Document (EAW Worksheet, Appendix A, B, C, or D)	Comment
EAW	The EAW refers to Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this project. However, Phase 1 & Phase 2 are not clearly defined. Their limits and the interim conditions between construction of the phases are not described. The EAW is inconsistent when defining the impacts of the project phases. The project phases and their impacts need to be more clearly defined. Additional graphics and architectural elevations of the bridge should be provided for contextual review should be provided. Specific phasing details are also needed.
EAW	The EAW analysis, impacts and cost of a "no build" scenario (the bridge remains closed and could include bridge removal without replacement) are not adequately vetted in the EAW. The EAW's Appendix does includes a Traffic Operation Analysis which describes a "2030 No Improvement Forecast". However, it is unclear as to whether this is the "no build scenario" discussed in the "Traffic Noise Modeling" section on page 44.
EAW	The EAW's Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) identified potentially contaminated properties needing evaluation (Table 4, page 12). The EAW listed the 15 sites with High or Medium Potential for Contamination. The list should include those sites with low potential as well.
EAW	It is unclear if the air quality analysis uses the "2030 No Improvement Forecast" in its modeling. This may affect air quality between the consturction of any project phasing and should be discussed as part of the EAW.
EAW	It is unclear if the traffic noise modeling uses the "2030 No Improvement Forecast" in its analysis. The EAW should clearly state the anticipated traffic noise levels between the consturction of any project phasing and the final project build out.

Rev: 1/26/2009

EAW	The allowed truck weights and projected truck volume assumptions are inadequately discussed in the EAW. More information is needed.
EAW	The EAW addresses existing and projected traffic volumes for this corridor and has determined that a four lane bridge section is required. The EAW needs to discuss how new bottlenecks created when lanes are reduced will be mitigated until future phases are constructed.
EAW	The EAW does not address traffic diversion through the adjacent neighborhoods that may result from the phase construction of the project.
EAW	The Hennepin County Bicycle Transportation Plan acknowledges the corridor as a bike route and requires that a 6 foot separated space be preserved for on-street bicycle use. Th four foot shoulder along the bridge structure and approaches is not sufficient for on-street bicyclists. Given strong possibility that may be converted in the to a bike lane in the future, it would be advisable to to use 6 foot shoulders throughout the project.
EAW	Table 2 PERMITS AND APPROVALS notes that a City demolition permit is required. This is an error. Approval is needed from the City's Heritage Preservation Commission to demolition the bridge but no permit is required.

Name: Ann Calvert

Department/Division: CPED (Bus Dev & Comm Plnng), and on behalf of Riverfront TAC

Phone Number: 673-5023

Document (EAW Worksheet, Appendix A, B, C, or D)	Page Number	Comment
Entire EAW		The EAW appears to be analyzing the bridge as it would be once both phases of construction are complete, rather than the first phase now being contemplated. The impacts of only the Ph. I Bridge are likely to be different from the impacts of the complete two-phase
EAW	p. 4	What is the source of the 1% assumed "low growth" increase in annual traffic volume? What has been the actual rate of increase over the last decade?
EAW	p.5, Table 1	It's not clear to what extent decreased future levels of service at the various intersections would be due to traffic on Lowry and to what extent they are caused by the traffic levels on the cross streets and/or deficiencies with the intersection designs. A "No Build" analysis should be examined.
EAW	р. 6	A note that the Above the Falls planning process included the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board and Hennepin County (and both of those parties provided funding).
EAW, section 17, and Appendix A	EAW p. 21 and Appendix A, Figure 11	The EAW discusses stormwater treatment facilities in locations described in Figure 11, but Figure 11 only shows one location and labels it as "potential." Therefore, it's not clear if the treatment facilities will definitely be included in the project, as we recommend they should.

14-Jan-09

Name: Ann Calvert

Department/Division: CPED (Bus Dev & Comm Plnng), and on behalf of Riverfront TAC

Phone Number: 673-5023

Document (EAW Worksheet, Appendix A, B, C, or D)	Page Number	Comment
EAW, Traffic section and Appendix C	EAW pp. 2526	It would be helpful to understand what types of traffic are expected to be carried on the bridge and what areas that traffic is serving. This would assist in considering to what extent the type and level of traffic might change due to implementation of Above the Falls and also to understand what might happen if the bridge were not replaced.
EAW, section 25, and Appendix B	EAW pp. 51 - 52 and Appendix B, correspondence	In addition to documentation, we encourage Hennepin County to include some interpretation (perhaps a sign at an overlook) with information about the bridge being removed and the changes made to it to accommodate barge transportation.
Appendix B	3/7/08 letter from MnDOT/CRU to SHPO	We would note that a 2007 Study of the Upper Mississippi Harbor by Hess Roise also determined that two districts associated with the Upper Harbor are eligible for the National Register and that the current Lowry bridge would be a contributing structure in one of those districts.
Entire EAW		There is no information about the design of the areas under the bridge, thus it is impossible to evaluate the impact the bridge design will have on the aesthetics and functionality of the planned parkway and trails under the bridge.
EAW Worksheet	2	Figure 3 is poor; there is no phasing. Additional figures are inadequate; need elevations.

