

SWLRT
Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)
City of Minneapolis Staff Comments
June 2, 2016

Preface to Staff Comments:

The City of Minneapolis continues to support the Southwest LRT project contingent on adherence to the Memoranda of Understanding reached between the City of Minneapolis and Met Council and between the City of Minneapolis and Hennepin County, both of which were adopted on August 29, 2014.

In its preface to Staff comments on the SWLRT FEIS, the City of Minneapolis wishes to restate previous concerns which are intended to lessen the negative impacts to residents and businesses near the corridor and to improve the quality of the project, comments are also intended to inform the final design, project specifications, construction means/methods, emergency planning, and long-term operation of the line. The City of Minneapolis will continue to work closely with the Southwest Project Office and with other partnering agencies to help make this project a long-term success.

The development of the project including route selection differs significantly from the recounting outlined in the FEIS. The City's perspective has been captured in previous council actions; the City of Minneapolis passed Resolution 2014R-362 on August 29, 2014, and Resolutions 2015R-384 and 2015R-385 on September 25, 2015 approving the physical design component of the preliminary design plans and conveying the City's concerns regarding freight rail safety for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Transit Project in the City of Minneapolis. The statements and positions asserted in Resolution 2014R-362, and Resolutions 2015R-384 and 2015R-385 continue to be valid for the City Council of the City of Minneapolis (see Attachment A), in addition to the following:

A. Safety & Security:

Freight Rail Safety: The City's perspective has been captured in previous council actions; the City of Minneapolis passed Resolution 2015R-385 on September 25, 2015 conveying the City's concerns regarding freight rail safety (see Attachment A – City Resolutions).

The FEIS describes the Council's *Operations Emergency Management Plan* for light rail which was developed to assist in identifying, responding to, and resolving emergency situations for the Project. The Operations Emergency Management Plan establishes the response process and responsibilities for departments and staff within Metro Transit, as well as outside agencies, in the event of a rail emergency. In addition, the Council maintains an emergency preparedness exercise plan, in compliance with the *Safety and Security Management Plan*. The emergency preparedness exercise plan identifies emergency preparedness exercises, which will be carried out by the LRT Fire Life Safety and Security Committee (FLSSC) both in advance of operation of the Project and during normal operations on an annual basis.

SWLRT
Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)
City of Minneapolis Staff Comments
June 2, 2016

There must be coordination between the SPO and the railroad to minimize the risk of a derailment, especially if trains are carrying hazardous materials. Emergency vehicle access to the construction site must be coordinated prior to construction. Although not specifically identified in the FEIS, the City of Minneapolis Fire Department and the Minneapolis Police Department should be considered as contributing partners in all emergency planning and included as members of the FLSSC. The SPO shall include both the Minneapolis Fire Department and the Police Department in future Emergency Response planning for both the construction period and long term operations.

LRT Operation - The FEIS acknowledges that there will be emergency vehicle delays at various locations within Minneapolis and St. Louis Park once the LRT opens for service. The Council shall include both the Minneapolis Fire Department and the Police Department in future Emergency Response planning for both the construction period and long term operations.

Pedestrian Connections – the continued presence of freight rail within the Kenilworth Corridor, in combination with LRT operations will be a substantial barrier to pedestrians attempting to access station locations and/or simply attempting to cross the rail corridor. To date, pedestrian crossings of the rail corridor are common and have been largely unrestricted. Current design plans provide for a limited number of at-grade crossing points and attempt to restrict all other crossings throughout the corridor by installation of various types of railings and fences. Although pedestrian crossings of the rail corridor at places other than established crossing points are technically considered a “legal trespass”, they do happen and will continue to occur regardless of any physical constraint. According to the FEIS, the Council will implement a Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP) to provide and maintain safety and security during operations within the vicinity of existing freight rail service; the Council and the SSMP must address this issue.

