

Meeting Summary

Project Name: Highway 252/I-94 Environmental Impact Statement
Meeting Subject: Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting 14
Meeting Date: 10/28/2024
Meeting Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. (Central Standard Time)
Meeting Location: Online meeting via Zoom

Distribution and Attendee List

Attendee	Organization	Attendee	Organization
Representative Esther Agbaje ^a	State of Minnesota	Brandi Popenhagen ^a	HDR
Senator Bobby Joe Champion ^a	State of Minnesota	Martha Allen ^a	HDR
Senator John Hoffman ^a	State of Minnesota	John Griffith ^a	HDR
Cassie Sohr ^a	State of Minnesota	Tess Heller ^a	HDR
Deputy Commissioner Kim Collins ^a	MnDOT	John McPherson	HDR
Khani Sahebjam ^a	MnDOT	Diane Nulton	HDR
Amber Blanchard ^a	MnDOT	Richard Storm ^a	HDR
Melissa Barnes ^a	MnDOT	Marcell Walker ^a	Bolton & Menk
Nicole Bartelt ^a	MnDOT	Claudia Estevez ^a	Bolton & Menk
April Crockett ^a	MnDOT	Nicole Krause ^a	Bolton & Menk
Lisa Elliot ^a	MnDOT	Haila Maze ^a	Bolton & Menk
Paul Hartzheim ^a	MnDOT	Mary Amsler ^a	General Public
Marni Karnowski ^a	MnDOT	Alois Bilek ^a	General Public
Jay Hietpas ^a	MnDOT	Carter Breunig ^a	General Public
Gloria Jeff ^a	MnDOT	Alex Burns	General Public
Sheila Kauppi ^a	MnDOT	Nicole Chileen ^a	General Public
Ben Klismith	MnDOT	T.H. Cook ^a	General Public
Ricardo Lopez ^a	MnDOT	Renee Cooper ^a	General Public
Chelsey Palmateer ^a	MnDOT	Carly Ellefsen ^a	General Public
Erik Rudeen ^a	MnDOT	Ae Lee Hang ^a	General Public
Nissa Tupper ^a	MnDOT	Joe Harrington ^a	General Public
Ryan Wilson ^a	MnDOT	Andrew Hazzard ^a	General Public
Corey Cresap ^a	FHWA	Yasmin Hirsi ^a	General Public
Wendell Meyer ^a	FHWA	Terry Hoffman ^a	General Public
William Lohr ^a	FHWA	Ken Holte ^a	General Public
Anna Varney ^a	FHWA	Terri Kasbohm ^a	General Public
CM Christian Eriksen ^a	Brooklyn Park	Nahid Khan ^a	General Public

Highway 252/I-94 Environmental Impact Statement

Meeting Summary

Attendee	Organization	Attendee	Organization
CM XP Lee ^a	Brooklyn Park	Josh Kloehn ^a	General Public
Marc Culver ^a	Brooklyn Park	Tom Kouri ^a	General Public
Jeff Holstein ^a	Brooklyn Park	Kevin Krueger ^a	General Public
Cartrice O'Neal	Brooklyn Park	Ron Larsen ^a	General Public
Mitch Robinson	Brooklyn Park	Dan Miller ^a	General Public
Craig Runnako ^a	Brooklyn Park	Terry Parks ^a	General Public
Shanna Woods	Brooklyn Park	Brian Pavlak ^a	General Public
Mayor April Graves ^a	Brooklyn Center	Michael Powles ^a	General Public
CM Gretchen Enger ^a	Brooklyn Center	Ember Rasmussen ^a	General Public
CM Dan Jerzak ^a	Brooklyn Center	Judy Reinking ^a	General Public
Reggie Edwards ^a	Brooklyn Center	Allan Robbins-Fenger ^a	General Public
Liz Heyman ^a	Brooklyn Center	D. Sannes ^a	General Public
Ahmed Omer ^a	Brooklyn Center	Darryl Sannes ^a	General Public
Armando Oster ^a	Brooklyn Center	Daniel Saunders ^a	General Public
Barb Suciu ^a	Brooklyn Center	Michael Svard ^a	General Public
Kory Andersen Wagner ^a	Brooklyn Center	PaNhia Vang ^a	General Public
CM Jeremiah Ellison	City of Minneapolis	Jane Voss ^a	General Public
CM LaTrisha Vetaw	City of Minneapolis		
Julieann Swanson	City of Minneapolis		
Bethany Turnwall ^a	City of Minneapolis		
Katie White ^a	City of Minneapolis		
Commissioner Jeff Lunde	Hennepin County		
Colin Cox	Hennepin County		
Richnetta Parker ^a	Hennepin County		
Josh Potter ^a	Hennepin County		
Carla Stueve ^a	Hennepin County		
Bethany Brandt-Sargent	Metropolitan Council		
CM Reva Chamblis ^a	Metropolitan Council		
Victoria Dan ^a	Metro Transit		
Adam Harrington ^a	Metro Transit		

Notes: CM = Council Member; FHWA = Federal Highway Administration; MnDOT = Minnesota Department of Transportation

^a Attended meeting

Agenda

Item #	Agenda item	Responsible party(ies)
1	Welcome	Deputy Commissioner Kim Collins, MnDOT
2	Housekeeping	Marcell Walker, Bolton & Menk
3	PAC Roll Call, Role of the PAC, Meeting Agenda	Deputy Commissioner Kim Collins, MnDOT
4	Recap of June PAC Meeting	Amber Blanchard, MnDOT

Item #	Agenda item	Responsible party(ies)
5	Project Objectives and Needs	Amber Blanchard, MnDOT
6	Project Commitments	Amber Blanchard, MnDOT
7	EIS Process Overview	Amber Blanchard, MnDOT
8	Phase 1A Evaluation Process	Amber Blanchard, MnDOT
9	Phase 1A Technical Analysis	Brandi Popenhagen, HDR
10	PAC Comments	Deputy Commissioner Kim Collins, MnDOT
11	Phase 1A Engagement	Marcell Walker, Bolton & Menk
12	Phase 1A Recommendations	Brandi Popenhagen, HDR
13	PAC Comments	Deputy Commissioner Kim Collins, MnDOT
14	Conclusion	Amber Blanchard, MnDOT; Deputy Commissioner Kim Collins, MnDOT

Notes: MnDOT = Minnesota Department of Transportation; PAC = Policy Advisory Committee

Summary Notes

The Highway (Hwy) 252/Interstate (I-) 94 project team conducted a presentation to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), which is summarized below. For additional details regarding the agenda topics, please see the presentation PowerPoint slides posted on the project website:

<https://dot.state.mn.us/metro/projects/hwy252study/committeeprocess.html>.

1. Welcome

- Deputy Commissioner Kim Collins welcomed PAC members to the 14th PAC meeting of this process.

2. Housekeeping

- Marcell Walker provided an overview of Zoom meeting tips and protocols.

