

# Appendix B – EA/EAW Comment and Responses

## Responses to Agency Comments

Metropolitan Council

Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission

SRF (City of Dayton)

Pollution Control Agency

## Responses to Public Comments

Comment Card – Mark Mayer

Email – Michael Swee

Comment from February 7, 2019 Public Hearing Transcript

## Introduction

The EA/EAW for the I-94 Resurfacing Maple Grove to Rogers and Brockton Interchange was distributed on January 11, 2019 to agencies and organizations on the official distribution list, as well as additional agencies/organizations that had either requested a copy of the document, and/or that could be affected by the proposed project. The comment period for the EA/EAW officially closed at the end of the business day on February 13, 2019. A public hearing and open house to receive comments on the proposed project and EA/EAW was held on February 7, 2019 (see **Appendix A** for further details). At the public hearing, attendees were invited to provide comments through one of two ways: written comments and oral statements.

- **Written Statements:** Attendees were invited to submit written comments through February 13, 2019 on cards provided at the open house, in letter, or via e-mail.
- **Oral Statements:** Statements were recorded by a certified court reporter during the public hearing.

During the public review and comment period, FHWA and MnDOT received comments on the EA/EAW from a total of seven agencies and individuals, including oral statements that were received at the public hearing.

Comments received are responded to in this appendix as part of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions for the project record. Specifically, responses have been prepared for substantive statements pertaining to analysis conducted for and documented in the EA/EAW, including: incorrect, incomplete or unclear information; permit requirements; content requirements. These comments and responses are included in **Appendix B** below. Written comments agreeing with the EA/EAW project information, general opinions, statements of fact, or statements of preference are also included.

# Responses to Agency Comments

## Response to Metropolitan Council

February 12, 2019

Mr. Rick Dalton  
MnDOT Metro District  
1500 West County Road B2  
Roseville, MN 55113

**RE: MnDOT I – 94 UBOL Resurfacing Maple Grove to Rogers and Brockton Interchange  
Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW)  
Metropolitan Council Review No. 22189-1**

Dear Mr. Dalton:

The Metropolitan Council received the EAW for the MnDOT I -94 resurfacing project from Maple Grove to Rogers and the Brockton Interchange on January 11, 2019.

Council staff has conducted a review of this EA/EAW to determine its adequacy and accuracy in addressing regional concerns and the potential for significant environmental impact. Staff have concluded that the EAW is complete and accurate and an EIS is not necessary.

We offer the following comments for your consideration.

**Item 9.b. – Land Use – Compatibility and implications for environmental effects**

(Jim Larsen 651-602-1159)

- The Council requests that the project proposer avoid utilization of woodland stands or areas identified as Regionally Significant Ecological Areas (RSEAs) when considering sites to excavate for potential stormwater best management practices (BMPs) and floodplain fill mitigation sites, to preserve the remnant woodland stands and RSEA vegetation areas near the roadway.
- Council and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) staff, in concert with the University of Minnesota, jointly prepared the natural resources inventory/assessment database for the seven-county area in 2004-2005, which Council staff continues to utilize. The data set originally identified as the Natural Resources Inventory/Assessment (NRIA) is currently identified in the Council's geographic information system as Regionally Significant Ecological Areas. The Council's regional development guide, *Thrive MSP 2040*, directs staff to work with local and regional partners to conserve, restore, and protect the region's remaining vital natural resources by adopting local land uses and planning strategies for protecting NRIA resources and minimizing development impacts.
- This avoidance effort will preserve the woodland stands and NRIA remnant lands for their noise and visual buffering values, as well as for their wildlife habitat value. Woodland loss impacts in the immediate right-of-way may be unavoidable where the roadway is planned for widening, but project proposers are encouraged to avoid impacting woodland areas in the vicinity of the proposed new Brockton Interchange, when siting BMP and floodplain fill mitigation excavations when alternative adjacent open ground sites that meet the siting requirements are available adjacent to the roadway.