B. Construction Impacts:

Given the close proximity of homes, condominiums, apartments and townhomes to the construction work, efforts must be made to dampen or minimize the noise and vibration caused by Tunnel Construction activity. Residents adjacent to the proposed tunnel have expressed great concern over the potential noise and vibration, and the potential for significant damage being caused to their homes. Construction impacts pertaining to the shallow tunnel design such as noise and vibration are covered in the FEIS. Although it is understood that the FEIS provides for mitigation of short-term construction impacts such as noise & vibration, and requires various construction mitigation plans, the FEIS does not specifically address construction means and methods. Current tunnel design

SWLRT
Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)
City of Minneapolis Staff Comments
June 2, 2016

plans indicate steel sheet piling as a component of the design. The construction method for piling installation is of specific concern; the City of Minneapolis shall be consulted in the review of selected construction means and methods for tunnel construction.

There will also be tree loss along the corridor. It should be clearly understood by the Council and its contractors that tree removal in the Kenilworth corridor is a highly sensitive issue. It should be noted that there is concern about potential noise created by chain saw activity in addition to wood chipping. Hours of construction operation must be limited to ensure that residents are not disrupted; the City of Minneapolis Noise Ordinance will be enforced restricting hours of operation on week nights, weekends, and Holidays. An effort must be made by the Council and its contractors to minimize tree removals, control dust, maintain safe truck routes, comply with truck weight limits, and to follow jake breaking laws.

The FEIS identifies the requirements to develop and implement a construction management plan that addresses means and methods, hours of operation, access routes, BMPs for mitigating dust and debris on public streets and private property. The City of Minneapolis shall be consulted in the development of this plan.

C. LRT Operation – Noise:

The FEIS covers noise and vibration mitigation at length; however as previously stated in the DEIS and SDEIS comments, it is important that noise from LRT operations, bells, whistles, and horns continue to be evaluated and minimized. While some warning devices are required by federal law, policies and procedures regarding some rail operations are local (at the discretion of the Metropolitan Council). Noise and vibration mitigation covered in the FEIS is largely based upon existing conditions and modeling; a commitment by the Council to further analyze noise after LRT operations begin and re-evaluate potential mitigations must be considered.

D. Visual Impact:

The City of Minneapolis agrees that the project will result in a substantial level of visual impact in the Kenilworth corridor. To some extent, the impact will be mitigated and the corridor improved in the manner described in the memorandum of understanding between the Metropolitan Council and the City of Minneapolis. However, the Council and its contractors should commit to additional care and control of construction means and methods within the projects “limits of disturbance” to minimize visual impacts as much as possible. The City looks forward to continued conversations with the Council, its contractors, and the community regarding the restoration of the corridor, and expects these measures to be fully implemented by the project.

SWLRT
Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)
City of Minneapolis Staff Comments
June 2, 2016

Staff Comments on the Adequacy of the FEIS:

On May 13, 2016 the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was issued for public review, with comments on the adequacy of the FEIS to be accepted by the Metropolitan Council through June 13, 2016. The FEIS is considered adequate under Minn. Rule 4410.2800, subp. 4, if it:

- A. Addresses the potentially significant issues and alternatives raised in scoping so that all significant issues for which information can be reasonably obtained have been analyzed in conformance with part 4410.2300, items G and H;
- B. Provides responses to the substantive comments received during the draft EIS and SDES review concerning issues raised in scoping; and
- C. Was prepared in compliance with the procedures of the act and parts 4410.0200 to 4410.6500.

Or, as summarized, the FEIS will be determined adequate if it addresses and analyzes the significant issues raised in scoping, responds to substantive comments on the draft EIS and SDEIS, and is prepared in compliance with the environmental rules. Therefore, comments by City staff on the adequacy of the document will address whether it meets those standards.

Staff Comments:

Public Works and CPED staff have reviewed the FEIS and,

- A. the document addresses the potentially significant issues and alternatives raised in scoping so that all significant issues for which information can be reasonably obtained have been analyzed in conformance with part 4410.2300, items G and H.
- B. the document has provided responses to all substantive comments by the City received during the draft EIS and SDES.
- C. the document was prepared in compliance with the procedures of the act and parts 4410.0200 to 4410.6500.

