

Attachment B:

Public Open House Summaries and Select Comments

Rosemount/Empire/UMore Area Transportation System Study Public Open House #1 Comment Summary – 04/01/2009

LOCATION: Rosemount Community Center Banquet Room; 4:00 to 6:00 pm; April 1, 2009	
COPIES TO: Rosemount/Empire/UMore Area Transportation system Study PMT	
FROM: Mary Gute, CH2M HILL	DATE ISSUED: April 7, 2009

1. Overview – thirty-five people signed in for the meeting, and approximately seventy people attended the open house. Display boards were on hand to describe the project objectives, existing conditions, and evaluation criteria to be used for future alternatives analysis. PMT members also provided informational boards about the status of related UMore Park, Vermillion Highlands, Rosemount, and Empire Township planning efforts.

2. Public Comments:

Thirteen written comments have been received as a result of the open house; most were written by attendees at the meeting. However, some email comments were sent to Brian Sorenson after the meeting. A brief summary of the input, categorized by topic area, follows:

Vermillion Highlands Wildlife Management Area (WMA)

Several comments were received about avoiding this open space/wildlife area. Primarily, people were concerned about a Blaine Avenue extension through the WMA – noting that maintenance of a continuous WMA property is a top priority. Other comments included:

- Concern for water quality and an otherwise “delicate” ecosystem that is unique to this portion of the Twin Cities Metro Area. One comment stated an interest in extending the WMA south to preserve lands around the Vermillion River.
- Specific areas of concern noted were about the impacts of using salt on roadways, preserving loggerhead shrike habitat, and potential future animal/vehicle collisions.

North-South Transportation

Most comments in this topic were related to avoiding the Vermillion Highlands WMA, generally noting that Blaine Avenue is close to County Road 81, so the emphasis should be placed on upgrading CR 81 instead. Others felt that Highways 3 and 52 provide enough capacity.

The impact of upgrading Biscayne Avenue was noted as well. The right-of-way and traffic impacts of corridor are a concern for existing land owners business (farming) and property values.

East-West Transportation

Mixed viewpoints about 170th Street were provided. One comment was opposed to it based on a concern about property values and traffic; and one comment supported the extension to

Highway 52. One person questioned whether a connection to Highway 52 would be consistent with plans for Highway 52.

Gravel operations and plans for extraction were noted as a confounding factor in long-term planning of area roadways.

Transit

County Road 42 has been identified as an important east-west transit corridor connection for several north-south transit corridors (e.g. 35W, Cedar, Robert Street)

Need to address the issue of transit mode and routing into UMore; along with compatibility for adjacent growth areas.

Rosemount's work with MVRTA on park and ride facilities should be considered.

Other

A longer open house should be provided. The two-hour window is not long enough. Additionally, more public notice should be provided (e.g. local newspapers, County quarterly newsletter, web site)

Rosemount/Empire/UMore Area Transportation System Study Public Open House #2 Comment Summary – 06/29/2009

LOCATION: Rosemount Community Center Banquet Room; 4:00 to 6:30 pm; June 29, 2009	
COPIES TO: Rosemount/Empire/UMore Area Transportation System Study PMT	
FROM: Mary Gute, CH2M HILL	DATE ISSUED: July 10, 2009

- 1. Overview** – Fifteen people signed in for the open house. Display boards were on hand to describe the alternative development and evaluation. PMT members also provided informational boards about the status of related UMore Park, Vermillion Highlands, Rosemount, and Empire Township planning efforts.
- 2. Public Comments** – Written comments from three individuals were received at the open house. Two individuals were property owners within the study area; the other individual was concerned with protecting Vermillion Highlands. After the open house, two comments were received from property owners within the study area (including one from an individual who'd commented at the open house). All comments reflected concern over how specific north-south corridor options would affect their property or Vermillion Highlands.

West Side of Study Area

- An individual with property on the west side of Biscayne Avenue is concerned that Options 4 and 5 would negatively impact their farming operation.
- Another individual noted that new road in the vicinity of Biscayne Avenue built as development occurs within UMore Park would accommodate much of the future demand in this study area (suggested transportation options for the east side of the study area are listed below).