**Item 11.b.i. Wastewater** (Roger Janzig 651-602-1119)

The EAW reflects a proposed project that may have an impact on multiple Metropolitan Council Interceptors in multiple locations. To assess the potential impacts to our interceptor system, prior to initiating any proposed project, preliminary plans should be sent to Tim Wedin, Engineering Services Assistant Manager (651-602-4571) at the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services for review and comment.

This concludes the Council's review of the EA/EAW. The Council will not take formal action on the EA/EAW at this time. If you have any questions or need further information, please contact Russ Owen, Principal Reviewer, at 651-602-1724.

Sincerely,



Angela R. Torres, AICP, Manager  
Local Planning Assistance

CC: Tod Sherman, Development Reviews Coordinator, MnDOT - Metro Division  
Russ Owen, Principal Reviewer, Metropolitan Council  
Raya Esmaeili, Reviews Coordinator

*N:\MTS\Staff\Owen\Principal Reviewer\_Files\MnDOT EA Review 22189-1.docx*

**Response to Comment 1:** The Council provided comments regarding Land Use and requests that woodlands and Regionally Significant Ecological Areas (RSEAs) are avoided when siting the stormwater and floodplain fill and mitigation areas. A new map, **Figure 21**, has been added to the Findings and Conclusions that shows the RSEAs. There are high and moderate quality RSEAs within the study area. Some of these areas have already been impacted, such as at the I-494 and I-94 interchange. The areas in Maple Grove are associated with the lakes and the wetlands. Impacts to these areas have been avoided or minimized. Near the proposed Brockton Interchange, there is a moderate quality area associated with the wooded area in the southwest portion of the interchange. A portion of this area is proposed to be impacted with the interchange. The design will attempt to minimize impacts to this area to the extent practical.

**Response to Comment 2:** The Council commented on the wastewater interceptor and noted that the project may have an impact on Metropolitan Council Interceptors. MnDOT will coordinate with Metropolitan Council staff regarding the interceptor in the project area.

# Response to Elm Creek Watershed District Management Commission

## elm creek Watershed Management Commission

---

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
3235 Fernbrook Lane  
Plymouth, MN 55447  
PH: 763.553.1144  
E-mail: [judie@jass.biz](mailto:judie@jass.biz)

TECHNICAL OFFICE  
Hennepin County Public Works  
Department of Environment and Energy  
701 Fourth Ave. South, Suite 700  
Minneapolis, MN 55415  
PH: 612.348.7338  
E-mail: [james.kujawa@hennepin.us](mailto:james.kujawa@hennepin.us)

January 22, 2019

Minnesota Department of Transportation  
Attention; Rick Dalton, Environmental Coordinator MnDOT Metro District  
1500 West County Road B2  
Roseville, MN 55113

Re: Environmental Assessment Worksheet, I-94 UBOL Resurfacing Maple Grove to Rogers and Brockton Interchange

Dear Mr. Dalton;

On behalf of the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission (ECWMC), please find my comments as they relate to the I-94 UBOL Resurfacing Maple Grove to Rogers and Brockton Interchange EAW. The EAW was reviewed for compliance to the Commission's Third Generation Stormwater Management Plan, Appendix C- Rules and Standards. Based on EAW and the ECWMC standards I have the following comments:

ECWMC Floodplain Rule F;

- 1) There are several FEMA flood zones along this corridor. The EAW addresses the requirements of the Commission for floodplain impacts (i.e. compensatory floodplain mitigation is provided at a 1:1 ratio by volume). In addition, it addresses the Commission's standards for floodway impacts, albeit in the Municipalities section of the report.
- 2) The ECWMC has two upland storage areas in Maple Grove that are not considered FEMA floodplains but are regulated as floodplains in the ECWMC stormwater management plan (see attached map). These are located at;
  - a. West of I-94 along DNR protected waters 27-027100 and 27-027400. The ECWMC 100-year elevation on this basin is 922.5 (1929 NAVD), and
  - b. Just south of the intersection of CSAH 30 along DNR unnamed stream M-062-008. The ECWMC 100-year elevation along this basin is 903.5 (1929 NAVD)
- 3) ECWMC and FEMA floodplain elevations and impacts must be determined by the existing elevations as determined by LiDAR or a current topography survey, not by the FEMA overlay map.

