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## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040 TPP</td>
<td>2040 Transportation Policy Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHP</td>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Area of Potential Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>Best Management Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRTOD</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>Construction Contingency Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Metropolitan Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWD</td>
<td>Capitol Region Watershed District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTIB</td>
<td>Counties Transit Improvement Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAW</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Environmental Site Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQB</td>
<td>Environmental Quality Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOFC</td>
<td>Findings of Fact and Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONSI</td>
<td>Finding of No Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Federal Railroad Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPZ</td>
<td>High Potential Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-94</td>
<td>Interstate 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGU</td>
<td>Local Governmental Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOD</td>
<td>Limits of Disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA</td>
<td>Locally Preferred Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCES</td>
<td>Metropolitan Council Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT</td>
<td>Minnesota Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT CRU</td>
<td>MnDOT Cultural Resources Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNRRRA</td>
<td>Mississippi National River and Recreation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnSHPO</td>
<td>Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>Maintenance of Traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MPCA  Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
MRCCA  Mississippi River Critical Corridor Area
NEPA  National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA  National Historic Preservation Act
NLAA  Not Likely to Adversely Affect
NRHP  National Register of Historic Places
NPDES/SDS  National Pollutant Discharge Elimination/State Disposal System
NPS  National Park Service
PA  Programmatic Agreement
PBO  Programmatic Biological Opinion
Project  METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit Project
RAP  Response Action Plan
RGU  Responsible Governmental Unit
RPBB  Rusty Patched Bumble Bee
RWMWD  Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District
TOD  Transit-Oriented Development
URA  Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act
USACE  U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC  U.S. Code
USFWS  U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WCA  Wetland Conservation Act
APPENDIX F. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS

F.1. Statement of Issue

The Metropolitan Council (Council) proposes a 10-mile transitway located in Ramsey and Washington counties in the eastern part of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. The Project corridor is generally parallel to Interstate 94 (I-94) and would better connect downtown Saint Paul with the suburban cities of Maplewood, Landfall, Oakdale and Woodbury.

Preparation of an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is considered discretionary for this project under Minnesota Rules 4410.4300. The Council is the project proposer. The Council is also the Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU) for review of this project, as per Minnesota Rules 4410.4300, Subpart 22.

The Council’s decision in this matter shall be either a negative or a position declaration of the need for an environmental impact statement (EIS). The Council must order an environmental impact statement for the Project if it determines that the Project has the potential for significant environmental effects.

Based upon the information in the record, which comprises the Environmental Assessment/Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EA/EAW) for the Project, related studies referenced in the EA/EAW, comments received during the public comment period, responses to substantive comments, and other supporting documents, the Council makes the Findings of Fact and Conclusions (FOFC) described in this document.

F.2. Administrative Background

The Council is the RGU and project proposer for the METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit Project (Project). A combined Federal Environmental Assessment (EA) and State EAW has been prepared for this Project in accordance with Minnesota Rules Chapter 4410 and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 USC § 4321 et. seq.). The EA/EAW was developed to assess the impacts of the Project and other circumstances to determine if an EIS is indicated.

The EA/EAW was filed with the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB) and circulated for review and comments to the required EAW distribution list. A “Notice of Availability” was published in the EQB Monitor on Oct. 7, 2019. The legal notice of availability was published on Oct. 7, 2019, in the Star Tribune. A press release was issued on Oct. 4, 2019. Advertisements of the two public meetings and project office drop-in hours were placed in three area newspapers. Attachment F-A contains copies of these documents.

The public meetings were also promoted on social media where content was displayed 20,240 times. Over 300 poster flyers were distributed to households in the City of Landfall. Copies of this document, or details on where to find the document, were sent to agencies, local governments, libraries and other interested organizations in accordance with Minnesota Rule 4410.1500, “Publishing and Distributing EAW.” Below is a summary of the EA notice of availability distribution:

- 555 adjacent property owners were notified via letter
- 784 Gold Line email subscribers were notified via email
- 1,381 Gold Line Partners email subscribers were notified via email
- 40 Gold Line mail subscribers were notified via letter
- Members of the Gold Line Community and Business Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, and Corridor Management Committee were notified via email
- 72 people who commented during scoping were notified
The document and reference materials were also available on the Project website at: www.metrotransit.org/gold-line. Hard copies of the document were available at the following locations:

- **Gold Line Project Office**: Metro Square Building, 121 7th Place E., Suite 102, Saint Paul, MN 55101
- **Downtown Saint Paul Central Library (George Latimer Central Library)**: 90 W. 4th St., Saint Paul, MN 55102
- **Dayton’s Bluff Library**: 645 E. 7th St., Saint Paul, MN 55106
- **Sun Ray Library**: 2105 Wilson Ave., Saint Paul, MN 55119
- **Maplewood Library**: 3025 Southlawn Drive, Maplewood, MN 55109
- **Landfall City Hall**: One 4th Ave., Landfall, MN 55128
- **Oakdale Library**: 1010 Heron Ave. N., Oakdale, MN 55128
- **Woodbury Library (R.H. Stafford Library)**: 8595 Central Park Place, Woodbury, MN 55125
- **Federal Transit Administration, Region 5**: 200 W. Adams St., Suite 320, Chicago, IL 60606

The Council held the following two public meetings:

- **Tuesday, Oct. 22, 2019**: 5-7 p.m.
  East Side Learning Center at Harding Senior High School
  1526 E. 6th St., Saint Paul, MN 55106
- **Wednesday, Oct. 23, 2019**: 5-7 PM
  Landfall Community Center
  Two 4th Ave. N., Landfall, MN 55128

The Council also held drop-in hours:

- **Monday, Oct. 28, 2019**: 11 AM-1 PM
  Gold Line Project Office
  121 7th Place E., Suite 102, Saint Paul, MN 55101

A total 37 people signed in at the public meetings and two people signed in during the drop-in hours. All attendees were provided with a Project fact sheet and a comment form upon entering the meeting venues. The public meetings were held in an open house format. A series of exhibit boards described the Project area, purpose and need, lead and cooperating agencies, federal and state permits and approvals, alternatives, Section 4(f) resources, Section 106 (historic properties), and instructions about how to comment. The 15% Concept Plan roll plots also were available for viewing at the public meetings. Attendees were invited to speak to Project staff to discuss specific issues and ask questions regarding the Project. A court reporter was available at both public meetings to record oral public comments. An American Sign Language interpreter was present at both public meetings, and a Spanish translator was present at the meeting location in Landfall. Copies of the EA, Section 4(f) Evaluation, draft PA, and all EA appendices were available at the meetings for attendees to review. The exhibit boards and 15% Concept Plan roll plots (see **Appendix G**) were available on the Project webpage after the meetings.

During the public comment period, the Council received 35 comments about the EA and two comments about the draft PA. Comments were provided via the Project email list, the comment form on the Project website and by U.S. mail. Comments were also given verbally to a court reporter at the Oct. 22 and 23, 2019, public meetings.
The following agencies sent comment letters:

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
- Minnesota Department of Transportation
- Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- State Historic Preservation Office (EA and PA)
- The Council
- Ramsey County
- City of Maplewood
- City of Oakdale
- City of Saint Paul
- City of Woodbury
- Sierra Club North Star Chapter

Appendix A of the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) contains a summary table of the comments, copies of the comments and agency letters, and responses to substantive comments.