3. PAC Roll Call, Role of the PAC, Meeting Agenda

a. PAC members in attendance:

- Deputy Commissioner Kim Collins, Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)
- Khani Sahebjam, MnDOT
- Wendall Meyer, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Richnetta Parker on behalf of Commissioner Jeff Lunde, Hennepin County
- Mayor April Graves, Brooklyn Center
- Council Member (CM) Dan Jerzek, Brooklyn Center
- CM Christian Eriksen, Brooklyn Park
- CM XP Lee, Brooklyn Park
- Bethany Turnwall on behalf of CM Jeremiah Ellison, City of Minneapolis
- Representative Esther Agbaje
- Senator Bobby Joe Champion
- Senator John Hoffman
- Adam Harrington (Metro Transit) on behalf of Charlie Zelle, Metropolitan Council

- CM Reva Chamblis, Metropolitan Council
- b. Role of the PAC
 - Kim presented on the PAC's role, which is to guide policy and funding decisions pertaining to Hwy 252 and I-94, review recommendations from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), provide input on public engagement materials, provide help in identifying important community issues, provide assistance in communicating with neighboring constituents on project decision points/major milestones, encourage public participation, and provide input as requested by MnDOT. Kim also provided an overview of the agenda.
- 4. Recap of June PAC Meeting
 - Amber Blanchard provided an update from the prior PAC meeting. The topics covered included Notice of Intent (NOI) comment summary, cooperating agency final concurrences, Phase 1A evaluation criteria, Phase 1A public engagement, and preliminary concept visualizations.
 - Amber provided a review of the topics raised at the prior PAC meeting. These include: concern with Hwy 252 over the local roadway due to snow and ice; Brooklyn Center does not support the freeway alternatives being evaluated; Brooklyn Center has not heard the benefits to their community; the project will have negative economic impacts to Brooklyn Center's tax base; frustration with the process; and MnDOT is not listening.
- 5. Project Objectives and Needs
 - Amber provided an overview of the project objectives:
 - Achieve equitable, social, environmental, and economic outcomes (equity means fair and just, taking into consideration the conditions and needs of persons/communities impacted)
 - Reduce injuries and fatalities associated with crashes along Hwy 252 and I-94
 - Support reliable transit service through operational improvements
 - Minimize the need to acquire additional property
 - Ensure solutions are consistent with local planning and compatible with the existing roadway network
 - Amber also provided an overview of the project needs that the project team is trying to address. These include walkability/bikeability, vehicle safety, and vehicle mobility, and are consistent with the previously established purpose and need. Amber noted that since the last meeting, the project team has updated the safety analysis supporting the purpose and need to include more recent crash data. With the new analysis, safety does remain a problem, with intersections and segments exceeding critical crash rates. Congestion also remains a problem on Hwy 252 and I-94.

6. Project Commitments

- Amber provided an overview of the commitments that MnDOT is making on behalf of this project. These include:
 - Using the Project Objectives in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
 - Continuing enhanced and focused engagement with Environmental Justice (EJ) communities throughout the EIS process as part of the EJ process
 - Consideration of Equity and Health Assessment (EHA) Report #3 priorities
 - Evaluating transportation benefits and burdens on low-income and minority populations as part of the EJ analysis
 - Integrating local and express bus service improvements in the EIS
 - Evaluating impacts to local travel patterns and travel times in the EIS
 - Evaluating the property and local travel impacts of the Hwy 252 access combinations and build alternatives
 - Assessing and disclosing projected traffic volumes on local roads
 - Evaluating air and water quality impacts in the EIS
 - Evaluating direct and indirect vegetation impacts in the EIS
 - Evaluating visual impacts in the EIS
 - Analyzing projected crashes on Hwy 252/I-94 and local roads in the EIS
- Amber also highlighted equity health priorities that will be addressed through the process. These included addressing community livability, roadway safety, and transportation equity. She specifically called out health equity engagement as well as distribution of benefits and burdens. She also noted this is a living document and will be updated over time.

7. EIS Process Overview

- Amber provided an overview of the EIS process. The project is currently wrapping up the Phase 1A over/under stage, after which, the process moves into Phase 1B access combinations. The goal is to develop an alternative that everyone can live with, which could be either build or no build. The community process has provided many comments, and the project team will be addressing them.

8. Phase 1A Evaluation Process

- Amber provided an overview of the over/under evaluation process. This process was to decide if grade separations (interchanges or multi-modal crossings) should be designed with Hwy 252 over or under the local roadway. The evaluation considered potential impacts to:
 - Properties, including EJ areas
 - Community facilities
 - Traffic noise
 - Section 4(f) resources (parks and recreational trails)

- Historic properties
- Stormwater management
- Aquatic resources (wetlands)
- Biological resources (rusty patch bumblebee)
- 100-year floodplain
- Mississippi River bluff impact and river shore impact zones
- Property tax (added)

9. Phase 1A Technical Analysis

- Brandi Popenhagen described the technical analysis process for Phase 1A and results in the form of an evaluation matrix. Results in the matrix are color coded based on whether a substantial, moderate, or minor difference exists between the results for the alternatives. The most significant differentials between the alternatives are related to property relocations and value impacts as well as traffic noise impacts.

10. PAC Comments

- Kim summarized Brandi's presentation and asked the PAC to provide feedback. The following comments were made:
 - CM Dan Jerzak

Question: If no build is a real option, can you please explain why we have to complete this process, which my constituents believe is rigged or a scam, and just stop it and focus on safety improvements?

Response: If we stop right now, we would have to go back to the beginning, including planning, scoping, and a new purpose and need process. In the meantime, safety issues continue.
 - CM Dan Jerzak

Comment: We are still not addressing the safety factors. Adding 28 million cars will not statistically reduce fatalities, and there's no evidence safety will be improved. Maybe you do start over to get it right.

Response: Thank you for sharing your thoughts.
 - CM XP Lee

Comment: Brooklyn Park City Council is mostly supportive of moving forward to a freeway design. My concerns are the aesthetic of overpasses/underpasses and pedestrian safety especially at 85th Avenue.

Response: Thank you for your comments.

- Mayor April Graves

Comment/Question: I think it's interesting that the TAC and the public got the same information; MnDOT chose the opposite of what the public said they wanted. It seems like public input doesn't matter. I'm interested in how these meetings are going in Minneapolis as well. The amount of input is a small percentage of the total. I know also there's been a lot of environmental activism that's happened here. Are freeways really beneficial? What about impacts to property values/tax capacity?

Response: This past phase focused on Brooklyn Park and Brooklyn Center, not Minneapolis, though that will be done in the next phase. In Minneapolis, we will focus on pedestrian/bicycle crossings.

- Mayor April Graves

Question: Is Minneapolis not in the same engagement process as the other cities?

Response: Yes, it's open to all via the survey and video. But the targeted engagement is focused on Brooklyn Park and Brooklyn Center due to impacts of the decisions, and it will be in Phase 1B too. Phase 2 will cover all the cities.