ECWMC Stormwater Management Rule D

- 1) Abstraction: ECWMC requires 1.1" abstraction for no more than 48 hours for all new impervious surfaces. 33.7 acres of new impervious area will require ~134,565 cubic feet of abstraction.
- 2) Water Quality: ECWMC requires post-development total phosphorus and suspended solids to be equal to or less than pre-development loads.

- a. Ponds proposed for stormwater treatment must be designed to NURP standards or better with dead storage volume equal to or greater than the volume of runoff from a 2.5" storm event or BMPs providing a similar level of treatment- 80-85% TSS removal and 60% TP removal.
- 3) Rate Controls: ECWMC requires post development flow rates be equal to or less than pre-development flow rates for the 2, 10 and 100-year storm events.

ECWMC Erosion and Sediment Control, Rule E;

- 1) Erosion control plans must use Best Management Practices and be consistent with the NPDES General Construction Permit requirements.

Temporary Impervious Areas During Construction;

- 1) Where permanent BMP's are not designed to treat temporary increases for new impervious areas to widen and/or accommodate traffic during construction (i.e. temporary traffic lanes etc.), abstraction, TP and TSS loads must be accounted for on these temporary areas and temporary BMP's designed to offset said loads.

Final site plans must be submitted to the Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission (ECWMC) for review and approval.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this EAW. Please contact me if you have any questions on this information.

Sincerely,



James C. Kujawa  
Technical Advisor to the Commission

cc Judie Anderson, Executive Secretary  
Jason Swanson, ECWMC Engineer



**Response to Comment 1:** The Elm Creek Watershed Management Commission (ECWMC) provided comments related to the need to incorporate not only the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain information, but also the ECWMC floodplain areas which are not within FEMA floodplain. The affected floodplain figures (**Figures 15C and 15D**) and floodplain information in the Findings of Fact and Conclusions document have been revised to show the ECWMC floodplain areas. There are no impacts expected for the ECWMC regulated floodplains as part of the project. There are also no significant FEMA floodplain impacts associated with the project.

**Response to Comment 2:** The stormwater, erosion control, floodplain and temporary Best Management Practice (BMP) requirements will be incorporated into the project design and submitted to the ECWMC for review.

### Response to SRF (Consultant to City of Dayton)

**Comment 1:** [w]e noticed one item that might be worth clarifying in the environmental management plan with the FOF&C. Environmental management plan, page 4, under contaminated materials, 2nd row, 2nd bullet.

“The City of Dayton will be responsible for the pre-demolition assessment and abatement, prior to removal of the one house and associated accessory structures in the footprint of the proposed Brockton interchange.”

**Response to Comment 1:** SRF on behalf of the City of Dayton provided a revision to the Contaminated Materials section of EA/EAW Appendix P (Environmental Management Plan). Based on this comment, this item has been revised to add the following: “The City of Dayton will be responsible for the pre-demolition assessment and abatement, prior to removal of the one house and associated accessory structures in the footprint of the proposed Brockton Interchange.” The updated environmental commitments have been included in **Appendix E** of the FOFC.

## Response to MPCA



520 Lafayette Road North | St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-4194 | 651-296-6300  
800-657-3864 | Use your preferred relay service | info.pca@state.mn.us | Equal Opportunity Employer

February 13, 2019

Richard Dalton  
Environmental Coordinator  
Minnesota Department of Transportation  
1500 West County Road B2  
Roseville, MN 55113

Re: I-94 UBOL Resurfacing Maple Grove to Rogers and Brockton Interchange Environmental Assessment/Environmental Assessment Worksheet

Dear Richard Dalton:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Environmental Assessment, Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EA/EAW) for I-94 UBOL Resurfacing Maple Grove to Rogers and Brockton Interchange project (Project) in the cities of Rogers, Dayton, and Maple Grove, Hennepin County, Minnesota. The Project consists of resurfacing of existing pavement and construction of a new interchange. Regarding matters for which the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has regulatory responsibility or other interests, the MPCA staff has the following comments for your consideration.