No changes to the EA/EAW were necessary because of the public comments. Changes to the PA based on comments received were made as appropriate.

F.3. Findings of Fact

F.3.1. Project Description

The Project is a planned 10-mile transitway in Ramsey and Washington counties in the eastern part of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. The Project generally would operate parallel to I-94 and would better connect downtown Saint Paul with the suburban cities of Maplewood, Landfall, Oakdale and Woodbury.

More broadly, the Project would better connect the eastern Twin Cities Metropolitan Area to the regional transit network via the Union Depot multimodal hub in downtown Saint Paul. The Project also intends to serve and draw ridership from other portions of the metropolitan area, including portions of eastern Washington County, Dakota County to the south, and Hennepin County (including the City of Minneapolis to the west).

The Project would include all-day, bi-directional transit service that operates from 5 a.m. to midnight on weekdays and weekends between the existing Smith Avenue Transit Center in downtown Saint Paul and a new station located near the Woodbury Theatre and I-494 in Woodbury. The Project includes 10 stations in downtown Saint Paul, including two new stations at Union Depot, and 11 stations along the remainder of the alignment. The Project would operate in a guideway dedicated only to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) for 66 percent of its route and in mixed traffic for 34 percent. The dedicated guideway is new roadway being constructed for the Project.
F.3.2. Findings Regarding Criteria for Determining the Potential for Significant Environment Effects

Minnesota Rules 4410.1700 provides that an EIS shall be ordered for projects that have the potential for significant environmental effects. In deciding whether a project has the potential for significant environmental effects, the following four factors described in Minnesota Rules 4410.1700, Subpart 7 shall be considered:

A. type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects;

B. cumulative potential effects. The RGU shall consider the following factors: whether the cumulative potential effect is significant; whether the contribution from the project is significant when viewed in connection with other contributions to the cumulative potential effect; the degree to which the project complies with approved mitigation measures specifically designed to address the cumulative potential effect; and the efforts of the proposer to minimize the contributions from the project;

C. the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority. The RGU may rely only on mitigation measures that are specific and that can be reasonably expected to effectively mitigate the identified environmental impacts of the project; and

D. the extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other available environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, including other EISs.

The Council’s key findings with respect to each of these criteria are set forth below.

F.4. Type, Extent and Reversibility of Environmental Effects

The Council finds that the analysis completed during the EA/EAW process is adequate to determine whether the Project has the potential for significant environmental effects. The EA/EAW describes the type and extent of impacts anticipated to result from the Project. The public/agency comments received during the public comment period (see Appendix A of the FONSI) were taken into account in considering the type, extent and reversibility of Project effects. Following are the key findings regarding potential environmental effects of the Project and the design features included to avoid, minimize, and mitigate these impacts and environmental commitments as a result of the EA/EAW process are included in Appendix C of the FONSI.

F.4.1. Land Use

The communities in the study area have prepared 2040 comprehensive plans, with most plans currently under review by the Council. The City of Landfall has adopted an updated 2040 comprehensive plan and the cities of Saint Paul, Maplewood, Oakdale and Woodbury have draft updates available for public review while under review by the Council. The land use policies described in the 2040 draft comprehensive plans are compatible with the Project. These plan updates frequently identify and consider the Project route when envisioning future land use, growth and development in the proposed station areas. In addition, the Saint Paul Planning Commission and City Council adopted station area plans for the Mounds Boulevard, Earl Street, Etna Street, White Bear Avenue and Sun Ray stations in October 2015 and amended the plans in February 2019. The station area plans update the city’s comprehensive plan and supersede other area plans. Also, the cities of Oakdale and Maplewood adopted Bus Rapid Transit Oriented Development (BRTOD) Plans in April 2018 and March 2019, respectively, as part of their 2040 comprehensive plan updates.
The draft *Ramsey County 2040 Comprehensive Plan*\(^1\) is guided by the county’s “All Abilities Transportation Network Policy” for implementing an integrated and fully interconnected, multimodal transportation system. The plan further supports transit solutions including Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) and compact growth strategies. The plan identifies the METRO Gold Line Project.

The *Washington County 2040 Comprehensive Plan*\(^2\) includes a series of policies and strategies aimed at effectively planning for and implementing transit (Transportation Goal 1) and encouraging TOD (Land Use Goals 2 and 3). The plan identifies the METRO Gold Line Project.

The Council’s 2040 *Transportation Policy Plan* (2040 TPP) includes the Project and identifies the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) in its fiscally-constrained transit investment plan. The 2040 TPP acknowledges that the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) identified the Project as a funding priority for its Phase 1 Program of Projects.

A 2018 update to the 2040 TPP identifies the Project as a planned “transitway expansion assumed to be funded within the current revenue scenario.” The 2018 update acknowledges the importance of BRT scalability and adaptability to meet changes in transit demand over time.\(^3\)

Portions of the Project are within the Mississippi River Critical Corridor Area (MRCCA) and the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area (MNRRA). The MRCCA is cooperatively managed by local governments, the DNR, the Council and the National Park Service (NPS); the MNRRA is a unit of the NPS. Alignment A1 borders the MRCCA/MNRRA boundary on Kellogg Boulevard between Sibley Street and I-94. Within this area, BRT would operate on the existing roadway in mixed traffic (not in a dedicated lane). The Project would not construct new stations within the MRCCA/MNRRA. Therefore, the Project would conform with MRCCA requirements and would not constitute a use of MNRRA.

The Council does not anticipate impacts to land use because the Project would be compatible with land use planning documents; therefore, the Council does not propose avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures. Ongoing coordination with local communities would occur for the placement of BRT stations and park-and-ride facilities.

**F.4.2. Geology, Soils, and Topography/Land Forms**

The Project would not produce long-term impacts to geology. Physical impacts to geology would occur during construction, however, the analysis did not identify karst formations (geologic hazards) in the study area; therefore, the Preferred Alternative would not produce short-term impacts to geologic features or hazards.

Because most of the Project would follow the existing roadway network, substantial grading in areas with steep slopes or other constraints are not anticipated; however, the need for grading in a few locations with steep slopes adjacent to roadways, such as areas where the guideway would be located between I-94 and the frontage road

---


are anticipated. The Council would utilize additional slope stabilization measures and potential retaining walls at these locations to mitigate the potential for erosion.

The Council does not anticipate impacts to soils from the Project; therefore, the Council does not propose avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures. All Project-related construction activities would adhere to the applicable grading and erosion-control standards and permitting requirements of the MPCA, Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), Capitol Region Watershed District (CRWD), Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District (RWMWD) and the corridor communities.

**F.4.3. Water Resources**

**F.4.3.1. Wetlands**

The Clean Water Act establishes regulations related to discharging pollutants into the Waters of the United States and for regulating quality standards for surface waters. 33 USC § 1344, et seq. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) oversees states’ implementation of these regulations, reviews permit applications and provides comments to the agency with jurisdiction. 33 USC § Pt. 320 et seq. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act establishes a permitting program to regulate the discharge of dredged or fill material into Waters of the United States, excluding those wetlands that are hydrologically isolated on the landscape. 33 USC § 1344. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), as the lead federal agency, implements Executive Order 11990 via U.S. Department of Transportation Order 5660.1A. USACE is responsible for implementing Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. 33 USC § 1344. USACE coordinated with FTA on development of the EA and will issue its permit decision under 40 CFR Part 230 after FTA completes its environmental review process.