Name: Becca Farrar / Hilary Dvorak

Department/Division: CPED / Planning - Development Services

Phone Number: 673-3594 / 673-2639

Document (EAW Worksheet, Appendix A, B, C, or D)	Page Number	Comment
EAW Worksheet	2	6b. The document states "the bridge will be designed to accommodate transit vehicles of up to 80,000 lbs." Will this result in new/revised truck routes? How will this alter existing truck routes? Does this project assume future rail transit in the corridor?
EAW Worksheet	4	6b. The document states "With half the number of lanes, the bridge does not match the existing capacity of the adjacent roadway." It should be noted that this is due to recent road improvements initiated by Hennepin County on Lowry Avenue. There will continue to be 2 lanes east of University.
EAW Worksheet	9	9. The document states"it will involve right of way acquisition from eight properties." Do we have a list of those properties and an estimate of land acquisition acreage necessary for the proposed improvements in order to address potential impacts? There is inadequate info in Appendix about this.
EAW Worksheet	13	9. The document states"All potentially contaminated properties identified in the ESA will be evaluated for their likelihood to be impacted by construction and/or acquired as right of way." Shouldn't that information be known and disclosed within this document? This data should be tabulated and included.

Name: Becca Farrar / Hilary Dvorak

Department/Division: CPED / Planning - Development Services

Phone Number: 673-3594 / 673-2639

Document (EAW Worksheet, Appendix A, B, C, or D)	Page Number	Comment
EAW Worksheet	51	24. The Conclusion states that the cost-effectiveness criteria is being exceeded therefore a noise barrier would not be constructed. Data should be provided that verifies that conclusion.
EAW Worksheet	53	26. The visual impacts section states that there will be impacts as the bridge will be larger and taller. It would seem that those impacts should be addressed in question 29 - Cumulative potential effects and under 31 - Summary of Issues. No graphic has been provided.
EAW Worksheet		There are references to the project being constructed in phases. The phases and subsequent proposed improvements should be clearly described/outlined under question 6.
Appendix A		There are no architectural elevations of the proposed bridge. Elevations should be provided for contextual review.

Name: Haila Maze
Department/Division: CPED / Planning

Phone Number:

Document (EAW Worksheet, Appendix A, B, C, or D)	Page Number	Comment
EAW Worksheet	Page 3	The project description includes reference to a 12 foot "sidewalk". Is this more accurately a shared-use path?
EAW Worksheet		The EAW occasionally refers to Phase I and Phase II of the project. However, this is not consistently used, and I can't see where it is clearly defined for those who do not already know. I assume that most of the impacts described in the analysis apply to the project as a whole (not just for Phase 1) but again, that's not clear to me. Since this is a major issue with this project, I think it needs to be as lucid and consistent as possible. If phasing is mentioned, including a graphic that shows Phase 1 vs. Phase 2 would be helpful, along with a definition of each. A specific instance of uncertainty is on page 3, where it talks about interim improvements to Marshall that will be needed prior to Phase 2 - are these part of Phase 2 that need to be prioritized, or something separate?
EAW Worksheet		A historic resources review may be required for this project.
EAW Worksheet		There was some confusion at the last Lowry Ave bridge meeting the consultants hosted regarding what permits were needed from the city.
EAW Worksheet		The project does in general seem in compliance with the applicable plans for the area - such as Above the Falls, the Comprehensive Plan, etc. However, delaying Phase 2 indefinately is not really consistent with ATF, though the project as a whole may be.

Name: Lois Eberhart

Department/Division: CPED / Planning

Phone Number: 673-3260

Document (EAW Worksheet, Appendix A, B, C, or D)	Page Number	Comment
EAW Worksheet	8	On Table 2, Permits and Approvals, Local: For the line "Plan Approval, City of Minneapolis, Approval" change to read "Plan Approval, including submission to Capital Project Task Force, City of Minneapolis Approval", and add a reference to footnote 2.
EAW Worksheet	8	Change footnote 2 to read "Approval of the Stormwater Management Plan is a requirement for Plan Approval."
EAW Worksheet	8	For the line "Stormwater Submission Form, City of Minneapolis, Permit" change to read "Stormwater Management Plan, City of Minneapolis, Approval".
EAW Worksheet	8	Delete the line "Erosion and Sediment Control, City of Minneapolis, Permit"