### **Water Resources (Item 11)**

#### *Surface Waters*

- Page 45 of the EA/EAW, states "Approximately 21.4 acres of aquatic resource impacts will result based on preliminary design construction limits and delineated resources (Table 11). However, not all the impacted aquatic resources are regulated." Please note that this is a misnomer. The MPCA regulates all waters of the state. In order for the MPCA to meet its Antidegradation Rule requirements (Minn. R. ch. 7050.0265 – 0335), it is necessary that Project proposers describe all of the impacts to waters of the state, as defined in Minn. Stat. 115.01 subd. 22 which reads; "Waters of the state" means all streams, lakes, ponds, marshes, watercourses, waterways, wells, springs, reservoirs, aquifers, irrigation systems, drainage systems and all other bodies or accumulations of water, surface or underground, natural or artificial, public or private, which are contained within, flow through, or border upon the state or any portion thereof." This definition goes above and beyond the definition of Waters of the U.S., and beyond the requirements for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR).

When the Project proposer makes application for the wetland impacts, the information needs to include location maps and tables indicating the impacts to 16.7 acres of ditch, the 0.4-acre impact to stormwater ponds, and any other wetlands not covered by the USACE and BWSR regulations that will be impacted by the Project. The MPCA would also like a list of the permanent and temporary impacts to each aquatic resource. An antidegradation assessment will also be required.

Note: In many cases, additional mitigation will not be required either because mitigation requirements will already be met through the USACE and the BWSR requirements, or the beneficial use of the lost aquatic resource is being replaced on the Project site.

- Page 80, Table 26 of the EA/EAW indicates 3.9 acres of wetland impacts. Page 28, Table 6 indicates 4.27 acres of wetland impact. Please explain this difference. If this is due to the presence of wetlands not regulated by USACE or the BWSR, please understand that all impacts to waters of the state need to be included in the application for Section 401 Water Quality Certification.

Richard Dalton  
Page 2  
February 13, 2019

- Appendix H, after table 5 under the title of Compensation (Replacement/Enhancements), contains the statement "The minimum wetland replacement ratio for the project area is 2.0, within Bank Service Area 7." Please explain what the 2.0 ratio means.
- Appendix P. It appears that a portion of Rush Creek (and maybe an unnamed stream (M-062-008), will be permanently filled. Please note that mitigation for Rush Creek may require improvement or replacement of a similar creek.
- It appears that dewatering may be a part of this Project. Please be sure to include the dewatering plan as part of the wetland application for Section 401 Water Quality Certification. For further information about the Section 401 Water Quality Certification process, please contact Jim Brist at 651-757-2245 or [Jim.Brist@state.mn.us](mailto:Jim.Brist@state.mn.us).

*Construction Stormwater*

- Because this Project will disturb more than 50 acres, the Project proposer is reminded that in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System Construction Stormwater (CSW) Permit they will need to submit the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to the MPCA for review and approval. Questions regarding CSW Permit requirements should be directed to Scott Fox at 507-206-2629 or [Scott.Fox@state.mn.us](mailto:Scott.Fox@state.mn.us).

**Transportation (Item 18)**

Traffic disruption will occur during construction of the Project. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) is planning to maintain six lanes on I-94 during construction as well as monitoring the local roadways that could be impacted by traffic diverting from I-94. Please note that MnDOT must prepare a detailed transportation management plan to manage all the expected traffic disruptions and detours during the final design of the proposed Project and provide commitment to monitoring and providing temporary improvements to those impacted intersections listed in the EA/EAW.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this Project. Please provide your specific responses to our comments and notice of decision on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement. Please be aware that this letter does not constitute approval by the MPCA of any or all elements of the Project for the purpose of pending or future permit action(s) by the MPCA. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Project proposer to secure any required permits and to comply with any requisite permit conditions. If you have any questions concerning our review of this EA/EAW, please contact me by email at [Karen.kromar@state.mn.us](mailto:Karen.kromar@state.mn.us) or by telephone at 651-757-2508.

