

ADDENDUM
The West End Final AUAR
Alternative Urban Areawide Review

April 2007

Prepared for:



In Cooperation with



Prepared by:



The West End Final AUAR and Mitigation Plan document was distributed for review on March 19, 2007. The distribution list included all those who received the Draft AUAR, plus anyone who commented on the Draft AUAR. Per EQB requirements, 10 days were given (until April 2, 2007) to make additional comments, or for state agencies and the Metropolitan Council to object to the contents of the AUAR. If no objections were received in this timeframe, the City of St. Louis Park would be free to adopt the AUAR

No objections were filed by state agencies or the Metropolitan Council during the Final AUAR comment period. The City received four comments on the Final AUAR, from the following entities:

- A. Metropolitan Council
- B. City of Golden Valley
- C. Todd Shipman, South Tyrol Hills resident
- D. Amy Altman, Sunset Ridge Condominiums

This addendum is prepared in response to these comments, and to assist the St. Louis Park City Council in making a decision on final approval of the AUAR and Mitigation Plan. Each comment is summarized and a response is given. See comment letters attached.

A. Metropolitan Council

A1. Water Quality - Wastewaters

Comment Summary: The final AUAR has addressed previous MCES issues. The Metropolitan Disposal System will have adequate capacity to provide wastewater services to the AUAR area, provided the flow at M120 does not exceed 6.5 MGD (peak hourly), prior to completion of regional improvements to interceptor 1-GV-461.

Response: Comment noted. Flows will be monitored as outlined in Section 1.6 of the Mitigation Plan. The City of St. Louis Park will work with the City of Golden Valley and the Metropolitan Council to plan and schedule necessary metropolitan sewer system improvements to serve new developments for future development in both Golden Valley and St. Louis Park.

A2. Transit Services - Park and Ride and Bus Turnaround

Comment Summary: There will be potential impacts to the existing park and ride; parking spaces lost should be replaced as part of the redevelopment. A new bus turnaround will likely be needed to accommodate possible changes existing routes. Need to continue to work together to resolve issues.

Response: It appears some park and ride spaces may be lost with an additional turn lane on Park Place Boulevard. The City and developer will continue to work with Metro Transit to replace the lost spaces within the redevelopment. The site plan is also expected to address a turn around area within the development to accommodate the potential rerouting of the buses in the future to best serve the development; service restructuring will likely not occur until the office buildings are substantially complete.

A3. Transit Services - Route 9

Comment Summary: Page 72 of the Final AUAR states that Route 9 has limited service along Highway 100; this is not the case.

Response: Correction noted.

B. City of Golden Valley

B1. Mn/DOT Issue - The ability of the regional roadways to serve demands

Comment Summary: A thorough traffic operations modeling effort using CORSIM would be necessary to evaluate the impacts to the regional system and identify the mitigation measures.

Response: City of St. Louis Park and SRF are currently working with Mn/DOT staff to complete the necessary CORSIM analysis to address the impacts to the regional system. Any changes in the mitigation measures needed as a result of this development will be coordinated with the developer and included in the developers agreement, as needed.

B2. Ramp Feasibility Issue

Comment Summary: The two-lane ramp mitigation measure for the eastbound on-ramp from Xenia Avenue/Park Place Boulevard to I-394 needs to be examined from a design feasibility standpoint. It does not appear that adequate space exists to satisfy Mn/DOT or AASHTO design guidelines for a two lane entrance followed by a single lane exit.

Response: The City of St. Louis Park and SRF are working with Mn/DOT to provide any additional analysis (CORSIM) to determine feasibility of this improvement. In addition, the City will work with FHWA to provide the necessary analysis and supporting documentation required for this improvement. If Mn/DOT /FHWA do not approve the 2-lane on-ramp improvement recommended to accommodate the additional traffic from the proposed redevelopment, a sensitivity analysis would be completed to determine maximum development thresholds (number of trips) or alternative mitigation measures to achieve the required levels of service.