- Mayor April Graves

Comment: Brooklyn Center is the most impacted of all the cities. Once the health equity impacts come to the surface, the situation will look different. You are trying to bulldoze over Brooklyn Center because we're small, we lack power, we are the most diverse, and people forget about it. We are prepared to make some pretty strong demands, especially when it comes to who is paying for it. You're going to get a lot more pushback in future stages once more information is brought to light. You are benefiting flourishing cities at the cost of cities that are already struggling.

Response: Brooklyn Center is an important partner in our efforts to resolve the Highway 252 transportation needs in a way that works for the local communities and MnDOT is committed to following through with the equity health commitments previously developed. As we learn more about the potential impacts, we are committed to working with you to identify effective mitigation to lessen those impacts.

- CM Reva Chamblis

Comment: Regarding aesthetics, I want to see the visuals of actual over/under locations, not just a drawing but photographs of actual locations. Noise is an important consideration as well. Also, I want clarification of over/under selection and mitigation options.

Response: We will be exploring and selecting mitigation options. This is already underway, and we know it will be needed to address impacts. As project details become clear in Phases 1B and 2 the project team will update visuals to help the public better understand the

project. Project aesthetics will be evaluated once a preferred alternative is selected after the conclusion of the environmental process.

- CM Reva Chamblis

Question: I have concerns about fire station access impacts. What would be done to ensure proper access and response by the fire department? Also, does it make sense to have a mix of over and under options, versus a more unified approach?

Response: It will be possible to mix and match over/under. And fire station access has been and will be considered.

- Mayor April Graves

Question/Comment: If you are really serious about assessing impacts, it would have made sense to include a broader definition of safety and more alternatives in the evaluation. Also, many images are very misleading—we need bird's eye visualizations to show what they look like. We don't want to downplay larger impacts. Why are we making decisions without things being assessed?

Response: Thank you for your comment. The project team will prepare more detailed visualizations in future Phases 1B and 2 as project elements are defined.

11. Phase 1A Engagement

- Marcell provided an overview of the public engagement done during Phase 1A from July to September 2024. Events included in-person property owners meetings, in-person workshops, virtual engagement via MnDOT's webpage, and two pop-up events. A total of 1,413 people were reached, with 150 comment cards or surveys completed. The results compiled showed a preference for Hwy 252 under the local roadway in most cases, though a significant number of people also expressed no opinion or left the survey blank. Marcell also provided a summary of the major themes heard during each engagement event beyond the voting exercise.
- A series of targeted engagement activities also occurred, including September and October stakeholder meetings as well as door knocking with businesses during October. The MnDOT project team between 10/2 and 10/3 door knocked each of the businesses located near Hwy 252 and 66th Ave. The project team scheduled follow up meetings with four of the businesses located near the intersection of Hwy 252 and 66th Ave. All of the businesses the project team met with were minority owned. Each meeting lasted 30-45 minutes. Each of the four businesses were in favor of 252 going over 66th and expressed their desire for maintaining direct access from 252 to 66th. Prior to this outreach, based on the Environmental Justice analysis that had been conducted, the results suggested the businesses near the intersection of Hwy 252 and 66th were not located within an Environmental Justice designated area. Following this effort and the information businesses shared with the project team, these businesses are now designated as Environmental Justice businesses.

- A November 13, 2024, public webinar is planned to share Phase 1A over/under recommendations and explain next steps.

12. Phase 1A Recommendations

- Brandi described the analysis results by intersection, including the recommendations for over/under options. These included:
 - 85th Avenue: Recommend Hwy 252 over 85th Avenue due to access and operational concerns at the fire station, with grades associated with the under option. These include noise tradeoffs, though that may be mitigated.
 - Brookdale Drive: Recommend Hwy 252 over Brookdale Drive due to fewer potential property, stormwater management, and biological resource impacts. These include noise tradeoffs, though that may be mitigated.
 - 73rd Avenue: Recommend Hwy 252 over 73rd Avenue due to fewer potential property and community facilities impacts. These include noise tradeoffs, though that may be mitigated.
 - 70th Avenue: Recommend Hwy 252 over 70th Avenue due to fewer potential property and biological resources impacts. These include noise tradeoffs, though that may be mitigated.
 - 66th Avenue: Recommend Hwy 252 over 66th Avenue due to fewer potential property and biological resources impacts. These include stormwater tradeoffs, though that may be mitigated.
- Brandi noted that noise is currently an issue on the corridor, and there is a tradeoff between the over options and noise impacts. It is noted that noise mitigation is not included at this stage in the process, though it is likely to occur. A full noise analysis will be completed in Phase 2. Noise mitigation in the form of noise walls will require local participation and voting.
- The results are consistent with the project objectives in most aspects. They will:
 - Minimize EJ property impacts
 - Minimize community facility impacts
 - Mostly minimize increased impervious surface
 - Minimize impacts on local property taxes
 - Minimize potential relocations and property impacts
 - Include city/county technical input on analysis
 - Gather community input
- As discussed above, potential noise impacts were not minimized. Other factors of the objectives will not be addressed until Phase 2, namely safety and transit impacts. Most factors of the equity health priorities will not be addressed until Phase 2. Some tradeoffs are noted, as above, regarding noise and impervious surface impacts.

13. PAC Comments

- Throughout the presentation, PAC members asked questions, which were as follows:

- Bethany Turnwall:

Question: Was there any option beyond over or under, such as reimagining the space entirely?

Response: No, there were no other options available, except “no opinion.”

- CM Reva Chamblis

Question: Regarding visuals displayed at open houses and other outreach opportunities, did you have drawings, visuals, or photos to show what this looks like, due to the importance of the decision?

Response: Yes, we had renderings of an interchange showing both over and under conditions. Copies of this were provided throughout the room. We also had maps available showing noise, property, and environmental impacts.

- CM Reva Chamblis

Question: Can we get access to the materials that were shared?

Response: Yes, those can be made available.

- Bethany Turnwall

Question: With future engagement, would it be possible to give people more options to respond to besides just these two?

Response: At the future stages, there are fewer options on the table for evaluation and consideration. Many were screened out during the Scoping Decision Document phase. Screening criteria included whether alternatives significantly improve safety. Also, more options will be explored in future stages once some decisions are made.

- Representative Esther Agbaje

Question: For people looking at other alternatives, will there be more to review later, down the line? Will there be a final set of alternatives to be reviewed later?

Response: The alternatives currently under review are the ones that will advance through the process.

- Representative Esther Agbaje

Question: Is there any option to explore an option with no change?

Response: Yes, a no build option is on the table throughout the process.

- Mayor April Graves

Comment: The Brooklyn Center and Brooklyn Park City Councils, as well as hundreds of residents, requested that more options should be included in this phase. MnDOT denied this request, which has been frustrating.

Response: Thank you for the comment.

- CM Dan Jerzak

Question: Currently, there doesn't appear to be any safety increase with the alternatives. Why not go with "no build" and then address safety issues directly? We just want something that is safer.

