

From: Cunningham, Gary <Gary.Cunningham@[REDACTED].us>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2015 3:18 PM
To: Duininck, Adam
Cc: Lamb, Brian
Subject: Fwd: Some questions, comments, about that bridge

Sent from: Gary L. Cunningham

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Reynoso, Edward" <Edward.Reynoso@[REDACTED].us>
Date: April 21, 2015 at 4:16:43 PM EDT
To: "Cunningham, Gary" <Gary.Cunningham@[REDACTED].us>
Cc: "Munt, Jennifer" <Jennifer.Munt@[REDACTED].us>, "Letofsky, Cara" <Cara.Letofsky@[REDACTED].us>, "Dorfman, Gail" <Gail.Dorfman@[REDACTED].us>
Subject: Re: Some questions, comments, about that bridge
Gary,

That is fantastic diligence and after looking into the issue further I'm also in the mindset to vote in favor of the funding of the bridge. When I had opposed it in the transportation committee I was under the impression by staff that it was the Vikings that were demanding that we fund this bridge. Obviously that is not the case so I will be supportive.

Edward Reynoso, Council Member
Metropolitan Council District 9

On Apr 21, 2015, at 3:06 PM, Cunningham, Gary <Gary.Cunningham@[REDACTED].us> wrote:
Hi Everyone,

Since our the conversation I had with Jennifer last week I let Brain Lamb and Chair Dunininck know that I had reservation regarding the pedestrian bridge attached to the Vikings Stadium. Chair Dunininck let me know that there were some very good reasons to for this project to move forward. Brian Lamb provided me with a link the email about both the safety issues and economic development potential for the site.

Then I did my due diligence by talking to:

Peter Wagenius in the mayors office
Minneapolis councilmember Jacob Frey
Minneapolis public works director Steve Kotke
Lester Bagley with the Vikings organization.

Here's what I found out:

Peter Wagenius was generally supportive of the project on public safety grounds, but didn't know enough about the project to

endorse this particular solution.

Councilmember Frey have a good handle on the project and felt that it was necessary for safety reasons. He indicated that he was surprised about the cost of the project, but indicated that he would support me voting yes.

Steve Kotke indicated that he thought that there was a huge safety issue there with a Metrodome was there, and it would only be exacerbated with the increase crowds for events at the stadium. He indicated that he had not been in touch with the project for sometime, and wasn't endorses a particular solution but that something needed to be done.

Lester Bagley for me that this was not a project that was driven by the Vikings at all, but was driven by Metro Transit. He also stated it wasn't a solution that the Vikings were looking for, but that they would go with what the Metro Transit felt was necessary to address the safety issues and crowd control. In other words, he didn't feel like the Vikings have a bone in this fight. With that said, he indicated that he was also concerned about the safety issues for the public and would abide by whatever the Metropolitan Council thought was a solution to that issue given it our preview. He also indicated that the Vikings have no interest in negotiating to pay for anything regarding this pedestrian bridge.

Given the fact that the legal challenge that Paul Ostrow raised doesn't seem to have much standing according to our legal counsel. The fact that elected representative of the district is in strong support of this project and the mayors office wants to see something happened to ensure public safety. After talking to Lester Bagley, it's clear to me that the Vikings actually played no role in determining what the solution would be with regards to the safety issues. The proposal was driven by our staff. It doesn't seem reasonable to me that we're would then charge The Vikings for a solution that we developed to safeguard the public and transit rider.

If anything, I think I'd like to see you scaled-back version of this project. \$6 million seems like a lot when there are other needs. In other words, I think this is our issue to deal with. I hope this is helpful as you consider your position on this matter on Wednesday.

Of course, I haven't made up my mind about this, but I am leaning in support of this project, unless there are other less expensive alternatives to be considered. We'll see how it goes in the debate.

Gary

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 18, 2015, at 9:50 PM, Munt, Jennifer
<Jennifer.Munt@metrocitymn.org> wrote:

Greetings, Cara!

Thanks for sharing your exchange with Brian and Jim.

My two cents. For safety reasons, a pedestrian bridge is absolutely necessary. But, the Vikings should pay for it, not the Met Council. For me, it's a matter of principle. How can we give \$6 million more to the Vikings, while our passengers wait for the bus without shelter? Yes, we got a grant to add 100 shelters on the Northside, but the governor's budget includes 1000 additional shelters that are needed, but not yet funded.

Gary Cunningham has changed his position and will be joining me in voting against the deal. Feel free to give me a call before Wednesday's vote.

Jennifer, [REDACTED]

From: Letofsky, Cara

Sent: Friday, April 17, 2015 3:36 PM

To: Munt, Jennifer

Subject: FW: Some questions, comments, about that bridge

Jennifer,

Just to fill you in on my line of questioning about that bridge. I may want to talk with you before the meeting on Wednesday.

Cara

Cara Letofsky

Council Member, District 8

Cara.Letofsky@metrocitymn.org | P. [REDACTED]

390 North Robert Street | St. Paul, MN | 55101 | metrocouncil.org

From: Letofsky, Cara

Sent: Friday, April 17, 2015 3:33 PM

To: Lamb, Brian; Harwood, James

Cc: Duininck, Adam

Subject: Some questions, comments, about that bridge

Brian and Jim,

I have some questions about the Downtown East Station bridge proposal in preparation for Wednesday's vote. I'll bet you've even had to answer some of these before I arrived on the Council, so thanks in advance for taking the time to get me some additional information.

First, when was this project added to Metro Transit's CIP, and can you send me the CIP that will show me the other projects that are on it?

Second, I've heard that Metro Transit has recently received funding for additional bus shelters and maybe additional system improvements. Can you get me the details of that funding, and what it will fund?

Third, it would be really helpful to have a diagram of the pedestrian flow from the stadium to the platforms. I know I asked at the Transportation Committee -- and even got an answer! -- but it's still not clear to me. Is the proposal to block off Chicago Ave to pedestrians, thus forcing people to go over the bridge? Don't some people get on the train on the stadium side of the trains? Anyway, I'm a map person, so do you have a map that will show this?

I will also encourage you to explain this project not so much as a problem to be solved because there will be lots of people coming to Vikings games. That perpetuates this idea that the Vikings are making us pay for something that they should be paying for and that it will only be used 8 days of the year. Instead you should pitch this as a needed station area enhancement because of the regional amenity that is being built adjacent to one of our busiest stations on the whole system.

To that end, I'd like to make sure that if this project goes ahead, that it goes ahead as a station area enhancement, just as much for the people who will use that stop the other 358 days of the year than for the hordes that will come for Vikings games. This can't just be a functional bridge inelegantly plopped onto a plaza meant only to get people onto trains and out of downtown as fast as possible. Instead it needs to be a signature bridge that facilitates and enhances the pedestrian experience, that incorporates public art components, as the rest of the stations on our system do.

So, last question: how is the community being brought into the conversation about the design of the bridge and it's impact on the station area?

Thanks in advance,

Cara Letofsky
Council Member, District 8

Cara.Letofsky@metrolink.net | P. [REDACTED]