B3. Site Access Issue

Comment Summary: Draft AUAR suggested that additional site plan work will evaluate the proposed location of the ramp access points for the office on the frontage road along TH 100. Trip distribution assumptions are not credible unless the site access assumptions are revised.

Response: The access locations are not firmly set. As the City and developer continue to work through the redevelopment approval process they will work to reconsider other access options to make Wayzata Boulevard less attractive. The trip distribution was developed using the Metropolitan Council Regional Model. In addition, the percentage of trips to the I-394 South Frontage Road (Wayzata Boulevard) east of TH 100 was verified using data from a peak hour license-plate study to determine the number of vehicles currently traveling eastbound that use the frontage road. Also a study of travel-time runs using I-394 vs. Wayzata Boulevard to travel from Xenia Avenue/Park Place Boulevard to Penn Avenue was completed. All three of these methods of determining the distribution were consistent, resulting in approximately 5 percent of the trips that would use that route. This distribution assumes that the regional roadway system is operating at a reasonable level of service. The future deficiencies of the regional system (mainline) will be addressed through CORSIM analysis.

B4. Traffic Calming

Comment Summary: The AUAR responses suggest that existing conditions on the Wayzata Boulevard frontage road east of TH 100 are deserving of traffic calming treatments prior to added development trips. It is inferred that the proposed development has no responsibility to mitigate effects of additional volume to this local collector. The development should be responsible for added traffic demands that exacerbate an existing condition.

Response: The City of St. Louis Park will work with the City of Golden Valley to determine feasibility of traffic calming measures.

B5. Detailed information

Comment Summary: More detailed information related to routing of site generated trips and delay and level of services values at the movement level should have been provided in the document. There is no "No Build" condition described for comparison.

Response: All supporting information that was requested by the various reviewers has been provided, including a figure showing the directional distribution for the redevelopment, the background yearly growth rate, and analysis outputs showing the LOS by movement for each intersection. As outlined in the AUAR guidelines, a No Build scenario is not required to be evaluated as the Comprehensive Plan scenario acts as the baseline for comparison.

B6. Peak Flow Factor (PFF)

Comment Summary: The 2.4 PFF was based on 2005 flow data recorded at the Metropolitan Council's M-120 flow meter station. This PFF may be low because the past three years of annual rainfall totals have been below typical norms. It would be important to check other years when conditions were above typical annual rainfall totals to determine if the PFF is correct.

Response: The PFF of 2.4 was used per direction of Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES). Capacity of the regional interceptor will be monitored as outlined in Section 1.6 of the Mitigation Plan. See also Comment A1 in this addendum document.

B7. Inflow and Infiltration

Comment Summary: Proposed mitigation measure of on-site storage is a short-term solution. However, if pursued, the City of Golden Valley should be involved in review of criteria used for design of the basin. If periods of unusually high inflow and infiltration (I/I) determine sizing, it is important to define "unusually high" and know how adequate storage will be determined, if needed, to minimize impacts within the St. Louis Park sanitary systems as well as the MCES and Golden Valley systems.

Response: In the event that temporary on-site storage is necessary, the facility will be sized to reduce peak flows to acceptable levels into M-120, as defined by MCES. This level is currently 6.5 MGD. The City will coordinate with the MCES on the design and sizing of the temporary storage area. The City will also coordinate with the City of Golden Valley on the I/I improvements to be implemented prior to increased capacity being achieved through temporary storage or interceptor upgrades being completed.

C. Todd Shipman

C1. Public services access

Comment Summary: Additional traffic volume during peak times on Wayzata Boulevard frontage road decreases ability of fire and rescue authorities to reach homes.