Response: If we do the no build option, an opportunity exists to look at other fixes to the intersections. These would either be through a new environmental process or as a series of stand-alone intersection-specific improvements.

- Senator John Hoffman

Question: Is anyone from MnDOT here?

Response: Yes, Deputy Commissioner Collins and Amber Blanchard, among others.

- Senator John Hoffman

Question: If cities requested a response in writing and received none, that's disturbing. Is this true? This isn't acceptable for a government body to deny consideration of options.

Response: The options requested were not added to the analysis. The process had filtered out those alternatives at an earlier stage through analysis. MnDOT responded during the scoping phase, responses which can be found in the Final Scoping Decision Document.

- Mayor April Graves

Question: We should use the commitments described earlier as part of the criteria for evaluating alternatives, but they haven't even been studied yet. How can you decide without a holistic consideration of factors?

Response: Purpose and need on roadway projects identifies transportation problems that need to be solved. Equity and health impacts have been incorporated through the PAC objectives, but we're not yet at the point of doing that analysis. These factors will be incorporated in a different way throughout the process. If we have impacts we can't avoid or mitigate, the no build option is still available.

- CM Dan Jerzak

Comment: Twice, a unanimous Brooklyn Center City Council voted (5-0) against this project. It appears that the factors the city cares about aren't being considered. There is no explanation for the upside to the city. I have received hundreds of comments on this project

and only one is in favor. We feel left out of the process, and what the city council and public say isn't being considered.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

- CM Reva Chamblis

Comment: Visuals that describe our process and priorities are helpful. Please include these to help explain the decision process better.

Response: Yes, we will do this in the next phase and are ready to do so.

- CM XP Lee

Comment: I feel frustration with the process but understand that funding may be jeopardized if the project doesn't meet certain goals. Ultimately, I am satisfied with what we have. However, if we're talking about what intersections look like, there's an opportunity to be creative going forward. It's not just about the alternatives, but some specifics of intersection design themselves.

Response: More detailed designs will be addressed.

- Adam Harrington

Comment: There has been a lot of work done in terms of technical analysis around transit. We're evaluating a number of alternatives right now through Network Now. It's worth going back to remind people about the transit evaluation process over time.

Response: Thank you, we will explore this at a future meeting.

- District Engineer Khani Sahebjam

Comment: MnDOT is committed to make safety improvements as needed to make it a better place. Fatalities are up systemwide this year. My sympathies for the losses.

Response: Thank you for the comment.

14. Conclusion

- Amber provided an overview of the current project status and upcoming schedule.
- Kim thanked the PAC members for their attendance and input. The PAC members are encouraged to contact Kim and/or Amber with any questions or comments as well as discussion regarding the project. Kim noted that the next PAC meeting will be in February/March 2025.
- As the meeting time ended before questions/comments posed in the Q&A during the meeting could be answered, MnDOT has compiled the Q&A questions/comments and responses, including them as Attachment 1 to this meeting summary.
- Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Action Items

Item #	Action item	Responsible party(ies)	Due date
1	Set date for next PAC meeting	MnDOT	January 2025
2	Post PPT and responses to Q&A questions/comments from October 2024 PAC meeting to project website	MnDOT	December 2024
3	Provide aerial map of over/under visuals to Brooklyn Center	MnDOT	November 2024
4	Send materials presented to PAC members	MnDOT	December 2024

Attachments/Supplemental Information

- Attachment 1: Questions and Comments from the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and Public
- Supplemental Information: Presentation at <https://dot.state.mn.us/metro/projects/hwy252study/meetings.html>

Attachment 1: Questions and Comments from the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and Public

Comments/questions provided in this attachment are verbatim from the chat/Q&A.

Comments to Panelists

From Mayor April Graves to all panelists 01:56 p.m.

Comment: The council also asked that that expanded definition of safety be included in the purpose and need when we asked for more alternatives.

Response: At this time, there is no consideration for revising the purpose and need statement. Other factors will be included in the evaluation criteria.

From Senator John Hoffman to all panelists 02:05 p.m.

Comment: I need to go to a City of Champlin Meeting but my staff Cassie Sohr cassie.sohr@mnsenate.gov will be on for my office. Thank you. Senator John Hoffman

Response: Comment acknowledged.

From Mayor April Graves to all panelists 02:35 p.m.

Comment: But that wouldn't be the case if more alternatives had been studied....

Response: Additional alternatives were studied at an earlier stage of the process but were screened out, during scoping (see Scoping Decision Document on the project website <https://dot.state.mn.us/metro/projects/hwy252study/>), from further consideration due to not meeting criteria.

Comments in Q&A

Brian Pavlak 01:03 p.m.

Question: Hello good day has the project been approved?

Response: No final decision has been made on the project design. The process to select an alternative will continue into 2025.

Anonymous Attendee 01:09 p.m.

Question: Why did MnDOT remove public comment from this meeting? For years, MnDOT has always allowed public comments during PAC meetings. You are silencing people who are going to lose their homes for this highway!

Response: The decision was made to ensure that PAC attendees had the opportunity to provide comments and feedback. Comments from the public in the meeting Q&A will be addressed following the meeting in writing.

Nicole Chileen 01:10 p.m.

Question: Will this meeting be available to watch later. Not just a summary, the entire meeting.

Response: No. This meeting was not recorded. However, meeting summary notes will be produced and included on MnDOT's project website.

Brian Pavlak 01:12 p.m.

Question: Hello is it possible for me to say something my Brother passed away 10/19/24 on 252 and 694..

Response: Our deepest condolences. Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) staff will be in touch with you directly.

Nahid Khan 01:17 p.m.

Question: Brandi Popenhagen, who is running this meeting and is VP of HDR, visited my Linked In page a few months ago. I would like to know the reason(s) why. Is it appropriate for Ms. Popenhagen, one of consultant team for MnDOT to be investigating a member of the public who also served on the Equity and Health Neighborhood Advisers for this project? Have other members of the public or the PAC been similarly investigated by members of the project team? What is your policy for your project team members regarding this sort of behavior (investigating members of the public who have spoken out against MnDOT's freeway objectives?)

Response: A Google search was performed to gather information on relative available research papers to better understand concerns that have been expressed about the project, which led to using various resources, including public LinkedIn profiles.

Anonymous Attendee 01:18 p.m.

Question: The EHA report recommendations included a request that MnDOT study non-freeway options. Why did MnDOT ignore this recommendation?

Response: The non-freeway options were studied in a prior phase of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. They were screened out during scoping (see Scoping Decision Document on the project website <https://dot.state.mn.us/metro/projects/hwy252study/>) due to not meeting the project purpose and need criteria related to safety and mobility.

Anonymous Attendee 01:19 p.m.

Question: How does expansion help traffic, safety, or equity when you account for induced demand?

Response: While conversion to freeway would immediately attract more users to Highway (Hwy) 252 because of its inherent efficiencies, it would also achieve substantial safety improvements due to removing conflicts that occur on this heavily traveled corridor, which serves this traffic via traffic signals, as documented in the Scoping Decision Document (SDD).