Build Alternative 1 would impact a total of 2.652 acres of surface waters. The Council will further evaluate possible measures to avoid or minimize these impacts as the Project design advances during the Project Development and Engineering phases. Mitigation for wetland impacts is expected through the purchase of credits from a state-managed wetland bank. Mitigation will be at a minimum 2:1 ratio, meaning 2 acres of mitigation is required for each 1 acre of impact.

The Project would require a CWA wetland permit from the USACE, a Public Waters Work Permit from DNR and a Section 401 certification from the MPCA and RWMWD. The City of Saint Paul has waived local government unit (LGU) jurisdiction to RWMWD and MnDOT’s right-of-way does not contain wetlands; therefore, RWMWD would be the designated LGU for the Project and would require a Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) wetland replacement plan.

**F.4.3.2. Floodplains**

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899 and Executive Order 11988 – “Floodplain Management” are federal laws that protect floodplains. 33 USC § 1344. 33 USC § 403. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) establishes state and local protections through public waters work permits; watershed districts; water management organizations/commissions; or city permits.

The Council anticipates the Preferred Alternative would impact floodplains with a minimum of 4,842 cubic yards of fill, and potential additional fill at two locations in Woodbury based on grading tie-in elevation. Mitigation will be provided for the fill and permitted through the appropriate regulatory agency. The Council will further evaluate measures to minimize these impacts as the Project design advances during the Project Development and Engineering phases. The Council does not anticipate impacts to floodways.
F.4.3.3. Groundwater

Impacts to wells are not anticipated from operation or construction of the Project. If any unused or unsealed wells are discovered during construction, they will be sealed in accordance with Minnesota Rules Chapter 4725. The Preferred Alternative would not produce long-term or short-term impacts to groundwater. The Council does not anticipate needs for a permanent surface or groundwater appropriation permit.

F.4.3.4. Stormwater

The Council anticipates the Project would increase stormwater runoff due to the introduction of new and reconstructed impervious surfaces. Impervious surfaces include roadways such as transitways and local streets; sidewalks and trails; parking facilities; and transit station platforms and structures such as bridges and parking areas. Various regulatory authorities require treatment for water quality, rate control and quantity (or volume) for these increases. In addition, the CRWD and RWMWD also require projects to control runoff volume from the reconstructed impervious surfaces with practices such as infiltration, which could potentially benefit groundwater recharge and water quality, and it could reduce peak discharges to local streams.

The Preferred Alternative would require mitigation measures for all Project-related new and reconstructed impervious surfaces of 78 acres.

Construction activities for the Preferred Alternative would likely require temporary dewatering to install structure abutments and walls, and to do grading activities. Construction activities for the Build Alternatives also would likely require temporary dewatering to install structure abutments and walls, and to do grading activities.


To identify and evaluate sites potentially containing regulated materials (pollutants, contaminants and/or hazardous materials), the Council completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) in 2018\(^4\) and a Phase II ESA in 2019\(^5\). The assessment identified the possible risk for soil and groundwater contaminants that have the potential to migrate from nearby sites to the Project study area.

The Council has undergone the initial environmental due diligence steps with the completion of the Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA. Based on the results of these documents and continued design to avoid and minimize impacts to contaminated areas, where disturbance of hazardous and contaminated material cannot be avoided, the next step the Council will take is to enter into the MPCA Brownfield program so that appropriate letters of assurance may be requested.

The Council will also develop a Response Action Plan (RAP) prior to the start of construction that addresses proper management techniques for the management (handling, storage treatment, and disposal) of hazardous materials, contaminated media (soil, groundwater, sediment, etc.), and other regulated materials/wastes. The Council will also develop as part of the RAP, a Construction Contingency Plan (CCP) for handling previously unknown contaminants that construction activities discover. All contaminated media encountered during construction will be managed in accordance with state and federal regulations and in keeping with MPCA best management practices (BMPs) and the RAP/CCP. For any petroleum or chemical release that is encountered or


may occur, the Minnesota Duty Officer would be contacted within 24 hours of the release, and the Officer would then immediately make the required agency contacts.

The Council will assess structures for asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint and other regulated materials/wastes before demolition. The Council will prepare a demolition and disposal plan for identified contaminants that construction activities may discover.

**F.4.5. Fish, Wildlife, Plant Communities, and Sensitive Ecological Resources (Rare Features)**

**F.4.5.1. Federally Listed Species**

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 requires all federal agencies to consider and avoid, if possible, adverse impacts to federally listed threatened or endangered species or their critical habitats that could result from the FTA's direct, regulatory or funding actions. 6 USC § 1531-1544, 87 Stat. 884. The resource study area does not include habitat designated or proposed as critical.

The analysis found the following threatened or endangered species within the two counties:

- Higgins eye pearl mussels, an endangered mussel species
- Snuffbox mussel, an endangered mussel species
- Spectaclecase mussel, an endangered mussel species
- Winged mapleleaf mussel, an endangered mussel species
- Northern long-eared bat, a threatened mammal species
- Rusty patched bumble bee, an endangered insect species

Adverse impacts are not anticipated for the four mussel species.

FTA determined that the Project is within the scope, and adheres to the criteria of, the Feb. 5, 2018, FHWA, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion (PBO) for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-Eared Bat to satisfy requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. FTA determined that with the adoption of applicable avoidance and minimization measures, the Project is not likely to adversely affect the northern long-eared bat. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) concurrence verification letter on the northern long-eared bat is located in Appendix E.

Since the publication of the EA and as part of their review as cooperating agencies, MnDOT and FHWA identified the need for additional consultation for impacts to the federally endangered rusty patched bumble bee (RPBB). Specifically, the Project will impact roadside vegetation within an area USFWS has identified as a High Potential Zone (HPZ). The information available to FTA during consultation with USFWS in 2018 and 2019 indicated that the RPBB did not forage in roadside habitat. As part of the EA, FTA, in consultation with the USFWS, had determined the Project would not impact habitat areas that would affect the RPBB due to the Project's proximity to roadway rights-of-way dominated by non-native and noxious weeds and therefore determined the Project would not impact the species. Research sponsored by MnDOT and published in June 2019 found that the RPBB does in fact use roadside habitat in the Twin Cities metropolitan area and will forage on non-native flowering species. MnDOT has also completed surveys in 2019 for RPBB in roadside areas and documented their presence in areas

---

of the Twin Cities and southeast Minnesota, including in areas dominated by non-native and noxious weeds. This new information was made available to the Council and FTA in October 2019.

The Project area overlaps with the RPBB HPZ and contains suitable habitat such as unmanicured upland grasslands. The amount of potential suitable RPBB habitat within the HPZ is approximately 15% or 18 acres of the total 118 acres within the limits of disturbance (LOD). Based on the presence of potential habitat within the LOD and recent studies provided by MnDOT, FTA now presumes presence of the RPBB where the Project area overlaps with the HPZ. Construction of the Project will involve clearing and grubbing of an estimated 11 acres that will result in short-term loss of vegetated areas. The majority of these 11 acres are existing rights-of-way or grasslands immediately adjacent to the existing rights-of-way. This loss of this habitat is considered short-term because these areas will be revegetated with native mix upon the completion of the Project.