Response: Five percent of the traffic was distributed to Wayzata Boulevard, east of TH 100. This equates to 150 vehicles during the p.m. peak hour and 1,500 vehicles per day. SEH, Inc. completed a traffic speed and volume study for this section of roadway in December 2006 for the City of Golden Valley. Based on this study, the traffic volumes are well under the capacity for Wayzata Boulevard

(approximately one-half of the capacity that the roadway is designed to carry). In addition, speeds were found to be generally within a reasonable range for the posted speed limit. With the projected traffic on Wayzata Boulevard with the proposed redevelopment, traffic volumes on Wayzata Boulevard will continue to be well under capacity, and is not expected to impede emergency vehicles. Based on general comments received from residents, traffic calming measures could be considered on this roadway, regardless of the proposed redevelopment.

C2. Safety

Comment Summary: Traffic and safety are primary concerns. Access to the neighborhood is limited to the frontage road. Topography of the area needs to be considered.

Response: Safety was not addressed for this section of Wayzata Boulevard as part of this study or the SEH study that was completed in December 2006. If there is a perceived safety problem with intersection site distance/access along this roadway, this should be evaluated independently of this study such that there is adequate sufficient sight distance for vehicles to safely access this roadway with the posted design speed.

C3. South Frontage Road Access

Comment Summary: Entrance to and from the proposed parking garages should not have access to the south frontage road. A traffic light should be added at the intersection of the south frontage road and the "cut across" under Highway 100 to ensure bike and pedestrian safety.

Response: The access locations for the proposed development are not firmly set. As the City and developer continue to work through the redevelopment approval process they will work to reconsider other access options. In addition, the City and developer will work together to incorporate improved transit facilities and pedestrian amenities with this project.

C4. West 16th Street Connection

Comment Summary: Any proposal to connect 16th Street through under Highway 100 is unacceptable.

Response: A direct connection of West 16th Street through the site is not being proposed. The potential for the extension of West 16th Street through the site to connect with Wayzata Boulevard on the east side of the site was analyzed by conducting a license plate study during the peak periods to determine the number of eastbound vehicles using West 16th Street/Wayzata Boulevard as a through route. Based on the results, it was determined that the extension of West 16th Street does not result in a viable option with the proposed redevelopment of the site. Additionally, based on previous public concern, the City has eliminated a through connection as an option for this development.

C5. Waster water

Comment Summary: Waste water is a concern. There will be limited future flow and that the line will need to be relocated in the future; this will impact the area. A line break or overflow would also impact the area.

Response: Wastewater mitigation has been identified based on feedback from Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES). The existing interceptor is planned for reconstruction in the next few years, however reconstruction is anticipated to occur in the same location as, or adjacent to, the existing line. Capacity of the regional interceptor will be monitored as outlined in Section 1.6 of the

Mitigation Plan, to minimize the potential for overflows to occur. See also Comment A1 in this addendum document.

C6. Pedestrian Access

Comment Summary: Important for the project to include ample safe access for pedestrian and bike traffic.

Response: The City and developer will work together to incorporate improved transit facilities and pedestrian amenities with this project.

C7. Noise Impacts

Comment Summary: Currently neighborhood experiences high sound levels from traffic; trusts this project will not add to that problem.

Response: The AUAR included a noise analysis, specifically for two receptors on the east side of Highway 100. The increase from existing to any of the proposed development scenarios was found to be one decibel or less. A 3 decibel change in noise level is considered to be the smallest noticeable change over an extended period of time for a time-varying noise source such as traffic. See Section 2.24 of the Final AUAR for the complete analysis.

C8. Visual Impacts

Comment Summary: Visual impact including lighting and seasonal changes should be managed to provide respect for area residents.

Response: A visual impact assessment was included in the AUAR. A lighting plan will be required as part of the development plan and review for the project site. See Section 2.26 of the Final AUAR for the complete analysis.

D. Amy Altman

Comment Summary: Ms. Altman telephoned to correct an interpretation of her comment at the public meeting held January 9th. The summary that she would like to see "reconstruction on existing structures..." was incorrect and should read "deconstruction of existing structures..."

Response: The developer will practice deconstruction practices by recycling existing building materials.