Anonymous Attendee 01:20 p.m.

Comment: Your options don't help community public health when you expand highways.

Response: The EIS process is designed to evaluate community impacts and consider them when making decisions. Public health will be considered during the upcoming stages of this EIS process.

Anonymous Attendee 01:21 p.m.

Question: Why isn't MnDOT studying the severity of crashes instead of just the number of crashes? Crash rates are misleadingly used to sell highway widening projects like this one that do nothing to improve safety https://cityobservatory.org/odots_big-lie/

Response: The crash analysis will consider crash severity and crash rates, not just the number of crashes.

Anonymous Attendee 01:23 p.m.

Comment: No build, fix the current expressway by expanding and recreating current on off ramps to be longer to allow additional time to speed up, have pedestrian overpasses.

Response: The no build option will continue to be considered throughout the EIS process.

Anonymous Attendee 01:27 p.m.

Comment: "relocation" is a curious way to say demolition

Response: MnDOT must follow the "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition for Federal and Federally-Assisted Programs". The process of removing a property will include both demolition of the structure and relocation of the residents, businesses, or institutions impacted. As part of the standard right-of-way acquisition process, MnDOT will pay for the relocation of residents, businesses, and institutions displaced by roadway construction to another suitable location.

Anonymous Attendee 01:29 p.m.

Question: Can you share the total amount of properties that may be demolished for each option?

Response: Yes. These numbers can be found in the PAC presentation available on the project website here, <https://dot.state.mn.us/metro/projects/hwy252study/>.

Nahid Khan 01:30 p.m.

Comment: Green is a misleading color. There are major harmful impacts overall for both "over" and "under" but there is little to no difference between them with regard to levels of harm. One should not view the "green" color as no problem, neutral, OK or good (which the green color tends to suggest).

Response: The intent of the color coding was to highlight the largest differentials between alternatives, rather than to convey other factors.

Nicole Chileen 01:34 p.m.

Comment: For 70th, like me, over or under my house was taken. Hard to have an opinion when your house is gone.

Response: While every effort was made to reduce property impacts, unfortunately a few properties were impacted regardless of alternative due to proximity to intersections. Keep in mind that at this point there is not a cumulative number since we are not proposing interchanges at every intersection.

Anonymous Attendee 01:36 p.m.

Comment: Regarding over / under it seems silly to ask property owners to say if they want it over or under when they might lose their home. That would sku data significantly. Also there should have been a no build option on those comment cards addition to no opinion

Response: The public engagement included both property owners that were directly impacted, as well as other members of the public that were not. The recommendations align with those who were most impacted. People had the option to provide additional comments besides the selection of over or under, which the project team also documented and reviewed.

Anonymous Attendee 01:39 p.m.

Comment: The "no opinion" option feels misleading. What if they didn't like either option?

Response: People had the option to provide additional comments besides the selection of over or under. The project team also documented and reviewed these comments.

Anonymous Attendee 01:40 p.m.

Question: Safety for WHO? Exurban commuters?

Response: The safety analysis will consider the safety of all road users, including pedestrians and bicyclists, on both the highway and local streets.

Anonymous Attendee 01:41 p.m.

Comment: The public overwhelmingly did not support any of the selected alternatives. Most people preferred to keep the expressway with added safety features, or a low speed freeway both of which were eliminated and Brooklyn Center asked Mndot to bring those alternatives back and Mndot DENIED the request

Response: The non-freeway options were studied in the scoping phase of the EIS process. They were screened out due to not meeting the project purpose and need criteria related to safety and mobility. The no build scenario will remain an alternative throughout the EIS.

Nahid Khan 01:43 p.m.

Comment: Thank you Bethany for bringing up the issue of public inability to comment on possibilities other than freeway. The Scoping phase referred to was skewed, beginning with the Purpose and Need statement for this project that was written in such a way that only the pre-determined 6-lane freeway design could emerge as the one that supposedly met the Purpose and Need statement. The Scoping phase was an extremely biased and manipulated phase that actively worked to move only the 6-lane freeway, from the very beginning.

Response: The Purpose and Need was written at the beginning of the environmental process, prior to alternatives being developed, and focused on transportation needs. The scoping phase of the study (see Scoping Decision Document on the website <https://dot.state.mn.us/metro/projects/hwy252study/>) provided a detailed analysis about why other alternatives ultimately did not advance into the EIS for further study. The freeway alternatives now under review, showed more benefits compared to those that did not move forward into the EIS. Among the reasons are safety improvements that result from separating vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists and others, as well as reducing other potential collision points through the removal of at-grade intersections. The scoping phase did not choose a preferred solution, nor has a preferred solution been chosen yet in the EIS phase. The no build scenario will remain an alternative throughout the EIS

Anonymous Attendee 01:44 p.m.

Comment: MnDOT is only evaluating the no-build because they are legally required to do so

Response: Yes, MnDOT is required to evaluate the no build alternative. It is not predetermined that any of the build alternatives will be approved.

Anonymous Attendee 01:46 p.m.

Comment: Great question Sen. Hoffman. Why can't MnDOT solve safety issues without adding lanes and demolishing homes and businesses?!

Response: The current Phase 1A process recommends options that minimize property takes. As the EIS process continues, MnDOT's priority is to avoid impacts and if that can't be done, to minimize them. The number of lanes has not yet been evaluated or determined.

Nahid Khan 01:47 p.m.

Comment: Thank you Mayor Graves for pointing out that Brooklyn Center and Brooklyn Park City Councils and residents have demanded other project design alternatives, but MnDOT has ignored us all.

Response: The scoping phase of the study (see Scoping Decision Document on the website <https://dot.state.mn.us/metro/projects/hwy252study/>) provided a detailed analysis about why other alternatives ultimately did not advance into the EIS for further study. MnDOT has reviewed and considered every comment received on this study. Decisions are not taken lightly and have been/will

continue to be thoroughly vetted. As the study continues, the project team will also demonstrate how MnDOT is incorporating feedback and meeting the project objectives. The no build scenario will remain an alternative throughout the EIS.

Anonymous Attendee 01:51 p.m.

Comment: The low speed freeway would improve mobility and safety for pedestrians and bicycles, but it was still removed. If the project objectives are about safety, then a lower speed road would provide more safety and be more equitable to the community.

Response: The scoping phase of the study (see Scoping Decision Document on the website <https://dot.state.mn.us/metro/projects/hwy252study/>) provided a detailed analysis about why other alternatives ultimately did not advance into the EIS for further study including the low speed freeway on page 4-8. The Hwy 252 four-lane low speed freeway was dismissed from further consideration because of increases in network crash costs; removal of transit advantages on Hwy 252; and low vehicle mobility performance during peak periods. People drive at the speed at which they feel most comfortable based on roadway conditions and design. Posting a lower speed limit does not change driver behavior. Dramatic changes in the design of Hwy 252 would be required to effectively encourage lower speeds.

Nahid Khan 01:51 p.m.