The remaining 7 acres of unmanicured upland grasslands habitat may be permanently lost due to construction of roadway and BRT travel lanes. These impacts are associated with old field habitat located at the southeast corner of 4th Street North and Hadley Avenue, the southwest corner of 4th Street North and Helmo Avenue, and the south side of I-94 at Bielenberg Drive. These areas are located immediately adjacent to, or within, the existing rights-of-way and are considered low quality habitat due to disturbance via mowing or the presence of open water. Based on MnDOT’s 2019 findings, the RPBB will utilize existing right-of-way and low-quality habitat.

This new information relative to the use of areas dominated by non-native and noxious weeds was unavailable to FTA at the time of the initial consultation with USFWS. As a result of the new information, FTA has made a revised determination of “may affect, not likely to adversely affect” for the RPBB, as the Project will be disturbing areas of low- to moderate-quality vegetation beyond the inslope of the roadway. FTA requested concurrence from the USFWS on this determination for the RPBB. USFWS concurrence letter is located in Appendix E. Consultation with USFWS local field office will continue as design advances to further minimize and reduce the potential for conflict to RPBB during the active season. Field surveys will be coordinated with USFWS to further refine potential impacts to RPBB. State-Listed Species.

The EA/EAW analysis used the Natural Heritage Information System database, which the DNR maintains, to identify potential state-listed species within 1 mile of the Preferred Alternative. Of the 19 species the analysis found, 16 are historic records or have completely aquatic life cycles and are associated with the Mississippi River; therefore, no Project-related impacts to these species are anticipated.

The Project could have the potential to produce impacts to the following three state-listed species: kitten-tails (*Besseya bullii*), Peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*), and Blanding’s turtle (*Emydoidea blandingii*). However, based on the analysis results, the Council does not anticipate the Project would impact them.

### F.4.5.2. Wildlife Habitats

The Preferred Alternative would produce impacts to wildlife habitat; however, because the extent of the potential area of disturbance is minimal, and higher-quality habitat is adjacent to it, the Council anticipates these impacts would be negligible. Overall these impacts are negligible to terrestrial and aquatic wildlife. Due to the resource study area’s urbanized location and low quality of the existing habitat, wildlife that live in the area are generalist species that are more tolerant of human presence and activities, and they have demonstrated by their presence that they can adapt to this type of environment. The conversion of habitat or undeveloped space to a transportation facility would not impair the continued persistence of wildlife.

### F.4.6. Historic Properties

The National Historic Preservation Act (hereinafter referred to as Section 106) requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties before undertaking a project. 16 USC § 470. 36 CFR Pt.
800 Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(a)(2), FHWA and USACE recognized FTA as the lead federal agency for the Section 106 process.\(^{7}\)

49 USC § 5309(d)(1)(C) requires the environmental review process for FTA's Capital Investment Grants program to be completed in two years. To ensure this requirement was met, FTA determined that a phased process was appropriate for completing the Section 106 process. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.4(b)(2), FTA, with assistance from the MnDOT Cultural Resources Unit (MnDOT CRU) and the Council, consulted with the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (MnSHPO), other consulting parties, and the public to prepare a PA to guide the completion of the Section 106 process for the Project (see Appendix B). FTA also invited the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) to participate in the development of the PA. ACHP chose not to participate but did provide technical assistance when requested by MnSHPO. The PA establishes roles and responsibilities for its implementation and includes processes for identifying and evaluating properties for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), assessing effects on historic properties, and resolving any adverse effects. The PA also spells out design development and review processes and requirements for protecting historic properties during Project construction. FTA sought input from the public on the draft PA through the NEPA public comment process.

To date, the FTA and MnDOT CRU have identified 29 historic properties within the Project’s architecture/history and archaeological Areas of Potential Effect (APEs). All identified properties are architecture/history properties. No NRHP-listed or -eligible archaeological properties have been identified within the Project's archaeological APE. The 29 architecture/history properties identified within the Project’s APE include four historic districts, 19 properties that are individually eligible for, or listed in, the NRHP, and six properties that are both individually listed, or eligible for, the NRHP and listed or eligible as a contributing element to a historic district.\(^{8}\) Per the terms of the executed PA, the FTA and MnDOT CRU will continue to conduct surveys to identify architecture/history properties in areas added to the architecture/history APE, as well as in previously surveyed areas that will be 50 years of age or older at the initiation of Project construction, that may be affected by the Project. Per the terms of the executed PA, the Project will also continue to survey the areas added to the archaeological APE to identify potential archaeological sites that may be affected by the Project. If FTA determines the Project would have an adverse effect on a historic property, FTA will consult with MnSHPO and other consulting parties per the terms of the executed PA to consider avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures to resolve the adverse effect.

The Council shall follow during the Project’s implementation stipulations in the PA. With the execution and implementation of the PA, FTA finds that the Project has satisfied the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

F.4.7. Visual Resources

The Council does not anticipate the Preferred Alternative would produce major changes to the visual character of the Project corridor. The design process would address potential low to moderate visual contrast.

As the Project moves into the Engineering Phase, design to mitigate impact to the Significant Views of Downtown Saint Paul and the Mississippi River at the Mounds Boulevard Stations and the Dayton’s Bluff Heritage

\(^{7}\) In a letter dated July 9, 2018, USACE recognized FTA as the lead federal agency pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.2(a)(2) to act on USACE’s behalf for meeting the requirements of Section 106. In a letter dated Aug. 28, 2019, FHWA invited FTA to be designated as the lead federal agency for the Section 106 process per 36 CFR § 800.2(a)(2) to act on FHWA’s behalf to fulfill our collective responsibilities under the Section 106 process, and FTA accepted this designation in a letter dated Sept. 16, 2019.

\(^{8}\) The 19 properties identified as individually eligible for or listed in the NRHP includes four properties being treated as eligible for the NRHP for the purpose of completing the Section 106 process for the Project.
Preservation District will be coordinated with the City of Saint Paul to comply with the Significant Public Views goal in the Saint Paul comprehensive plan (Strategy 3.17) “preserve significant public views through standards that regulate such impacts as height, bulk, scale, and view corridor.”

The design of the new BRT-exclusive bridges over Johnson Parkway and near the 3M campus would use visually compatible details and materials to further minimize impacts and match the new bridge with the existing I-94 bridge. Appropriate design and landscaping techniques would minimize the impact from vegetation removal and introduction of built features. Landforms to accommodate the new bridges will be designed to restore slope and landform to be consistent with the existing setting. Vegetation would be retained and restored, as appropriate to be consistent with existing massing and species. Landscape plans for areas adjacent to elevated structures, retaining walls, and noise barriers would be developed. The PA will inform design modifications to avoid, minimize and mitigate visual impacts to historic properties. Resolution of adverse effects will be completed under the terms of the PA as the Project advances through the Project Development and Engineering phases (see Appendix B).

Visual-quality-related mitigation for all affected residential properties will be addressed in the Engineering phase of the Project. Stations would be designed to be aesthetically attractive and to complement their surroundings. Station design and aesthetics will be addressed during continued design advancement during the Project Development and Engineering phases and through ongoing outreach efforts conducted in the surrounding neighborhoods.