Sincerely,



Karen Kromar  
Project Manager  
Environmental Review Unit  
Resource Management and Assistance Division

KK:bt

cc: Dan Card, MPCA, St. Paul  
Jim Brist, MPCA, St. Paul  
Scott Fox, MPCA, St. Paul  
Mehjabeen Rahman, MPCA, St. Paul

**Response to Comment 1:** The MPCA commented in the Surface Water section of the EA/EAW regarding its Antidegradation Rule requirements. The MPCA commented that wetland impact applications will need to include the information related to impacts to ditches and stormwater ponds and an antidegradation assessment will also be required.

Information on aquatic resource impacts will be included in the permitting process and an antidegradation plan will be completed if necessary. This information has been added to the FOFC and this will be addressed through the permitting process.

**Response to Comment 2:** The MPCA commented that Table 26 in the EA/EAW indicated 3.9 acres of wetland impact. Table 6 indicated 4.27 acres of wetland impact.

To clarify, the wetland impact is 3.9 acres as correctly stated in Table 26. The FOFC contains updated wetland impacts.

**Response to Comment 3:** The MPCA requested clarification of the wetland replacement ratio of 2.0 stated in Appendix H. This means that the wetland replacement ratio is two acres of replacement for every one acre of impact. This has been clarified in the FOFC.

**Response to Comment 4:** The MPCA comments that it appears that a portion of Rush Creek and maybe an unnamed stream M-062-008 will be permanently filled. This impact is related to culvert replacements or extensions, not fill. MnDOT does not anticipate that mitigation will be needed for this type of activity. This will be reviewed through the design and permitting of the project. The need for mitigation for any impacts will be evaluated during permitting.

**Response to Comment 5:** The MPCA commented that dewatering may be a part of this project and to provide a dewatering plan as part of the wetland application for Section 401 Water Quality Certification. The I-94 portion of the project will be delivered as a design-build project and as such, a dewatering permit would be prepared by a selected design-build contractor. The Brockton interchange portion of the project is anticipated to be a design-bid-build project. Dewatering plans will be provided based on the delivery method design plans.

**Response to Comment 6:** The MPCA reminded that the project will need to submit its SWPPP for review and approval. This comment is noted.

**Response to Comment 7:** The MPCA commented that MnDOT will need to prepare a detailed transportation management plan to manage traffic disruptions and detours and to provide commitment to monitoring and providing temporary improvements to those impacted intersections. MnDOT will be completing this plan. Additional information about traffic monitoring and temporary management plans are included in the FOFC.

# Responses to Public Comments

## Comment Card A - Mark Mayer

### MnDOT environmental assessment comment card

Name: MARC MAYER

Address: 15395 81st Av. N., Maple Grove 55369

Phone: 612.889.0508

Email: marc.mayer@gmail.com

Please provide your comments about the environmental assessment for work on I-94 between Maple Grove and Rogers.

#### Comments:

1. THE LACK OF APRON ALIGNMENT ON BOTH SIDES OF BRIDGE #27969 ARE A PERCUSSIVE SOURCE. THIS WITH PRECISION OVERLAY PAVING COULD BE MINIMIZED.
2. I'D LIKE TO FURTHER DISCUSS POSSIBILITY OF PERFORATED PANELS ON SIDE OF THE (NON-DOT) CITY M.G. PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE. I'M WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN STRUCT. ANALYSIS OF LIMITED & LIGHT-WGT. PANEL STRESS.
3. I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE A (SAY) HEIGHT TO 12 FT. OF AN OFF-SET VEGETATIVE WALL OF CLIMBING PLANTS. (NOT TREES, NO SHRUBS). THIS MAT IS MEANT AS ABSORBITIVE PERCENTAGE OF OVERALL WALL.