Comment: Thank you BC Council member Jerzak for pointing out that the residents ultimately want to see safety and asking about the possibility of doing a NO BUILD with improved safety features for Hwy 252. It is disturbing that this will only be considered as a separate project after the current EIS determines that the No Build is the decision. That means a big delay in actually addressing safety issues on Hwy 252.

Response: The goal is to keep the EIS process moving forward toward resolution so safety and other improvements can be made as soon as expedient.

Brian Pavlak 01:51 p.m.

Comment: Population Safety should be #1

Response: Safety remains one of the primary objectives of the purpose and need statement.

Nahid Khan 01:52 p.m.

Comment: Thank you Rep. Agbaje for your penetrating questions about project design alternatives and lack of response to the public concerns about this project.

Response: Public comments have been received, reviewed, and responded to as part of this process.

Anonymous Attendee 01:53 p.m.

Comment: those two options DO increase safety and mobility, the problem is MNDOT wants to push more through traffic through the corridor and THAT is why they said the alternatives are not good enough. This is not about safety, this is about pushing more cars through and calling it "safety" as a disguise.

Response: Both safety and mobility are components of the purpose and need. The project will not move forward if it does not improve traffic safety on the corridor.

Nahid Khan 01:53 p.m.

Comment: Thank you Sen. Hoffman for raising a serious issue, that the BC and BP concerns in writing to MnDOT have been ignored / dismissed.

Response: Public comments have been received, reviewed, and responded to as part of this process.

Anonymous Attendee 01:55 p.m.

Comment: The "purpose & need" justification is a scam. "Mobility" = traffic capacity. This project has always been about expanding vehicle lanes for the outer suburbs, dating back to 2015, and MnDOT is now pivoting and claiming this is a safety and bike project. There are a million ways to improve safety and bike & walking access without expanding the freeway. Why isn't MnDOT going back to the drawing board to move forward solutions that the impacted communities actually support? It sounds like you are saying it is too late

Response: The purpose and need statement includes walking and biking improvements as primary elements, alongside improving safety and mobility. The project will seek to address community concerns alongside additional evaluation of the remaining alternatives.

Nahid Khan 01:56 p.m.

Comment: The previous (2020-2023) phase was misleadingly called the "Environmental Review" although there was not the slightest "environmental" characteristic or quality to this phase or the resulting Scoping Decision Document.

Response: The project was started as an Environmental Assessment and converted to an EIS based on the analysis conducted. The completed Final Scoping Decision Document is part of the EIS process. .

Joe W 01:57 p.m.

Comment: A majority of the residents want change with 252 and to convert into a freeway. No build does not deal with traffic congestion or safety.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Nahid Khan 02:01 p.m.

Comment: Thank you Sen. Hoffman and Met Council member Chamblis, for reminding us about your objections to MnPass (now called EZ Pass), which is pay lanes for non-residents to speed through BC and BP, and don't benefit residents of the project area at all. Also, for reminding us that earlier iterations of this project called for removing bus service from Hwy 252! That is a travesty, given the priorities to expand public transit service by Met Council . Bus service should expand on Hwy 252 and area; it should be all day and evening service for both weekdays and weekends.

Response: Transit improvements are being considered as part of the project and will be explored in more detail in future phases.

Nahid Khan 02:03 p.m.

Comment: Thank you BC Council member Jerzak for emphasizing BC residents and Council objections to freeway projects on Hwy 252.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Anonymous Attendee 02:04 p.m.

Comment: It sounds like he is asking for a bypass ramp like in Rogers

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Nahid Khan 02:07 p.m.

Comment: Thank you BP Councilmember XP Lee for asking about other designs for Hwy 252 that reduce property and environmental impacts significantly. The way to reduce / prevent them is NO BUILD. A huge range of full safety designs can be implemented without a freeway.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Nahid Khan 02:08 p.m.

Comment: Thank you Adam Harrington for prioritizing Metro Transit's commitment to expanding public transit on Hwy 252 and area.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Nahid Khan 02:09 p.m.

Comment: Thank you Sen. Hoffman for stating that your views of this project have changed entirely.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Brian Pavlak 02:11 p.m.

Comment: Thank you 🙏

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Alois Bilek 02:12 p.m.

Comment/Question: Why does the 70th show that it will increase traffic West River Road? They would be redirecting West River Road onto a neighborhood street (Dallas Road or Willow lane) which are dead end roads and do not go through. This isnt traffic on West River road this is redirecting traffic into a neighborhood that currently does not have traffic volumne except for residents. This concerns me greatly that this was glossed over

Response: The traffic analysis for alternatives will consider traffic volume and safety impacts on neighborhood streets, and will seek to avoid, minimize, or mitigate them. The project team will be studying West River Road in more detail in Phase 1B.

Nahid Khan 02:14 p.m.

Comment: Thank you Khani Sahebjan for your commitment to implementing safety features if/when the NO BUILD is selected. I request that some basic safety features be implemented immediately without waiting for this EIS process to be completed. For example, when entering Hwy 252 from the south, I-94 and I-694, there are NO "Freeway Ends" signs whatsoever. There is no system for priming and preparing drivers to adjust from freeway driving to non-freeway driving. MnDOT needs to add "Freeway Ends" signs, as well as more "traffic lights" signs and speed limit signs all over this area, from south of I-694 on I-94 all the way to the 66th Ave intersection. Please also look at more roadway designs such as "rumblestrips" or even "musical highway" designs (look it up on the internet) to slow drivers down and prepare to stop at the 66th Ave. intersection (and the other intersections).

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. Highway 252/I-94 Interim Safety Improvements Memo dated January 20, 2022, recommended improvements on the highways. The memo outlined those improvements that were completed in Summer 2023 as well as improvements that were not recommended. MnDOT completed the removal of the free right turn in the southwest corner of Highway 252 and 66th Ave, installed advance warning flashers on southbound Highway 252 before the 85th Ave signal, installed "signal ahead" pavement markings on northbound Highway 252 for the signal at 66th Ave, installed new pedestrian crosswalk pavement markings at 66th Ave, 70th Ave, 73rd Ave, 81st Ave, and Brookdale Dr., upgraded one-way signing, and others. Advanced warning flashers were not installed for the 66th Ave signal as currently, this intersection does not meet criteria for advanced warning flashers because, based on available crash data, there does not appear to be a specific problem with right-angle

crashes that would be helped by the installation of these flashers at this location. MnDOT will continue to monitor crash data for right-angle crashes at this location.

Nahid Khan 02:17 p.m.

Comment: Everyone, please keep in mind that MnDOT provided only limited options / choices for public comment with all these stakeholders, so results are skewed and biased. If other options / choices had been provided, results would have been quite different. This whole public comment process for this project has been designed to "manufacture consent" for MnDOT's predetermined outcome of the 6-lane freeway.