The impacts to visual resources during construction will be further minimized by staging construction activity to minimize the duration to the extent possible, restoring areas disturbed during construction and regularly utilize BMPs to remove debris and equipment from residential areas.

**F.4.8. Air**

Public transportation projects proposed for federal funding must meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. 42 USC § 85. Air quality conformity is a process intended to ensure that FTA funded transit projects are consistent with the air quality goals set forth in the Clean Air Act. 42 USC § 7506(c). In order to conform, a transit project must come from a currently conforming Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program, must not cause or contribute to any air quality hot spots and must follow any other requirements in the State Implementation Plan for air quality that pertain to the project. 40 CFR § 93.114 and 93.115.

The Council is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization that develops the conforming Metropolitan Transportation Plan (locally known as the Transportation Policy Plan, or TPP) and Transportation Improvement Program. The Council's 2040 TPP (2018 Update) identifies the Project (in which it is named the METRO Gold Line), and the Council anticipates the Project would begin operating around 2024. In July 2014, the MPCA found the draft 2040 TPP conforms with EPA requirements (see the Physical and Environmental Resources Technical Report (Attachment A-5-6) of the EA for documentation of conformity). The Project is not included in MnDOT’s 2019-2022 State Transportation Improvement Program, but the Council included it in its 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

The Project would not create stationary source air emissions. The analysis conducted for the Project demonstrates there would be no anticipated exceedances of air pollutant concentrations during the operating phase of the Project; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary. The State of Minnesota does not require permits related to air quality for projects of this type.

The analysis also demonstrates that the Council does not anticipate exceedances during Project construction; however, where applicable and prudent, the Project would implement EPA-recommended measures to reduce short-term construction impacts to air quality, and a series of BMPs would be implemented during construction to control dust.
F.4.9. Noise

The Council does not anticipate that the Project would exceed the MPCA noise standards, so the Council used the more protective FTA criteria to determine locations for mitigating Project-related impacts to noise. The Preferred Alternatives would not produce long-term noise impacts; therefore, the Council does not propose avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures for the Preferred Alternative. The Project would relocate existing noise barriers along I-94 in consultation with FHWA and MnDOT to accommodate the BRT dedicated guideway. The relocated noise barriers will be replaced in-kind, so the noise reduction currently provided remains at least the same as the existing condition (see the Physical and Environmental Resources Technical Report in Appendix A of the EA).

The primary means of mitigating short-term noise and vibration due to Project-related construction activities is a detailed noise and vibration control plan, which the Council will require.

F.4.10. Transportation

Short-term mitigation strategies could include providing signage that directs business patrons to streets where parking is available and implementing an ongoing outreach program that informs business owners and residents about construction activities in the neighborhood. Additionally, the Council would implement staged construction activities to minimize short-term impacts to the greatest extent possible. The construction contractor would implement the staging plan and would reduce the loss of parking spaces during construction to the extent possible. The construction staging plan will address these areas to minimize the duration and frequency of these impacts. The construction staging would be developed as the design of the Project advances during the Engineering phase and prior to the start of construction.

The Council would develop maintenance of traffic (MOT) plans during the Engineering Phase and prior to construction and submit for approval to the roadway authorities. The MOT plans would address construction phasing, maintenance of traffic, traffic signal operations, access through the work zone, any road closures, and any traffic detours.

The Council does not anticipate long-term impacts to transit; therefore, they do not propose avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures.

To minimize the short-term impacts to bus operations during construction, before temporary stop closures and detours go into effect, the Council and its Metro Transit division would inform riders about the temporary service changes by posting information at bus stops and publishing details on its website and in its onboard “Connect” brochure.

Based on measures incorporated as part of the Project design, the Council does not anticipate long-term impacts to traffic; therefore, they do not propose additional avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures. As part of its design, the Project would incorporate improvements to roadways and intersections to provide Level of Service (LOS) D or better traffic operations at all intersections in the Project corridor, and to provide safe and efficient traffic and BRT operations. The Preferred Alternative would achieve an acceptable LOS D or better with these improvements in place.

To address short-term impacts, the Council will develop a detailed construction staging plan for the Project. It will also develop MOT plans during the Engineering Phase to address construction phasing, traffic signal operations, and access through the work zone, road closures and traffic detours.

The Project would build a new mixed traffic bridge at the crossing of I-94 connecting Helmo Avenue and Bielenberg Drive. This bridge would include a center running guideway, a multi-use trail and roadway lanes for local traffic. The Dedicated Guideway Option at Hadley Avenue and 4th Street, which is included under Alignment C, would reconstruct a bridge at the crossing of Interstate 694 at 4th Street to accommodate a dedicated
guideway along 4th Street. The Project would reconstruct the existing roadway bridge to include a center running guideway and multi-use trail. The Council coordinated with FHWA and MnDOT on the conceptual design of these bridges to ensure there will be adequate space beneath the bridges for future needs on I-94 and I-694 that are currently being studied. See the “Traffic” section of Table C-1 in Appendix C of the FONSI for specific commitments. The agencies will continue to coordinate as the design advances through the Project Development and Engineering phases.

**F.4.11. Cumulative Potential Effects**

The Project's direct and indirect effects, when considered with the potential resource impacts of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions in the study area, may contribute to cumulative effects on the transportation system, land use and the natural environment. However, based on the cumulative impacts assessment, it is unlikely that the extent that the combined impacts to resources would reach a level of concern that would warrant special avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures for the Project other than those described herein. The Project's direct impacts would be mitigated in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations including Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Sections 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination/State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) permitting process for stormwater runoff at construction sites, the federal Endangered Species Act, and the Uniform Relocation Act and Minnesota Statutes Chapter 117.

**F.4.12. Other Potential Environmental Effects**

**F.4.12.1. Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations**

The Project would acquire property in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (URA) of 1970 to ensure fair and equitable treatment to people whose real property is acquired or who are displaced because of federally funded projects; to provide relocation assistance; and to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing within the displaced person’s financial means. 42 USC § 61. 49 CFR Pt 24. Project-related property acquisition is also subject to Chapter 117 of the Minnesota Statutes, which requires compensation and standardized relocation benefits. Minnesota Statues 2019 § 117.187. The URA and the Minnesota Statutes requirements apply to full and partial acquisitions, displacement, and permanent and temporary easements.

A total of 35 partial acquisitions and 2 full commercial acquisitions are required. Approximately 21 businesses would be displaced; no institutional entities or housing units would be displaced. The number of displacements is approximate and is subject to change. The Council will further refine acquisition, displacement and relocation needs as the Project design advances during the Project Development and Engineering phases.

**F.4.12.2. Utilities**

The Council anticipates several long-term impacts from the Preferred Alternative to existing underground and overhead utilities throughout the limits of disturbance. As the Project design advances, the Council will evaluate utilities on a case-by-case basis to determine potential impacts due to Project construction and operations. If elements of the Project conflict with existing utilities, owners may need to modify, relocate or reconstruct the utilities. The Council will coordinate with each utility owner regarding impacts to existing facilities as the Project advances through Project Development and into the Engineering Phase.