East Side of Study Area

- An individual with land just south of 190th Street noted that Option 9, as drawn would bisect and possibly require acquisition of their home; he provided the following suggestions and observations:
 1. Existing north-south corridors should be considered for expansion – specifically, Clayton and Biscayne Avenues.
 2. If Option 9 is approved, consider moving the curve south so it passes south of the property; this will also follow the contour of the land. It is understood that this refinement could result in a lowered speed limit (from 60 to 45 mph), which is more acceptable to those living in the area.
 3. Option 9 would require a new, larger river crossing of the Vermillion River, which would result in significant negative environmental impacts to the river (e.g., designed trout stream; and wildlife and plant impacts). This option

would also consume a significant portion of contiguous Vermillion Highlands, reducing the value of the park land for wildlife, park users, and/or agricultural interests.

- An individual with property along Clayton Avenue is concerned with Options 9, 10, and 11, as each would be in his backyard; Options 10 and 11 would bisect his property. The following alternatives to Options 9, 10 and 11 were suggested:
 1. Extend Blaine Avenue (Note: This was Option #8 which was eliminated during the first round of evaluation).
 2. Improve CR 81/Clayton Avenue, including straightening the road to go over the hill it currently goes around.
 3. Construct an interchange at Highway 52 and CSAH 66 to alleviate the need for a new north-south road on the east side of UMore Park. (This interchange is needed now because accessing Highway 52 from CSAH 66 is dangerous). This interchange would take away almost all traffic from Clayton Avenue.

This property owner also offered the following observations regarding the north-south alignments under consideration on the east side of the study area:

1. Much of the land that would be taken under Options 9, 10, and 11 is currently rented out to Hmong farmers by the property owner and his neighbor. The farmers sell their produce at local farmers markets. He commented that the farmers do not know about this study; most do not speak English. He questioned how this group's voice can be heard?
2. Other parts of the land that would be impacted by Options 9-11 have been restored to native prairie grasses, costing thousands of dollars.
3. It's ironic that his property may be bisected by a road that would accommodate traffic generated by the "green" university project, while he: rents to Hmong farmers who farm and sell locally, has restored native prairie, and has had geothermal heating/cooling installed in his house. The new development will generate carbon from cars using the highway and result in plowing up hundreds of acres of green land.
4. The property owner would like to see data supporting the need for an additional north-south highway on the east side of the study area. There is nothing on CR 79/Blaine Ave. south of CSAH 66 that people will want to travel to from this new development. Residents will travel north; if they go south, they will only go to Vermillion Highlands and not south of CSAH 66.
5. If data does support the need for a north-south highway, the property owner questioned why CR 79/Blaine Avenue was no longer on the table? Re-routing of Blaine Avenue away from the County's plan is the same as what occurred with the MinnCan pipeline, where the university used their clout to move the pipeline onto someone else's land. "Cty. 79 must be put back on the table as an option - it is totally inappropriate that it was taken away as an

option in the manner that it was – especially because the U is the reason we even need (supposedly) this highway.”

6. The property owner offered for the study team to visit his home, noting that not everything can be seen from maps. He also requested a meeting to review data and discuss options. This meeting would be open to the press and the farmers who rent his land.
 - One person noted that public lands should not be degraded by using it for road right-of-way. There has been a lack of recreational areas in the south metro. Now that this shortage is being addressed, this land shouldn't be given up. Rather than building on completely new alignment, CR 81 should be upgraded.
 - Two individuals noted that new regional roads would not be needed if the UMore Park development were not built. One commented that this development should not occur so close to Vermillion Highlands.

Rosemount/Empire/UMore/Area Transportation System Study

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

April 1, 2009

COMMENT FORM

You may leave this completed form with us today by dropping it into the COMMENT BOX.
Or you can e-mail your comments to Brian Sorenson, PE, Dakota County Transportation
Department, Brian.Sorenson@co.dakota.mn.us

Built

NO ROAD ~~BUILT~~ ~~IN~~ ~~THE~~ THROUGH
THIS AREA. THERE ARE ENOUGH
N. S. HIGHWAYS IN THIS AREA
HWY 52, & HWY 3

THIS AREA WOULD BE SEVERELY
DEGRADED IF A ROAD WAS BUILT.

THERE IS NO OTHER POTENTIAL
TO HAVE AN AREA THIS SIZE IN
SOUTH METRO.

ALREADY TO MANY ROADS.