ATTACHMENT A

City Council Resolutions

2014R-362

**Resolution to Approve the Physical Design Component
of the Preliminary Design Plans for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project
in the City of Minneapolis**

Whereas, the City of Minneapolis has been a strong advocate for increased investments in transit generally and for Southwest LRT in particular, and has been a reliable regional partner in advancing a multimodal transit system, and

Whereas, the City of Minneapolis has relied on other regional partners to work in a collaborative way to achieve a shared vision and is therefore extremely disappointed to be asked to approve a project which violates past commitments, and

Location of Freight

Whereas, when the Kenilworth Rail Corridor was acquired by the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (“HCRRA”) in the late 1980s, the corridor was empty and not regularly in use by any railroad, and

Whereas, MNDOT needed to move freight rail out of the Midtown Corridor because the reconstruction of Highway 55 was going to sever the at-grade crossing of the highway. The government agencies involved had decided the solution was to relocate freight rail to the existing Minneapolis, Northfield and Southern Railway (“MN&S”) rail corridor in St. Louis Park. But before the project began, project engineers learned that the land under the planned connection to the freight reroute – the Golden Auto site in St. Louis Park – was contaminated and unfit for construction, and

Whereas, HCRRA then allowed Twin Cities & Western (“TC&W”) railroad to temporarily move its trains to the publicly-owned Kenilworth Corridor right-of-way in order to assist the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT) to meet deadlines to save federal funding for the reconstruction of Highway 55 in south Minneapolis, and

Whereas, the Kenilworth Corridor was only to be in use for a maximum of six years, thus allowing time for environmental cleanup at the Golden Auto site. HCRRA entered into an agreement with TC&W for relocation to the MN&S corridor after the clean-up, and

Whereas, Hennepin County’s promise to re-route freight before the corridor would be used for passenger transit service is summarized in its 2009 Freight Rail Study, and

Whereas, the State legislation providing substantial funding for soil remediation for the Golden Auto site required that MNDOT not disburse those funds until an agreement had been reached regarding the routing of freight. MNDOT failed to follow the law and gave the soil remediation funds to St Louis Park without a binding agreement from St. Louis Park regarding the rail routing. Laws of Minnesota, 1997, Ch. 231, Art. 16, Sec.23, and

Whereas, when planning for Southwest LRT began in earnest in the mid-2000s, TC&W trains continued to operate in the Kenilworth Corridor, as they were not moved to the MN&S pursuant to the earlier agreements and state law, and

Routing of LRT

Whereas, decisions about light rail projects like Central LRT and Southwest LRT are driven by a need to adhere to the Federal Government's transit criteria or "funding formula," as the federal government provided 50% of the funding for Central and is anticipated to do the same for Southwest, and

Whereas, the decision about where to route the Southwest LRT line was made when the Bush-era transit funding formula was still in effect. That formula said that only new transit riders should count. If you were already a transit rider, you didn't count towards projected ridership. That formula was inherently biased against urban neighborhoods where lots of people already ride transit. That formula was inherently favorable to suburban areas where it is easier to find potential riders not currently taking transit. The Bush-era formula created an incentive for transit planners and policy-makers to avoid, rather than serve, dense neighborhoods where many people already take transit, and

Limitations of Kenilworth Alignment

Whereas, the routing of Southwest LRT was not designed around serving disadvantaged populations or serving the greatest number of Minneapolis residents. It was designed to achieve the fastest route between suburban and downtown destinations, and

Whereas, when the City reluctantly agreed to proceed with Hennepin County's preferred alignment of Kenilworth, it did so with the express condition that the bicycle/pedestrian trail in the Kenilworth Corridor (the "Kenilworth Trail") would be preserved and with reassurance that long-standing promises to reroute freight would be kept, and

Serving the Communities Left Behind

Whereas, following the selection of the Kenilworth Corridor as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), the City redoubled its existing efforts to advance plans to provide rail service to the Nicollet Avenue corridor in the form of a more appropriately-sized Modern Streetcar and to provide rail service to the Midtown Greenway. These two corridors had been considered for Southwest LRT, but not selected, and

Whereas, the City appreciates Hennepin County's leadership in advancing Modern Streetcar on Nicollet by helping the City secure passage of a value capture tool and Metropolitan Council's leadership on advancing rail transit in the Midtown Greenway through its Alternatives Analysis, and

Whereas, the City also appreciates the support of both Hennepin County and the Metropolitan Council in their collaborative work with the City to jointly fund a study of the West Broadway corridor through North Minneapolis. This is a key step toward potentially expanding a Modern Streetcar to North Minneapolis, which would include an estimated 12-16 stops in North Minneapolis between Hennepin Ave and the City border in a full build out scenario, and