The Project will avoid and/or minimize potential maintenance impacts to buried oil pipelines through advancement of design near the proposed Helmo Avenue Station and along Bielenberg Drive. The Council will coordinate with pipeline owners to advance design that will minimize impacts to pipeline maintenance activities. The Council recognizes routine maintenance or extraordinary repairs may be necessary for these pipelines. The design
advancement will coordinate the placement of the guideway, structures, and traffic systems to limit the future disruption of BRT operations and allow construction access to the pipelines. Advancement of design will evaluate where 1) the footprint of disturbance on the pipeline can be reduced through perpendicular crossings of the guideway, 2) offsetting the guideway to allow pipeline maintenance access when parallel to the pipeline, 3) adjusting proposed grading where feasible to limit additional fill on top of the pipeline, and 4) placement of permanent structures (i.e., stations and bridges) and stormwater facilities would minimize impacts to pipeline maintenance activities.

The Project will not impact Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) interceptor sewer lines for Alignment A, C, and D3. Within Alignment B a valve box for the MCES interceptor sewer line is located near the guideway. The Project will avoid and/or minimize any potential impacts through design advancement during the Project Development and Engineering phases.

In most areas utility vaults would not result in a conflict with the station platform. However, the Project could impact the accessibility of utility vaults located in downtown Saint Paul within Alignment A1 due to bump outs at the station areas. The 5th Street/Robert Street Station, Union Depot/Sibley Street Station and Union Depot/Wacouta Street Station will have bump-outs to accommodate combined pull-out and in-lane stopping. The Council will continue to evaluate the extent of impacts from station construction and will coordinate with utility owners as the Project design advances through the Project Development and Engineering phases.

The Preferred Alternative would produce short-term impacts to utilities during construction activities such as excavation and grading, placing structural foundations and using large-scale equipment. Utility relocations would result in service disruptions during limited durations throughout construction. The Council anticipates these disruptions would be minimal, and providers would establish temporary connections for customers before permanently relocating utilities facilities. The Council will coordinate with utility owners to schedule disruptions to service.

The Council will continue to confirm and map the locations of existing utilities in the Project area during the Project Development and Engineering phases so that it can refine designs to best avoid the utilities, where practicable. Where conflict is unavoidable, the Council will coordinate with utility owners to identify Project-related impacts and potential mitigation measures such as relocations, replacements or other actions. If a legal agreement exists stating that a utility owner would pay to move the utility to accommodate a roadway improvement project, the Council will coordinate with that owner per the conditions of the agreement. Existing utility land rights will also be evaluated to determine their impact on relocation costs.

The Council will continue to coordinate with Minnesota Pipeline LLC and Flint Hills Resources to advance the design on the BRT guideway and other Project infrastructure in compliance with standards separating the Project from the oil pipelines. The Council will analyze any adjustments to the Project resulting from ongoing coordination and the Project will maintain a specified distance from the oil pipelines as determined through this coordination. The Council will continue to evaluate any potential impact as the Project design advances through the Project Development and Engineering phases.

The Council will coordinate during construction with utility owners and operators to determine potential disruptions in service. If Project construction requires temporary service disruptions, the utility owners would notify affected property owners. Potential disruptions would be temporary, and owners would restore utility services to preconstruction levels in a timely manner. If construction activities reveal previously unidentified utilities, the Council would notify the owner of the utility and determine appropriate mitigation measures. The Council will coordinate closely with owners of water supply lines critical for the cooling systems of the data centers within Alignment D3. In the case of a disruption to the water supply, a temporary connection would be established.

The Council will also implement measures to avoid and mitigate risks associated with utility relocations, including implementing a confined space entry safety plan, remediating contaminated soils prior to utility excavations, and remediating and disposing of hazardous pipe coatings and materials impacted by utility relocations.
The Council will mitigate accessibility impacts at the station platforms by adjusting existing utility vaults to match the new grade, including raising or lowering and resetting existing frames, covers, and lids and adding or replacing riser collars.

**F.4.12.3. Community Facilities, Character and Cohesion**

The Council anticipates that over time, continued development of transit and transportation facilities in the Project area, combined with future actions and the direct and indirect effects of the Project, would place increased demands on community services and facilities and could change community character. For locations where comprehensive plans call for growth and mixed-use development, such changes in character would be consistent with planned growth and development. Without attentive management and adequate funding, overuse or degradation of facilities or resources could result. Because cities and park jurisdictions typically forecast and plan for future population growth over time, their development plans would anticipate such potential impacts. The types of indirect and cumulative impacts identified are typically consistent with and governed by applicable land use plans and capital improvement plans to expand public infrastructure and services. Also, the Council and the counties and municipalities in the corridor have plans to expand and enhance parks and open spaces in the area to meet the demand of population growth over time.

**F.4.12.4. Business and Economic Resources**

The Council anticipates that the continued development of transit and transportation facilities in the Project area over time, combined with future actions and the direct and indirect effects of the Project, may cumulatively strengthen the business climate by providing improved transportation access to customers and employees. While the Project could negatively affect individual businesses, particularly in the short term due to construction activity, the cumulative result of the Project would be positive. Development that occurs in response to the Project and the reasonably foreseeable future actions would be expected to increase access to businesses in the area and expand the base of potential local consumers. Applicable municipal codes and land use plans regulate all development.

**F.4.12.5. Safety and Security**

The continued development of transit and transportation facilities in the Project area over time, combined with future actions, natural population growth, and the direct and indirect effects of the Project, may cumulatively add to the demands on law enforcement and security providers, potentially affecting staffing levels and budgets over the long term. Local municipalities, counties and emergency service providers would plan measures to address safety and security for Project-induced development and future actions. The Council would establish a Safety and Security Management Plan and a Safety and Security Certification Plan to guide safety and security policies for the Project during design and construction. These plans would include requirements for design criteria, hazard analyses, threat and vulnerability analyses, construction safety and security, operational staff training and emergency response measures. These plans would also specify actions and requirements of Metro Transit and its police force to maintain safety and security during BRT operations.

**F.4.13. Summary Finding**

The Council finds that the Project, as it is proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent, and reversibility of impacts to the resources evaluated in the EA/EAW and in the Findings summary above. Project impacts will be mitigated as described in the EA/EAW and the FONSI document.
F.5. Cumulative Potential Effects

As discussed in the EAW, the cumulative potential effects have been considered and the proposed project has minimal potential for cumulative impacts to the resources directly or indirectly affected by the project. Given the laws, rules, and regulations in place as well as local regulatory requirements and comprehensive planning and zoning laws, substantive adverse cumulative impacts to resources as not anticipated.