Response: The scoping phase of the study provided a detailed analysis about why other alternatives ultimately did not advance into the EIS for further study. The freeway alternatives now under review showed more benefits compared to those. Among the reasons are safety improvements that result from separating vehicles, and pedestrians, bicyclists and others, as well as reducing other potential collision points through the removal of at-grade intersections. The no build scenario will remain an alternative throughout the EIS.

Anonymous Attendee 02:19 p.m.

Comment: "relocation" - nice euphemism

Response: As part of the standard right-of-way acquisition process, MnDOT will pay for the relocation of residents, businesses, and institutions displaced by roadway construction to another suitable location.

Anonymous Attendee 02:23 p.m.

Comment: A reminder that research shows that highway noise walls don't work very well

<https://undark.org/2017/12/27/highway-noise-barrier-science/>

Response: Noise wall modeling will be used to demonstrate the degree to which noise can be mitigated.

Nahid Khan 02:23 p.m.

Comment: Everyone, please be aware that the MnDOT project team's Scoping Decision Document (SDD) originally presented ONLY the two 6-lane freeway alternatives (plus no build) as of its June 2022 draft, which was a very mature almost final draft (not an early draft which MnDOT pretends). Only because a member of the Highway 252 Safety Task Force discovered it on a public MnDOT web page and exposed it (it was not "leaked" or obtained in any fraudulent way as MnDOT claimed), was MnDOT forced to add back the previously eliminated 4-lane normal speed freeway to the SDD. However, the SDD clearly states that the 4-lane freeway is only a placeholder project in case full funding is not received for MnDOT's predetermined and preferred 6-lane freeway, and is pending later receipt of full funding for that 6-lane freeway, which is the ultimate goal, even if the project that goes forward is the 4-lane freeway.

Response: The Final SDD states Element 5 (four-lane freeway) is expected to experience congestion under year 2040 conditions. Segment level of service (LOS) with Element 5 is projected to be LOS F during the morning peak hour and LOS E during the afternoon peak hour. A microsimulation analysis of Element 5 will be completed in the Draft EIS. This next level of analysis will provide additional insight on how Element 5 performs in combination with Interstate (I-) 94 elements. This microsimulation analysis will also include investigating mitigation measures to potentially improve the peak hour operations of Element 5 under future conditions.

Anonymous Attendee 02:25 p.m.

Comment: what influence (if any) did the public preferring 252 under in your decisions?

Response: Engagement on this topic required a difficult tradeoff between input from those directly impacted by relocation and input from those noise-impacted properties in surrounding communities. The first impact was deeper and more severe, the second one broader and more dispersed. The determination reflected the desire to avoid displacing residents and businesses when possible, consistent with the PAC Objectives, alongside the options available to mitigate noise through design and walls.

Nicole Chileen 02:28 p.m.

Comment: Again, people need to know what design will impact their houses. Is my house gone either way still?

Response: No final decision has been made yet regarding property impacts. Materials provided show the potential area of impact. Additional design work will provide a more precise determination as to impacts.

Anonymous Attendee 02:28 p.m.

Comment: Did MnDOT study the differences in pollution impacts?

Response: Air and water quality impacts will be studied in more detail during the Phase 2 analysis.

Anonymous Attendee 02:30 p.m.

Comment: So what you are saying is SCREW what the residents want yet again! The residents overwhelmingly want to have 252 to go under. We are the ones that have to live next to this disaster. You guys DONT CARE AT ALL HOW WE FEEL AND YOU CONTINUE TO IGNORE US AND WASTE OUR TIME!!!! SCAM ARTISTS JUST CON ARTISTS NO BUILD NO BUILD NO BUILD!!!! You dont care what we say, you dont want our participation at all!

Response: Engagement on this topic required a difficult tradeoff between input from those who could be potentially directly impacted by demolition/relocation and input from those noise-impacted properties in surrounding communities. The first impact was deeper and more severe, the second one broader and more dispersed. The determination reflected the desire to keep from displacing residents and businesses when possible, consistent with the PAC Objectives, particularly those in Environmental Justice (EJ) communities, alongside the options available to mitigate noise through design and walls.

Nahid Khan 02:33 p.m.

Comment: Why do you not record the PAC meetings? Every other state, county, city government meeting is recorded so that we the members of the public and the taxpayers are able to listen in later (especially if we have to miss the meeting). The failure to record the PAC meetings so that we can listen to the discussions is a violation of the state open meeting laws. State Senators and Representatives, please take steps to make MnDOT record these PAC and public meetings so that people can view and listen to them, not just read through the presentations and minutes/meeting summaries whenever the project team deigns to put them up on the web site, which in the past has been MONTHS later: another violation of the open meetings laws. During the so-called "environmental review" phase of 2020-2023, the project team was not at all forthcoming regarding public information and the public record for the PAC and public meetings. That is why there is so much dissatisfaction now. Goal has clearly been to advance only the 6-lane fwy.

Response: PAC meetings are not subject to Minnesota's open meeting laws as they are not decision-making bodies, nor do they take official actions by holding votes or passing resolutions, therefore PAC meetings will not be recorded. We apologize for past delays in posting notes and will make an effort to provide these more promptly in the future.

Anonymous Attendee 02:36 p.m.

Comment: Instead of "minimize" property demolition, why isn't an equity and health priority to not demolish any homes or businesses?

Response: MnDOT is committed to avoiding property impacts where possible. It is not possible to accommodate some potential alternatives without some property impacts. However, every effort is being made to minimize impacts.

Nahid Khan 02:38 p.m.

Comment: Everyone, please be aware that 11 times MORE people die from freeway traffic-induced air pollution (asthma, COPD and other respiratory diseases) than are killed by traffic accidents. The so-called benefits of walking and biking trails, etc. is a farce given that exercising next to or near a freeway is worse than NOT exercising at all. Such traffic induced air pollution also has been linked to onset of several serious health issues, including dementia.

Response: Air quality including analysis of criteria pollutants, mobile source air toxics, greenhouse gas emissions, and carbon monoxide hot spot modeling at three intersections, will be completed in Phase 2. Public health impacts, including those on EJ populations, will be considered as part of future stages of the EIS process. Supplementary health and equity analysis is being completed in parallel to the DEIS process, providing additional insights as to potential community health impacts and mitigation options.

Anonymous Attendee 02:39 p.m.

Comment: A classic sunk cost fallacy argument

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Anonymous Attendee 02:39 p.m.

Comment: so you're using sunk cost fallacy because you didn't include equity from the start?

Response: MnDOT is committed to providing a solution to connect and serve all people through a safe, equitable and sustainable transportation system. This is our mission. The process is intentionally including considerations of equity and EJ through the PAC Objectives and equity health commitments. Delays in improvements will not necessarily result in more equitable outcomes for communities.

Anonymous Attendee 02:40 p.m.

Comment: if your labor is harmful, it has no value. Start over

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Nahid Khan 02:40 p.m.

Comment: Many thanks, BC Council member Jerzak for your question about ending this flawed EIS process and basically starting over to focus strictly on safety improvements.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Anonymous Attendee 02:41 p.m.