Whereas, these neighborhoods along Midtown, Nicollet and Broadway are crying out for improved transit and for the opportunity to be connected to the regional spine of Southwest LRT and without continued shared efforts by our partner agencies, Southwest LRT will not meet its full potential, and

Freight Challenges Will Be Ongoing

Whereas, after the LPA decision the Metropolitan Council took over the project as lead agency and convened a Southwest Corridor Management Committee (CMC) to advise the Metropolitan Council on Southwest LRT, and

Whereas, coordination with and the cooperation of the railroads was identified at the CMC as a potential obstacle to progress of the project. The City's sole delegate at the CMC, Mayor Rybak, was reassured that the Metropolitan Council was going to be a tough negotiator with the railroads, and

Whereas, in late 2012, Hennepin County released the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Southwest LRT project. The City's official comments on the DEIS made it absolutely clear that its continued support for the Kenilworth LRT route was contingent upon implementing the freight relocation plan, and

Whereas, at the direction of the Federal Transit Administration ("FTA"), the DEIS included analysis of a scenario in which both freight and LRT would coexist at-grade in the Kenilworth corridor, a concept that had not advanced through the Alternatives Analysis process, or for which the project sponsor developed conceptual engineering drawings. Using layouts developed by the City of St. Louis Park, not the Southwest LRT Project Office or Hennepin County, the DEIS found that co-locating freight and LRT at-grade in the Kenilworth corridor would be detrimental to the environment, and recommended the LPA with freight re-routed as the option "that will cause the least damage to the biological and physical environment and that best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources." Southwest Transitway DEIS, October 2012, pages 11-15, and

Whereas, tasked with belatedly addressing the freight issue, last summer the Metropolitan Council put forward three options, only one of which rerouted the freight as promised. This option included construction of a new rail right-of-way located on top of a two-story berm. It imposed surprising and, as it turned out later, unnecessary impacts to neighbors along the MN&S in St. Louis Park, including the removal of over 30 homes, and

Whereas, at the CMC, Mayor Rybak's vote was cast in favor of removing the most expensive option, a deep tunnel, from further consideration. This was done after the Mayor was assured that an independent freight expert would be hired by Metropolitan Council to look at all options for addressing the freight issue, and

Whereas, at Governor Dayton's direction, the Metropolitan Council developed a scope of work for the independent freight study. All the cities along the corridor including Minneapolis were able to provide input, and the scope of work was formally adopted by the CMC. As called for by Metropolitan Council staff, the scope of work explicitly identified the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance Right-of-Way (AREMA) standards as the design standard that the freight expert must meet for any proposed freight line, and

Whereas, TranSystems of Kansas City was hired to do the freight analysis and it developed the MN&S North solution which requires the taking of dramatically fewer homes and was significantly less expensive than the "two-story tall berm option" both in initial construction and from a long-term operating perspective. The TranSystems solution provided important benefits to St. Louis Park, and to the region described in the City of Minneapolis's May 7, 2014 Resolution, and

Whereas, unfortunately, Southwest Project staff reacted by undermining TranSystems design which met, and in some cases, exceeded the required AREMA standards according to the City's own consultant with substantial freight expertise. TranSystems was not invited to present their final report in person so they could answer questions about the report. When the City repeatedly asked Project staff to either confirm or deny that the TranSystems solution met the agreed-upon AREMA standard, Metropolitan Council staff repeatedly declined to answer the question. They simply indicated that the proposed solution was not acceptable to the railroads, and

Railroads and the Surface Transportation Board (STB)

Whereas, in 1998 when MnDOT was moving freight from the Midtown Corridor to its temporary location in the Kenilworth corridor, TC&W signed a trackage rights agreement with HCRRA which owns the Kenilworth Corridor. The trackage rights agreement says TC&W would move out of the Kenilworth corridor when provided with another connection. TC&W signed another similar agreement in 2012, and

Whereas, if after approval by the Surface Transportation Board (STB), the Metropolitan Council were to build the TranSystems MN&S North solution, the conditions of these agreements will have been met and TC & W would be required to move, and