F.6. Extent to Which the Environmental Effects are Subject to Mitigation by Ongoing Public Regulatory Authority

The mitigation of environmental impacts will be designed and implemented in coordination with regulatory agencies (including the coordination and approvals listed in Table F-1) and will be subject to the permitting processes. Permits and approvals that have been obtained or may be required prior to project construction include those listed in Table F-1. The permits listed include general and specific requirements for mitigation of environmental effects of the project. Therefore, the Council finds that the environmental effects of the Project are subject to mitigation by ongoing regulatory authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Government</th>
<th>Type of Application</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Environmental Decision Document</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Environmental Decision Document</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA, Department of Interior, as applicable</td>
<td>Section 4(f) Determination</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Capital Investment Grant</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA, ACHP</td>
<td>Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Right-of-Way Use Agreement</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Section 404 Wetland Permit</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Determination</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>Public Waters Work Permit</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>Water Appropriation Permit</td>
<td>Contractor to acquire, if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Water and Soil Resources</td>
<td>Joint Application Form for Activities Affecting Water Resources in Minnesota</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnSHPO</td>
<td>Section 106 PA</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT</td>
<td>Right-of-Way Permit</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT</td>
<td>Application for Drainage Permit</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT</td>
<td>Application for Utility Accommodation on Trunk Highway Right-of-Way</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT</td>
<td>Application for Miscellaneous Work on Trunk Highway Right-of-Way</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## F.7. Extent to Which Environmental Effects can be Anticipated and Controlled as a Result of Other Available Environmental Studies Undertaken by Public Agencies or the Project Proposer, Including other EISs

The Council has extensive experience in major transit project construction and assessment of environmental effects. Many transit projects have been designed and constructed throughout the area encompassed by this governmental agency. All environmental, design, and construction staff are very familiar with the Project area. Council staff has conducted risk assessments throughout the development of the Project and are well equipped to anticipate and solve issues as they arise. The Council finds that the environmental effects of the Project can be anticipated and controlled as a result of the assessment of potential issues during the environmental review process and the Council’s experience in addressing similar issues on previous projects.
F.8. Conclusions

1. The Metropolitan Council has jurisdiction in determining the need for an environmental impact statement on this Project.

2. All requirements for environmental review of the Project have been met.

3. The EA/EAW and the permit development processes to date related to the Project have generated information which is adequate to determine whether the Project has the potential for significant environmental effects.

4. Areas where potential environmental effects have been identified will be addressed during the final design of the Project. Mitigation will be provided where impacts are expected to result from project construction, operation, or maintenance. Mitigative measures provided in Appendix C of the FONSI will be incorporated into Project design and have been or will be coordinated with federal, state and local agencies during the permit processes.

5. Based on the criteria in Minnesota Rules part 4410.1700, Subpart 7, the Project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects.

6. An environmental impact statement is not required for the METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit Project.

7. Any findings that might properly be termed conclusions and any conclusions that might properly be called findings are hereby adopted as such.

Based on the Findings and Conclusions contained herein and on the entire record:

The Metropolitan Council hereby determines that the METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit Project will not result in significant environmental impacts, and that the Project does not require the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

For Metropolitan Council

Signature: ____________________________

Date: March 26, 2020

Title: Chair
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Environmental Assessment/Environmental Assessment Worksheet

Project Title: METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit Project

Comment Deadline: November 6, 2019

Project Description: The Metropolitan Council (Council) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have issued an Environmental Assessment (EA)/Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. Gold Line BRT is a proposed nine- or ten-mile bus rapid transit line that will connect Saint Paul, Maplewood, Landfall, Oakdale, and Woodbury with bus-only lanes generally north of and near Interstate 494. Gold Line is proposed to provide 21 full-service stations and frequent all-day service, seven days a week.

The Environmental Assessment evaluates potential environmental, social, economic, and transportation benefits and impacts from the project’s construction and operations. Upon consideration of the comments received on the EAEW, the FTA and the Council will determine the adequacy of the environmental document. If further documentation is necessary, preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), revising the EAEW, or providing clarification in the Findings of Fact and Conclusions would accomplish this.

If an EIS is not necessary, the Council will prepare a Negative Declaration on the need for an EIS, pending environmental requirements. Further, if, upon consideration of comments received on the EAEW, the FTA agrees with the Council’s findings, the FTA will issue a Finding of No Significant Impact.

Comments on the accuracy and completeness of the information, potential impacts that may warrant further investigation before the project is commencing, and the need for an EIS on the project are being accepted through November 6, 2019. Written comments can be submitted via: Email: goldline@metrotransit.org; Online: metrotransit.org/goldline-environmental-mail; Gold Line Project Office, c/o Chefsa Johnson, 121 7th Place E., Suite 102, St. Paul, MN 55101

The Council will host two public open house events on the EAEW on Tuesday, October 22, 2019 at East Side Learning Hub at Harding High School located at 1526 8th St. E., St. Paul 55106 and Wednesday, October 23, 2019 at Landfall Community Center located at 2 Fourth Ave., Landfall, 55126. The open house events will begin at 6:00 p.m. and end at 7:00 p.m. All venues are ADA accessible. Gold Line Project Office will also host drop-in hours on Monday, October 28, 2019 from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Attendees will have the opportunity to talk to project staff and submit written comments at the events. If you require any assistance to participate in these meetings, such as a translator or other accommodations, please contact Liz Jones at 651-602-1877 or Elizabeth.Jones@metrotransit.org

Document Availability: The METRO Gold Line BRT EAEW can be viewed at the following locations: Gold Line website: metrotransit.org/gold-line-environmental (George Latimer Central Library, 90 W. 4th St., Saint Paul, MN 55102), Dayton’s Bluff Library, 646 E. 7th St., St. Paul, MN 55106; Sun Ray Library, 2105 Wilson Ave., St. Paul, MN 55119; Maplewood Library, 3025 Southaven Dr., Maplewood, MN 55109; Landfall City Hall, 1 4th Ave., Landfall, MN 55123; Oakdale Library, 1010 Heron Ave. N., Oakdale, MN 55128; H.H. Stafford Library, 8565 Central Park Pl., Woodbury, MN 55125; Gold Line Project Office, 121 7th Place E., Suite 102, St. Paul 55101. The Project Office is open Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. A CD will be sent to interested businesses, individuals, and organizations, when requested. To request additional translation or ADA accommodations, please contact Liz Jones, Gold Line BRT Public Outreach Coordinator, at 651-602-1877 or Elizabeth.Jones@metrotransit.org at least ten days prior to the comment period close.

Link to document: https://www.metrotransit.org/post-line-ea

Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU): Metropolitan Council

RGU Contact Person:
Chefsa Johnson
Environmental Lead Metro Transit – Gold Line Project Office
121 7th Place E., Suite 102
St. Paul, MN 55101
651-602-1967
geoms@metrotransit.org
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Public comment needed on METRO Gold Line BRT Environmental Assessment

Metropolitan Council sent this bulletin at 10/04/2019 10:20 AM CDT

Having trouble viewing this email? View it as a Web page.

Contact: John Schad (651) 602-1508

Public comment needed on METRO Gold Line BRT Environmental Assessment

Open houses to be held on east metro bus rapid transit line

Saint Paul – The public is being asked to weigh in on a new rapid transit line that will connect the east metro to downtown Saint Paul. Planning, design and development work is underway on the METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit line that will serve Woodbury, Oakdale, Maplewood, Landfall and Saint Paul. Service is scheduled to begin in 2024.

Both the state and federal government require a detailed environmental assessment of the project. That work has been completed, and the public has 30 days to review it and make comments that will be included in the final public record.

The environmental assessment considers a wide variety of possible impacts the project could have on the neighborhoods and communities it serves. Some of the topics covered include connection to community and social resources, impacts on the environment, historic properties and even indirect effects and long-term impacts.

