSB - Rethinking I-94 Consultant
X	Noel Mills Ford	WSB - Rethinking I-94 Consultant

General Public Attendees

An "X" in the Present column denotes members attending the meeting virtually.

Present	Name	Organization (if provided)
X	Elizabeth W.F.	
X	Keith B.	Reconnect Rondo
In-Person	Alex B.	Our Streets Minneapolis
X	Robert G.	
X	Yasmine R.	
In-Person	Joe H.	Our Streets Minneapolis
X	Katherine S.	
X	Joan P.	St. Paul 350
X	Anne K.	Our Streets Minneapolis
X	Mateo F.	
X	Anne N.	
X	Jesse C.	
X	Jon K.	
X	Serafina S.	
X	Alec H.	

Present	Name	Organization (if provided)
X	Abby H.	
X	Taylor B.	
X	Josh B.	
X	Alexander J.	
X	Steve M.	
X	CJ L.	BikeMN
X	Ian B.	
X	Megan (no last name)	
X	Laura C.	
X	Pamela W.	
X	Soren S.	
X	Maryellen (no last name)	
X	Cynthia T.	
X	Kathleen S.	
X	Ali R.	
X	Ignacio (no last name)	
X	Britt H.	BF50 Indigenous Health Initiative
X	Ted R.	
X	Scott B.	Union Park District Council
X	Joseph V.	Hennepin County
X	Andrew G.	
X	Mary M.M.	
X	Habon A.	Ayada Leads
X	Katherine D.	
X	Brooke B.	
X	Kyle J.	
X	Desmond S.	
X	Faye S.	
X	Philip S.	
X	Jarod K.	
X	Victor H.	

Present	Name	Organization (if provided)
X	Adrian P.	
X	Sean I.	
X	Nahid K.	Highway 252 Safety Task Force of Brooklyn Center ; Equity and Health Neighborhood Advisors for the Hwy 252/I-94 Project
X	Charles F.L.	Minnesota Environmental Justice Table
X	Kent A.	ReConnect Rondo
X	Michelle V.	
X	Laurel P.	
X	Heather R.	
In-Person	Carly E.	
X	Grant J.	
X	Seth S.	Recovery Bike Shop
X	Joy S.	
X	Carly E.	Our Streets Minneapolis
X	Peter G.	
X	Abby T.	
X	Emily T.	SunOpta
X	Emily B.	
X	Kevin A.	
X	Jared F.	
X	Pat T.	St. Anthony Park Community Council
X	Laverne M.K.	UNCF
X	Kahni S.	SRF
X	Katie B.	
X	Zack F.	
X	Eleanor D.	
X	Mariana G.	
X	Ally A.	
X	Sarah P.S	
X	Shane S.	

Present	Name	Organization (if provided)
X	Elizabeth B.	Our Streets Minneapolis
X	Bryce M.	
X	Sophia H.	
X	Gus G.	
X	Darwin S.	
X	Marya H.	
In-Person	Yasmin H.	Our Streets Minneapolis
In-Person	Jose Z.C.	Our Streets Minneapolis
In-Person	Kathryn S.E.	
X	Stewart V.	Augsburg University
X	Jeremie E.	
X	Malik D.	Rondo Realty Group
X	Hyon K.	MN Best Inc.
X	David F.	Prospect Park Association
X	Peter V.	Minneapolis Pedestrian Advisory Committee
X	Ben S.	
X	Thomas P.	Lao Center of Minnesota
X	Zach F.	
X	Christopher Thomas	Our Tech Cooperative
X	Greta M.	University of Minnesota College of Design
X	Karl H.	Move Minneapolis
X	Walter E.	
X	Kathryn E.	
X	Lisa N.	
X	Subashri B.	
X	Dan M.	ATRI
X	Mikaela Z.	
X	Mags B.	Health Professionals for a Healthy Climate
X	Ma L.	

Present	Name	Organization (if provided)
X	Nick H.	
X	John M.	
X	Joshua Colas	SRF Consulting Group
X	Samantha H.	Natural Resources Defense Council
X	Hyon K.	OurTech Coop
X	Barb T.	Union Park District Council
X	Scott E.	
X	Andrea R.	
X	Ben F.	Union Park District Council
X	Aubrey N.	Union Park District Council
X	Andrew H.	
X	John L.	Hamline Midway Coalition
X	Colleen O.T.	Friends of the Mississippi River
X	Greg H.	
X	Connor S.	
X	Sam F.	
X	Peter W.	
X	Michelle M.	
X	Sara Z.	
X	Melissa M.	Boriken
X	Tim M.	
X	Joel W.	
X	Jane D.	Minnesota Youth Collective
X	Peyton A.	
X	Aurin C.	
X	Raquel S.	
X	Suz W.	

Press Attendees

An "X" in the Present column denotes members attending the meeting virtually.

Present	Name	Publication
In-Person	Jiahong Pan	Minnesota Spokesman Recorder
In-Person	Karen Yucel	MPR News
X	Nancy Lebens	MPR
X	Kyle Stokes	WCCO
X	Jane McClure	Villager Newspaper
X	Susan Du	Star Tribune
X	Guy Still	WCCO
X	Timothy Burns	KTSP
X	John Simon	KARE 11
X	Andrew Hazzard	Sahan Journal
X	Frederick Melo	Pioneer Press
X	Gustav DeMars	Minnesota Daily
X	Eram Cowlas	CBS