Whereas, while TC&W clearly opposed the re-route, the STB exists to resolve these kinds of disputes between railroads and local governments. Given that the reroute meets AREMA standards, coupled with the fact that the reroute is comparable in length and geometry to the existing Kenilworth route, the City agrees with the TranSystems principal who said that he could not find any reason why the STB would not approve the reroute, and

Whereas, of the government agencies represented at the CMC, only the City of Minneapolis, was willing to re-route freight out of the corridor by going to the STB. Mayor Hodges was outvoted at the CMC by all the cities along the corridor as well as Hennepin County and Metropolitan Council representatives. Opponents of rerouting the freight expressed concern that opposition to the freight re-route by TC&W at the STB would result in unacceptable delays, even if it were ultimately approved, and

Whereas, since the TranSystems report is still unrefuted by any credible source, the City does not concede that Freight could not be re-routed safely from the corridor. Nonetheless, the City must react to the region's unwillingness to take a possible re-route to the STB, and

Whereas, there were serious mistakes made during the development of this project: failing to secure a binding agreement with St Louis Park, failing to secure a binding agreement with the railroads, failing to follow up with MNDOT to ensure they were following the law requiring a binding agreement before disbursing funds for the Golden Auto site, failing to design a new version of a freight reroute to reflect changes in industry practice, failing to hire an independent engineering firm like TranSystems years earlier, and when a new viable reroute was finally identified, an unwillingness to bring that plan to the STB for approval, and

Whereas, these mistakes were not made by the City and cannot be corrected by the City, but the City can do everything in its power to avoid repeating these mistakes and therefore has secured written, binding agreements on critical issues with the responsible government agencies, and

Whereas, nonetheless the City has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Metropolitan Council regarding property ownership in the Kenilworth Corridor, and

Whereas, the City has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with Hennepin County regarding property ownership in the Kenilworth Corridor, and

Whereas, the City has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Metropolitan Council regarding design of the Southwest LRT in Minneapolis and the stations in Minneapolis, and

Whereas, the Memoranda of Understanding for Southwest LRT reached by the City could not address, and are not expected to address, every possible issue which will affect residents quality of life or their experience of Southwest LRT, and ongoing work will be required at each stage of project development, and

Whereas, the City of Minneapolis considers the pedestrian access and other project components from the resubmitted municipal consent package that are described in the Design Memorandum of Understanding to be necessary mitigations for both the alignment choice and the unexpected and unwelcome presence of freight rail in the Kenilworth Corridor, and

Whereas, the City of Minneapolis considers the Memoranda of Understanding with the Metropolitan Council and Hennepin County to be important, though limited, assurances regarding future property ownership in the Kenilworth Corridor, and

Whereas, without such agreements, the City of Minneapolis would not approve the physical design component of the Preliminary Design Plan for Southwest LRT, and

Benefits to the Region and Minneapolis

Whereas, while the routing-specific and station-specific benefits of Southwest LRT to advancing equity and to serving Minneapolis neighborhoods, have been exaggerated, Southwest LRT will nonetheless benefit equity by significant overall improvement of the regional transit system, and

Whereas, while Southwest LRT was not designed around serving disadvantaged populations or serving dense urban neighborhoods, Central LRT was designed around those goals. Central LRT serves, rather than avoids, dense Minneapolis neighborhoods. Central LRT was built on a city street with accessible, easy-to-find stations and ample room for development and job growth. These qualities of Central LRT are critically important because Southwest and Central will be one single “interlined” train. For example, riders will be able to get on in West Bank and get off in Hopkins without changing trains. This is referred to as a “one seat ride,” and

Whereas, both Hiawatha LRT (Blue Line) and Central LRT (Green Line) have exceeded ridership projections, and Southwest LRT, largely on the basis on its suburban ridership, still has the potential to be a successful project with ridership projected at 30,000 every weekday by 2030, and

Whereas, bringing people into downtown Minneapolis by transit, and not by automobile, will benefit Downtown Minneapolis, and is consistent with the City’s plans, including Access Minneapolis – the City’s Ten Year Transportation Action Plan, and

Whereas, residents of Minneapolis are disproportionately affected by regional air pollution and increasing overall regional transit ridership will help fight global climate change and improve regional air quality.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Minneapolis approves the physical design component of the preliminary design plans for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project that were submitted to the City by the Metropolitan Council in order to fulfill the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, Section 473.3994, Subd. 3, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City of Minneapolis requests that the Metropolitan Council communicate with TC&W and seek the cooperation of TC&W in developing a "Good Neighbor Agreement" that will include a promise to maintain the current speed limit for freight in the corridor and approximately the same freight mix as currently exists, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City of Minneapolis requests Metropolitan Council respect the residential and/or park-like nature of the 21st Street and Penn Ave Station Areas and agree to avoid unnecessary discretionary noise pollution, including not ringing bells as trains approach these stations.