"No one understands these impacts better than the people and organizations the line will serve," said Gold Line Project Manager Christine Redpath. "A successful transit line has to become part of the communities it serves. Feedback from the people and businesses who will use the line every day is essential and extremely helpful to us as we work to make sure the project becomes a seamless part of the community."
The METRO Gold Line is a planned 10-mile bus rapid transit (BRT) line that will connect Saint Paul, Maplewood, Landfall, Oakdale and Woodbury with bus-only lanes generally north of and near Interstate 94. The Gold Line will provide more transit connections to the east metro with 21 full-amenity transit stations and frequent all-day service, seven days a week.

The project is being managed through a unique partnership between the Metropolitan Council, Metro Transit, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Ramsey and Washington counties, and the cities of Saint Paul, Maplewood, Landfall, Oakdale, and Woodbury.

The environmental assessment has been completed and results are provided in the document. The 30-day public comment period is Oct. 7 to Nov. 6, 2019. The full environmental assessment is available on the Gold Line project website, metronet.org/gold-line-environmental, and at local government offices and libraries throughout the corridor beginning on Oct. 7. A list of locations to view the document is available below.

The Metropolitan Council is hosting public events to provide information on the environmental assessment, answer questions and offer an opportunity for public comment. The environmental assessment document along with supporting materials will be available for viewing. The public may also provide written comments or verbal comments on the document at these events. There will be no formal presentation. Public events will be held at the following times and locations:

Open House
Tuesday, Oct. 22
5 p.m. to 7 p.m.
East Side Learning Hub at Harding High School
1526 Sixth Street East
St. Paul

Open House
Wednesday, Oct. 23
5 p.m. to 7 p.m.
Landfall Community Center
2 Fourth Avenue
Landfall

Office Hours at the Gold Line Project Office
Monday, Oct. 28
11 a.m. to 1 p.m.
121 Seventh Place East, Suite 102
St. Paul

In addition to the Gold Line project website, the METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit Environmental Assessment can be viewed at the following locations:

- George Latimer Central Library, downtown St. Paul
Dayton’s Bluff Library, St. Paul
Sun Ray Library, St. Paul
Maplewood Library, Maplewood
Landfall City Hall, Landfall
Oakdale Library, Oakdale
H. Stafford Library, Woodbury
Gold Line Project Office, downtown St. Paul

The public may also submit comments online or through the mail:

- Email: goldline@metrotransit.org
- Online: metrotransit.org/gold-line-environmental
- Mail: Gold Line Project Office, c/o Chelsa Johnson, 121 Seventh Place East, Suite 102, St. Paul, MN 55101

The METRO Gold Line is a planned 10-mile bus rapid transit (BRT) line that will connect Saint Paul, Maplewood, Landfall, Oakdale and Woodbury with bus-only lanes generally north of and near Interstate 94.

metrotransit.org/gold-line-project
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LEGAL NOTICE AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION, OCTOBER 7, 2019

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION
STATE OF MINNESOTA  
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN 

Terri Swanson, being first duly sworn, on oath states as follows:

1. (S)He is and during all times herein stated has been an employee of the Star Tribune Media Company LLC, a Delaware limited liability company with offices at 650 Third Ave. S., Suite 1300, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55488, or the publisher’s designated agent. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this Affidavit, which is made pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §331A.07.

2. The newspaper has complied with all of the requirements to constitute a qualified newspaper under Minnesota law, including those requirements found in Minnesota Statutes §331A.02.

3. The dates of the month and the year and day of the week upon which the public notice attached/copied below was published in the newspaper are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of Publication</th>
<th>Advertiser</th>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Order #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>StarTribune 10/07/2019</td>
<td>METRO GOLD LINE BUS RAPID TRANSIT</td>
<td>1000369909</td>
<td>329478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The publisher’s lowest classified rate paid by commercial users for comparable space, as determined pursuant to § 331A.06, is as follows: $481.90

5. Mortgage Foreclosure Notices. Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §580.033 relating to the publication of mortgage foreclosure notices: The newspaper’s known office of issue is located in Hennepin County. The newspaper complies with the conditions described in §580.033, subd. 1, clause (1) or (2). If the newspaper’s known office of issue is located in a county adjoining the county where the mortgaged premises or some part of the mortgaged premises described in the notice are located, a substantial portion of the newspaper’s circulation is in the latter county.

FURTHER YOUR AFFIANT SAITH NOT.

Terri Swanson

Subscribed and sworn to before me on: 10/07/2019

Jalene K. Howard
NOTARY PUBLIC
"
LEGAL NOTICE PUBLISHED IN STAR TRIBUNE, OCTOBER 7, 2019

PUBLIC STORAGE
4849 HAMLINE AVENUE N, BROOKLYN PARK, MN 55443
TIME: 10:00 AM

PUBLIC STORAGE
2554 BANJOE STREET NW, RAMSEY, MN 55303
TIME: 10:45 AM

PUBLIC STORAGE
4000 73RD AVENUE N, BROOKLYN PARK, MN 55443
TIME: 9:45 AM

PUBLIC STORAGE
3510 ROBINSON DRIVE NW, BLAINES, MN 55424
TIME: 10:45 AM

PUBLIC STORAGE
3431 LAKELAND DRIVE W, MAPLE GROVE, MN 55369
TIME: 10:45 AM

NOTICE OF PUBLIC SALE
To satisfy the owner's lien, 51 Strange Lane, St. Paul, MN 55116, will sell at public sale on December 22, 2019, at 10:00 AM, the personal property in the building located at 51 Strange Lane, St. Paul, MN 55116.

CITY OF OAK GROVE
STATE OF MINNESOTA

MetroTransit

LEGAL NOTICES
Text messages foreshadowed death of Minnesota woman

An accused will be sentenced Friday.

The Twin Cities metro area is under a state of emergency.

Troops withdrawn

Public Comment Needed

JANUARY 2020
ATTACHMENT F-A: EA/EAW PUBLICATION AND NOTIFICATION MATERIALS

12th Annual Lakeside Health Foundation Gala to raise funds for Oncology & Rehabilitation Center

Stillwater Gazette, October 11, 2019

Library Corner

Stay connected with Bayport Public Library

ATTENTION: HIP REPLACEMENT RECIPIENTS

Smith & Nephew product catalog includes the new recalled Birmingham Hip Resurfacing (BHR) and R3 Hip Replacement systems. As a result of malfunctions in both devices, many patients who have received these defective surgical implants have needed dangerous, painful, and costly revision surgery to correct the damage done.

Smith & Nephew’s ‘Painful Birmingham Hip Resurfacing and BHR Trial Hip Implant Systems both used dangerous, de facto hip implants that proved ineffective and harmful to patients. After years of higher-than-expected failure rates and an abnormal number of cases requiring revision surgery, the manufacturer finally recalled the BHR System product in September 2016.

Side effects include:
- Severe hip and leg pain
- Tissue and bone damage
- Reduced joint mobility
- Pseudotumors in the area

If you or a loved one has suffered harmful side effects or required painful and costly revision surgery after receiving a defective Smith & Nephew, Stryker, DePuy or Zimmer hip implant call us today.

FARRAR & BALL LLP
7117 Market St., Mission, KS 77002

Meshbesher & Spence PLLC
1616 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, MN 55404

CALL 800-311-1747
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