THE NATURAL WORLD SHOULD TAKE
PRIORITY ESPECIALLY WHERE DEVELOPMENT
IS OCCURRING AT SUCH A RAPID PACE.

You may leave this completed form with us today by dropping it into the COMMENT BOX. Or you can e-mail your comments to Brian Sorenson, PE, Dakota County Transportation Department, Brian.Sorenson@co.dakota.mn.us

- Have a longer mtg time 4 to 6 doesn't fit a lot of schedules
- No notice in local newspapers about mtg
- Have notice of next mtg in Co's Quarterly newsletter
- Make it easier to find on web page

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT AGAINST BUILDING A ROAD *connecting*

Co. Hwy. 71 & 79

Water quality salty water so we need places where clean fresh water can infiltrate without roads More roads means more salt. More ATV's in road ditches and more sediment from those denuded ditches. These actions will cause more salt and sediment right into our prized Vermillion River which is on the brink of degradation already but is still a prized trout stream.

Loggerhead shrike. A disappearing species that could rebound in this area due to a large enough habitat to nest and find enough insects for food and the type of vegetation to store their food. Little impact from agricultural chemicals.

No other place to have an area like this in so. metro. Natural highland prairie woods mix All kinds of non motorized recreation. Extended day hikes, cross country day ski trips, hunting, fishing. Close to large population center.

At some point development of more roads need to stop and for this area in the opinion of HEP the time is now to make other transportation plans than building another road. There are two major highways north and south just to the east and to the west of this area. Lets make plan to use those roads which are already built In our estimation their could not be a worse project to degrade this area. Even if there was a major wild fire in the area or a tornado the area would recover but if a road were built the area would be severely degraded and never recover and the Vermillion River watershed would be severely degraded.

I DONT THINK THE PUBLIC WANTS TO TAKE THAT CHANCE.

*TRAVEL WILL CAUSE MANY CAR ANIMAL
CRASHES DEER CROSSING FROM ONE SIDE
WMA TO THE OTHER,
DEER CRASH ALLEY.*

Concerned about the potential connection of 170th Street from TH 3 to TH 52.

This would increase traffic and have a negative impact on area property values.

Would such a connection be consistent with the TH 52 study? Would there need to be an overpass planned?

Rosemount/Empire/UMore/Area Transportation System Study

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING—June 29, 2009

COMMENT FORM

We need your input to guide decisions about modifying corridor options and developing a regional transportation system to serve the study area. Some topics to consider include:

- How should a new regional road on the east side of the study area use public or private lands?
- How can Highway 3 and Biscayne Avenue best serve regional transportation needs?
- How can roadways be planned to coordinate best with recreational uses in the area such as regional parks, hunting, or trails?
- How can County Highway 46 be realigned to allow for aggregate mining and support future urban development of UMore Park?

You may leave this completed form with us today by dropping it into the COMMENT BOX. Or you can e-mail your comments to Brian Sorenson, PE, Dakota County Transportation Department, Brian.Sorenson@co.dakota.mn.us

Ok - I just listened to everyone and
looked at ~~the~~ the maps and here are
my final comments:
- The north/south road needs should
be dealt with by paving Biscayne as
houses are built on U land on west →

Use back for more comments.

side since that is where need
will be.

I see very little need for any
north/south road added on ~~west~~ east
side of U land. People living on
U land will go north, not south. Any
north/south road needs ~~with~~^{should} be
met with an interchange on 52
and 66. This interchange is needed
right now — if we had it there
would be almost no traffic on
Clayton Ave. The only ones on
Clayton Ave. are the ~~Henry~~ Farmers that
my neighbors and I rent to, and
those people who don't want to
risk their lives accessing 52
from 66 now since it is so
dangerous.

Thanks, Mike Beltz

**Thank You for Your Interest and Input about this
Study.**

We have concerns with options 4 & 5 - our dairy farm is located on the west side of Biscayne Ave. We feel these options would negatively impact the farming operations.

1) Clayton Ave. should ~~not~~ be upgraded to Option 11

2) Biscayne should be upgraded

3.) Hard fought for public lands should not be degraded by using them for Public R.O.W.

Public lands owned by 8 million Minnesota citizens should not so easily be assumed to be alternatives for Road R.O.W.s. We have been remiss in providing enough recreational areas in the south metro and now that we are mediating this mistake we shouldn't give up these lands.