(3. CONTINUED)

EFFICIENCY, MEANT AS <sup>TO</sup> DEFLECT A PERCENTAGE OF NOISE APPROACHING THE WALL.

IT IS NOT MEANT TO BE ON THE WALL SURFACE, AS THIS WOULD SHORTEN THE WALL'S LIFESPAN.

THANK YOU!

MARC

**Response to Comment 1:** The comment indicated that there is a percussive source while driving over the bridge. The project will provide a new concrete overlay on I-94 which will improve the ride quality of the roadway.

**Response to Comment 2:** The comment indicated a preference for perforated noise wall panels on the city facing side near the pedestrian bridge in Maple Grove. Additional panels on the pedestrian bridge would need to be limited in height based on the wind load and structural load specifications of the bridge. Because this additional shielding would be short in length and height, the increase in noise reduction to the impacted and benefited receptors would be negligible. The resurfacing being completed as part of the project will improve the pavement surface in the area of the bridge.

**Response to Comment 3:** The comment encouraged a limited height to the noise walls in Maple Grove. This preference on barrier aesthetics and appearance is noted. Decisions regarding vegetation and landscaping will be made during final design. MnDOT will also consider including an absorptive barrier material that is a textured concrete and wood composite. MnDOT will consider public viewpoints on barrier appearance, such as aesthetic choices like texture or color.

## Email A – Michael Swee

### Andi Moffatt

---

**From:** Michael Swee <mjswee@charter.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 18, 2019 8:47 AM  
**To:** Dalton, Richard (DOT)  
**Subject:** Re: Feedback — I-94 Construction (Maple Grove to Clearwater)

To further clarify, I should note that there's already one merge sign located on the east side of the MN-101 overpass on I-94E, but it is placed too far east to be useful. People have already prematurely moved to left lane from not knowing about the sign/road design on the west side side of the bridge. There is a bend in the road here and the merge sign/road design is not visible. Again, please help by adding a second merge sign to the east side of the MN-101 overpass on I-94E.

Regards,  
Michael Swee

> On Jan 18, 2019, at 8:37 AM, Michael Swee <mjswee@charter.net> wrote:

>

> Also, please address the merging issue from MN-101 to I-94E at Rogers. If there could be an entrance ramp merge sign added on the west side of the MN-101 exit overpass bridge, it would communicate to drivers that they don't need to merge over to the left lane, creating bottlenecks. This sign has been has been a glaring miss in this area, and has not been addressed. Please bring this up to the people in charge during this construction time. I drive this section of road every day and this is a huge problem. People think they need to merge to the left lane, when the on ramp from MN-101 turns into the third lane on I-94E. Please help!

>

>

> Regards,  
> Michael Swee

>

>> On Jan 18, 2019, at 8:30 AM, Michael Swee <mjswee@charter.net> wrote:

>>

>> As a Saint Michael resident I'd like to provide some feedback on the upcoming I-94 improvements between Maple Grove and Clearwater. How can you have this going on for 3 years and not address "Rogers to Albertville" and "Albertville to Monticello" sections of I-94? These 2-lane sections are just going to become the new bottlenecks, ultimately still being traffic congestion problems. I was just shocked to hear that we'll be spending all of this time and money and not truly addressing all traffic issues within this section of I-94. This project appears to be another miss on infrastructure improvements that doesn't truly address current traffic needs, and certainly not future traffic needs, especially with the growing population and commuter traffic coming from St. Cloud. Shaking my head.

>>

>>

>> Regards,  
>> Michael Swee  
>> 417 5th St. NW  
>> Saint Michael, MN 55376  
>> 763-443-6889  
>> mjswee@charter.net

**Response to Comment 1 and 2:** The comment indicated a concern about merging from TH 101 to I-94 eastbound in Rogers and poor signage. The signing in that area will be reconfigured due to the addition of a 3<sup>rd</sup> lane under TH 101 and the additional of the 4<sup>th</sup> lane east of TH 101.