Comment: To the project manager, it's gross that you are using their deaths to justify a highway expansion project that will demolish homes and businesses and pollute surrounding communities

Response: Response: MnDOT welcomes all feedback and comment on the project, but we encourage respectful discourse and reaffirm our commitment to engaging with the community in an inclusive and accessible manner.

Nahid Khan 02:47 p.m.

Comment: Turning Hwy 252 into a freeway will double the traffic on Hwy 252, which will NOT improve congestion. MnDOT staff spoke to the BC City Council in April 2023 and said that if a freeway is built on Hwy 252, it will be fully congested within 7 years. This is because the traffic numbers will go from roughly 56,000 to 116,000 vehicles a year (or around 20M to 40M a year). Truck traffic will go from a few hundred to many thousands of huge diesel-fueled semi-trucks per year. All this will significantly increase air pollution in the area, especially in eastern Brooklyn Park.

Response: While conversion to freeway would immediately attract more users to Hwy 252 because of its inherent efficiencies, it would also achieve substantial safety improvements due to removing conflicts that occur on this heavily traveled corridor, which serves this traffic via traffic signals, as documented in the SDD. This document also indicates one four-lane freeway element carried forward would likely experience congestion, while the two six-lane freeway elements carried forward would not. All three are being carried forward due to their safety benefits. The EIS will evaluate other mitigation options for the four-lane element carried forward to determine if the expected congestion can be mitigated.

Anonymous Attendee 02:48 p.m.

Comment: No you I want to hear from the communities, they gave feedback that they wanted 252 to go under, yet you have it going over at every interchange. Just stop lying

Response: Engagement on this topic required a difficult tradeoff between input from those who could be potentially directly impacted by demolition/relocation and input from those noise-impacted properties in surrounding communities. The first impact was deeper and more severe, the second one broader and more dispersed. The determination reflected the desire to avoid displacing residents and businesses when possible, especially in EJ communities, alongside the options available to mitigate noise through design and walls.

Anonymous Attendee 02:48 p.m.

Comment: This is why participation is down and now showing up, because people are tired of showing up and not being listened to, this meeting has yet again shown that you do not care so why bother showing up.

Response: The project team is working to document and demonstrate how comments are being heard and reflected in the recommendations being developed.

Michael Svard 02:50 p.m.

Comment: There isn't anywhere else in MN that freeways go over cross streets in residential areas. The decisions to put 252 over in BP & BC isn't mindful of the EJ. Bringing more noise forever in these communities. With a raised freeway and potential noise walls cutting our community in half. Why was community input not included in this decision?

Response: Engagement on this topic required a difficult tradeoff between input from those who could be potentially directly impacted by demolition/relocation and input from those noise-impacted properties in surrounding communities. The first impact was deeper and more severe, the second one broader and more dispersed. The determination reflected the desire to avoid displacing residents and businesses when possible, especially in EJ communities, alongside the options available to mitigate noise through design and walls.

Nahid Khan 02:51 p.m.

Comment: We have a great but under-resourced and under-valued North Mississippi Regional Park (Three Rivers Park District). This park needs to be resourced and expanded to benefit our area residents'

quality of life and the environment. To begin with, there should be signs from I-94 to this park at the 49th-53rd Ave. exits (which do not exist at present).

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We will consider this further during future stages of design.

Nahid Khan 02:52 p.m.

Comment: Relocation is not just a property lost, but our valuable residents / families / human & social capital lost.

Response: For this reason, we are working on minimizing the number of people displaced. The process will seek to find them a suitable new place nearby where possible, so they can remain part of the community.

Nahid Khan 02:53 p.m.

Comment: Aesthetics of freeways, what an amusing concept. Freeway blight is what results from concrete structures, especially noise walls.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Nahid Khan 02:55 p.m.

Comment: Thank you BC Mayor Graves for raising many serious concerns about the impacts to both BC AND N. MPLS. These two communities have the highest rates of air pollution related illnesses, hospitalizations and deaths in the state.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Nahid Khan 02:59 p.m.

Comment: Also, I-94 is overbuilt by 30,000 vehicle capacity. Therefore, just on the basis of traffic "need" alone, no sort of expansion is needed. I have lived in BC for 29 years and have traveled on I-94 at all hours of day and night. There is no congestion at any time, except when there is a crash or some type of roadwork, both of which are rare occurrences. The Met Council Transportation Plan (all years) shows that both I-94 and Hwy 252 through N Mpls, BC and BP have less than 1 hour of congestion per day. Also, MnDOT data itself shows that Hwy 252 traffic has dropped by 2,000 as a result of the pandemic-induced social shift to virtual / work at home.

Response: The traffic and safety analysis are being updated to include post-pandemic data. Safety and mobility considerations remain.

Nicole Chileen 03:00 p.m.

Comment: This entire meeting should be available for replay for the public

Response: This meeting was not recorded. However, meeting notes will be provided on the public website, including all questions and responses.

Nahid Khan 03:01 p.m.

Comment: Yes, mitigation means trying to reduce impacts of the project, which actually means the impacts will make the project area worse. The goal should be to reduce harms from current levels.

Response: The first priority will be to seek to eliminate then minimize harms. Mitigation is only a factor when it is not possible to minimize or eliminate all harms.

Nahid Khan 03:04 p.m.

Comment: Your decision on "over" and "under" for interchanges for your predetermined freeway project is premature, given all the serious problems of this project.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Anonymous Attendee 03:05 p.m.

Comment: And how am I supposed to believe that our engagement will matter? Seems like it has not mattered so far.

Response: The project team will continue to work to demonstrate ways that engagement is having an impact on the process and recommendations.

Nahid Khan 03:05 p.m.

Comment: Your public engagement work is merely trying to rubber-stamp this project and manufacture consent for this harmful project.

Response: Thank you for your comment.

Terry Parks 03:05 p.m.

Comment: Is there an option of somehow skipping over Brooklyn Center I live on 73rd and 252 and I am tired of looking at crosses at that intersection. Lets start at 85th and figure out BC later

Response: At this point, the project is being considered as a whole. In the future, separate phasing may be an option.

Jane Voss 03:06 p.m.

Comment: Is your recommendation to have 252 go over all cross streets/avenues?

Response: Hwy 252 over options are what is being recommended at this stage in the process however the next phase will look at access to/from Hwy 252.

Answered Questions

Brian Pavlak 01:16 p.m.

if I could tell his story please thank you

Kim Collins 03:00 p.m.

Private answer

Hi Brian, our meeting this afternoon is going to run over. I offer my condolences for the loss of your brother. Will you please contact me offline? kim.collins@state.mn.us

Nahid Khan 01:37 p.m.

Phase 1A-Public Preferences - Over/Under: The numbers of people giving comments are very LOW. Thank you, Met Council member Chamblis for asking whether there were other options besides over/under, such as revisualizing/reimagining options entirely.

Reva Chamblis 01:41 p.m.

Thanks for your comment, to clarify I was asking about what visuals were used to give an idea of the current alternatives presented look like during engagement for over/under options