① Dakota City St is in major need of upgrading and should be considered the only clear route on the east side. Option 11 appears to be the best alternative.

Rosemount/Empire/UMore/Area Transportation System Study

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING—November 12, 2009

COMMENT FORM

The goal of this open house is to get public input on the recommended regional highway corridors identified as potentially part of a future roadway transportation system. We need your input on the following:

- Does the recommended system provide a plan that properly balances all of the needs in the area? Does this plan properly set the stage for coordination with recreational uses such as regional parks, hunting, or trails while still addressing the growth and transportation needs?
- How should road implementation be phased to coordinate with future land use and transportation plans? Are there implementation issues we should be aware of?

You may leave this completed form with us today by dropping it into the COMMENT BOX. Or you can e-mail your comments to Brian Sorenson, PE, Dakota County Transportation Department, Brian.Sorenson@co.dakota.mn.us

I am directly impacted by Option #11B which would cut right through the middle of my land (created by Homing Farmers). I have been meeting with County Staff and DNR and I support Option #11A as a good compromise between Option #11B which I do NOT support →

Use back for more comments.

and the routing of this N/S route along Blaine Avenue (County 79) which is where this road is currently shown on County's Comprehensive Plan.

In conclusion I would like to say thank you to Brian Sorenson and all of the Staff and elected officials (Terry Holmes) who have allowed me to be included in this process. This process worked. It was well run with an Open House in Summer 2009 where I first learned of this and then I was allowed to meet with Staff and elected officials on site where this road would cross my land and/or bypass my land as Option #11A ~~does~~ does. I want to say thank you for running a good process and for only doing Option #11B IF landowners such as me sell their land in the future. Compromise by both sides was given in this process and for that I say thank-you.

Sincerely - Mark Beltz

Thank You for Your Interest and Input about this Study.

I LIKE THE FACT THAT THE
MAIN CORRIDOR IS MOVED EAST
OF VERMILION HIGHLANDS. 11A & 11B
OPTIONS ARE ACCEPTABLE. THE MORE
DESIRABLE OPTION WOULD BE TO
TOTALLY AVOID VERMILION HIGHLANDS
BY MOVING THE N5 ROUTE ANOTHER
 $\frac{1}{2}$ MILE EAST. BUT SO BE IT.

Use back for more comments.

REGARDING THE OPTION // A CORRIDOR ~~WEST~~ ^{WEST} OF "LITTLE LONG ROCK" - WHEN NOTIFIED THAT THE MN CAN PIPELINE WAS TO BE ROUTED THROUGH OUR BACKYARD, WE ASKED WHY IT COULD NOT BE ROUTED ALONG THE WEST SIDE OF CLAYTON THEN MOVE WEST ALONG THE "U-LANDS" NORTH BOUNDARY (APPROX 180TH) - THE REPLY FROM

MR KENNEDY - (A PIPELINE REP) WAS - THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION TOLD THE PIPELINE COMPANY THAT DUE TO CONTAMINATION ON THE "U-LANDS" THEY WERE TO AVOID THOSE AREAS AND NOT DISTURB THE CONTAMINATED AREAS.

THE PIPELINE NOW FOLLOWS THE SECTION LINE TO A PLACE NORTH OF THE "U-LANDS" CROSSES CLAYTON TO THE WEST & TURNS NORTH ALONG THE 1/2 SECTION LINE -

THE PIPELINE ~~SUGGESTED~~ ^{STATED} THE CONTAMINATED AREA IS WEST OF "LITTLE LONG ROCK"

PLEASE EXCUSE MY POOR PENMANSHIP -

THANKS FOR YOUR TIME

Thanks for identifying the transportation options. With our limited use of the current interlocal roads, our preference would be for road expansions that least affect wetlands and watershed features.

Use back for more comments.

I WAS HAPPY TO SEE THE CHANGES TO OPTION I. THEY MAKE MORE SENSE - THE ONLY EXCEPTION IS THE INTERCHANGE OF CR 3 & VERMILLION RIVER TRAIL - IT SEEMS LIKE IT MAY BE DIFFICULT TO BUILD THAT OUT W/O IMPACTING THE VERMILLION RIVER.

Use back for more comments.