**Response to Comment 3:** The comment indicated a concern about not addressing the roadway bottlenecks between Rogers to Albertville and also the Albertville to Monticello sections of I-94. The I-94 reconstruction project between Rogers and St. Michael that was completed in 2015 added an eastbound auxiliary lane from TH 101 to TH 241. This section of roadway includes three lanes in both directions.

The Albertville to Monticello section of I-94 will remain a 2-lane section. Due to funding constraints, MnDOT cannot build this segment as a 3-lane section at this time. Traffic modeling was performed on all I-94 projects in current and future conditions to identify points of congestion.

# Comment from Public Hearing

## Transcript of Public Comments and Questions - 2/7/2019 Public Meeting For Environmental Assessment & Noise Wall Voting

Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 The Public Comment and Question portion of the Public 2 Meeting for Environmental Assessment &amp; Noise Wall Voting 3 is taken on this 7th day of February, 2019, at the Maple 4 Grove Government Center, Emergency Operations Center, 5 12800 Arbor Lakes Parkway North, Maple Grove, Minnesota, 6 commencing at 6:44 p.m. 7 (Presentation given by Jerome Adams, MnDOT 8 Project Manager, and Natalie Reis of MnDOT.) 9 MS. ANDI MOFFATT: Thanks, Natalie. We are 10 required to have a public comment period of the hearing 11 on the EA, and so we have a court reporter here. So if 12 you want to have a comment on the record, you can come 13 to the microphone and state your comment or question. 14 We want to answer those questions through the official 15 public hearing. We can talk afterwards, or you can go 16 talk to the court reporter directly if you don't want 17 to stand in front of this large crowd and comment. 18 (Laughter.) 19 So I will officially open the public hearing if 20 anybody wants to make an official comment. 21 If you could just state your name and your address 22 and your comment or question. 23 MR. GERALD ANDERSON: Sure. My name is 24 Gerald Anderson, and I've got a commercial property at 25 14040 81st Avenue North, Maple Grove. I'm also a Maple</p>	<p>1 their view of that. So those are some of my concerns. 2 MS. ANDI MOFFATT: Thank you. Does anyone 3 else want to officially make a comment or question on 4 the record? Seeing none, I will close the public 5 hearing. Thank you very much. And then we will stay 6 here for a little bit longer for folks who still have 7 questions or want to ask questions. So thank you very 8 much. 9 (Whereupon, this portion of the public 10 meeting concludes at 7:00 p.m.) 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p> <p>1 Grove resident. As long as I'm on the record, my 2 concerns with the noise wall barrier are that my 3 commercial property -- visibility is a key factor in 4 the commercial property. With a noise wall right in 5 front of my building, my visibility is going to 6 decrease. The property value will decrease as well. 7 My windows are facing that side. I can look out my 8 windows right now. My patients can look out the 9 windows. With the noise wall there that is concrete, 10 our view will be blocked by the concrete wall. So it 11 will affect property value. It will affect our 12 visibility. So those are my concerns. And Natalie 13 mentioned that there are some other options. There is 14 a -- instead of a concrete wall, there's an acrylic 15 wall which will increase visibility. 16 People who are driving down East Fish Lake Road, 17 when they get close to the highway, one of the things 18 they are doing is -- at least I'm doing it -- is 19 checking to see how much congestion is on the highway 20 before I decide if I'm going to go on the highway or if 21 I should just take the back roads, which I can get 22 around faster if it's all plugged up on the weekends or 23 holidays or later in the afternoon. With a concrete 24 wall there, people won't have an opportunity to make 25 that decision because the concrete wall will block</p>	

**Response to Comment:** The comment was about a decrease in visibility to commercial properties, decrease in property value, and view for customers. There was also a concern about being able to see congestion on I-94 before getting on to the freeway. The preference on barrier aesthetics and appearance from the comment is noted. Decisions on noise wall materials will be made during final design. MnDOT will also consider including an absorptive barrier material that is a textured concrete and wood composite. MnDOT will consider public viewpoints on barrier appearance, such as aesthetic choices like texture or color.