**2015R-384
Resolution
of the
City of Minneapolis**

By Reich

Approving the Physical Design Component of the Preliminary Design Plans for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project in the City of Minneapolis.

Whereas, the City of Minneapolis passed Resolution 2014R-362 on August 29, 2014, approving the physical design component of the preliminary design plans for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Transit Project in the City of Minneapolis as submitted to the City in July of 2014; and

Whereas, the statements and positions asserted in Resolution 2014R-362 continue to be valid for the City Council of the City of Minneapolis; and

Whereas, continued design and engineering by the Metropolitan Council resulted in an updated project cost estimate of \$1.994 billion; and

Whereas, project partners and stakeholders engaged in discussions regarding project scope reductions that resulted in changes in the project and a new project scope and related cost estimate of \$1.744 billion; and

Whereas, the Metropolitan Council has submitted the revised version of the physical design component of the preliminary design plans for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Transit Project for approval by Hennepin County and the cities of Eden Prairie, Minnetonka, Hopkins, St. Louis Park, and Minneapolis per Minnesota Statutes, Section 473.3994, Subd. 3; and

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by the City Council of The City of Minneapolis:

That the City of Minneapolis approves the physical design component of the preliminary design plans for the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Transit Project that were submitted to the City by the Metropolitan Council in order to fulfill the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, Section 473.3994, Subd. 3.

**2015R-385
Resolution
of the
City of Minneapolis**

By Reich, Palmisano, and Bender

Conveying the City's concerns to the railroad companies and the Metropolitan Council regarding freight rail safety in the Southwest Light Rail Corridor and the City of Minneapolis.

Whereas, the Minnesota legislature, in 2015 updated Minnesota laws chapter 312 which calling on the State to, "analyze preparedness and impacts to public safety from transportation of ethanol by rail"; and

Whereas, the Minnesota legislature updated Statutes 115E to include additional safety and spill response reporting for trains carrying oil and ethanol; and

Whereas, 19,000 Minneapolis residents live in the evacuation zone of a possible oil, ethanol, and other high hazardous flammable materials train explosion in the Kenilworth corridor and Downtown Minneapolis; and

Whereas, the Federal Railroad Administration has found the risks of an explosion from ethanol tankers to be similar to those of carrying crude oil; and

Whereas, the utilization of unit trains carrying eighty or more ethanol and other flammable tanker cars through the Kenilworth Corridor and downtown Minneapolis is increasing; and

Whereas, Twin City and Western Railroad has opposed public disclosure of state required spill prevention and clean-up plans; and

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by The City Council of The City of Minneapolis:

That the City of Minneapolis convey via letter a request that railroad companies traveling in the Kenilworth Corridor and parts of downtown Minneapolis that are co-located with light rail:

- publicly disclose emergency response and spill prevention plans; and
- begin a process with city and local neighborhood organizations and citizens groups to address community concerns; and
- publicly disclose routing decision plans and present options for rerouting of oil, ethanol, and other high hazardous flammable trains from the Kenilworth Corridor during SWLRT construction; and
- report to the city the extent of its liability insurance for spills, fires and explosions and items covered under that insurance.

Be It Further Resolved that the City of Minneapolis convey via letter a request to the Metropolitan Council to:

- prepare a report to the Minneapolis City Council regarding rail safety measures undertaken in other communities in the United States where light rail transit is co-located with crude oil and ethanol trains; and

- ensure that the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Southwest Light Rail project include discussion of emergency response planning for an ethanol, oil, or other hazardous materials train incident; and
- discuss measures the Metropolitan Council will take to ensure that railroads operating in the corridor respond to the above mentioned requests from the City of Minneapolis of the railroads.