

Upper Mississippi River Master Plan

Preferred Plan Basis of Selection

May 27, 1999

Background

Three conceptual alternatives, referred to as A1 (park and neighborhood), A2 (park and light industrial), and B (working river) were developed and evaluated during a period from June 1998 through January 1999. The three conceptual alternatives were formally evaluated using criteria established and reviewed in small and large public meetings. The assessment methodology was designed to make the evaluation criteria as quantifiable as possible. For reference, the evaluation summary is attached as Appendix A to this working paper.

Following the assessment of both quantifiable and qualifiable features contained in the alternatives, a fourth plan was developed to make modifications and address opportunities identified in the previous three alternatives. Through discussions, reviews by technical advisory committee (TAC), further analysis, and input from a variety of sources, this alternative began emerging as a preferred plan by most of the public, agencies, politicians, and members of the planning team. The preferred plan contained many components from the initial conceptual alternatives.

In summary, the preferred plan **balances** anticipated benefits in economic development (net increase in employment, tax base and revenue, housing units), land use (redevelopment and intensification of light industrial activities, creation of a new neighborhood), recreation (increase in riverside parkland, water access points, parkways and trails), natural systems (increase in public and private areas for storm water retention and filtering), and river ecology (length of river's edge restoration and creation of wildlife habitat).

Planning team members believe the preferred plan expands the rivers economic development potential based upon our nation's emerging values of natural resources as settings for recreation, housing and community development, versus late 19th and early 20th century values using rivers as primary means to transport bulk goods, and as a setting for heavy industrial activity. It builds upon Minneapolis' heritage, established over a century ago, of providing public access to waters edge. Perhaps most importantly, the preferred plan envisions a future for the Minneapolis' Upper Mississippi which would best attract public and private investment; and regional, state, and federal funds for implementation.

The plan's preference, in comparison with the three initial alternatives, is based upon the following considerations:

- 1) *Consistent objectives identified in over 25 years of previous public planning efforts and objectives of the 1999 Upper River Master Plan*

The review of previous public plans for Minneapolis' Mississippi riverfront and the careful consideration of overall goals for this planning effort, yielded the following objectives which guided the plan:

- Create a continuous recreational trail along both banks of the river
- Seek opportunities for public ownership of the riverbank

- Enhance streets leading to and parallel to the river
- Work toward a pattern of river-enhancing land uses
- Create locations for observing the river
- Revegetate the riverbanks
- Remove unneeded railroad spur lines
- Improve river ecology and water quality
- Reduce or eliminate sources of air, noise, or water pollution
- Harmonize the Upper river-related plans and actions of local, regional, state and federal units of Government

In comparison with the three concept alternatives, the preferred plan:

- provides the longest length of public trails and opportunities for public ownership along both sides of the riverbank.
- increases the provision of enhanced streets leading to and parallel with the river by creating pedestrian decks over 1-94 at Farview Park (29th Avenue) and Perkins Hill Park (35th Avenue) and the creation of neighborhood ped/bike trails along vacated BN rail right-of-way. Further, it creates an extension of the West River Road, connecting existing West River Parkway to North Mississippi River Regional Park. Improvements planned for Marshall Street between Plymouth Ave. north to St. Anthony Parkway include its upgrade to a landscaped boulevard street.
- provides added opportunities to create strategic river observation areas where these routes meet the river.
- plans for long term transitions to the most river enhancing land uses as in A1 and A2
- provides the same length of riverbank revegetation as A1 and A2 and shows the longest length of railroad spur line removal (Northeast Minneapolis), calling for eventual replacement with trails.
- creates less overall riverfront parkland than A1 and A2, providing less opportunity for stormwater filtration area and wildlife habitat restoration.
- shows long term land-use transitions on both sides of the river, as does A1 and A2 and the east bank of B. away from heavier industrial activities to lighter industrial/manufacturing, housing, and parkland. This eliminates open yard storage of materials, minimizing impervious surface stormwater runoff directly into the river and minimizing air, noise, and visual pollution in adjacent neighborhoods.
- Directly relates local land use decisions to broader regional and state initiatives concerned with the river e.g. MNRRA, regional/metropolitan open-space planning and funding, and national river initiatives (e.g. American Heritage River designation).

2) *Upper Mississippi River Master Plan principles best met by preferred alternative in planning team analysis*

Principles to develop the Master Plan, formulated by planning consultant team members, were used to guide overall planning. The principles were:

- The plan should respond to the natural and cultural foundations of the study area.
- The plan should conserve key environmental features, most notably along the riverbank.
- The plan should preserve recognized historic and visually important structures.
- The plan should reclaim open space for the benefit of the community and the ecological health of the river.
- The plan should improve the ecological performance of the river edge.
- The plan should provide tangible links between the two sides of the river.

- The plan should enhance major features and forms and reinforce views across and along the river corridor.
- The plan should extend parkland benefits back to river neighborhoods.
- The plan should stabilize existing neighborhoods and river enhancing uses.
- The plan should revitalize underutilized industrial, commercial, and residential land.
- The plan should differentiate park design between the two differing sides of the river.
- The plan should create a variety of spatial and aesthetic experiences .

Although the principles were used to create all of the alternatives, in assessing the three alternatives and the preferred plan, planning consultants determined A1, A2 and the preferred plan most successfully applied the principles to accomplish the objectives.

3) *Review and critique of planning work by National Advisory panel members*

During November, 1998 and March, 1999 a panel of nationally respected economic and land use consultants were gathered to 1) offer their perspectives for long-term redevelopment of the upper river and 2) act as independent reviewers of planning progress. The panelists views supported plans for an economically and environmentally healthier river corridor. The panelists also endorsed ideas that would provide more opportunities for people to connect with the river in a variety of ways including recreation and residency.

Although panel members represented different areas of expertise, they came to several consistent conclusions. They recommended that the closure of the Upper Harbor Terminal (UHT) be anticipated as part of the long-range planning for the area.. They urged that there be a plan to maximize green space, especially along the water's edge - however, not to the exclusion of light industry. The panelists said that all waterfront businesses should eventually move off of the river's edge. They also recommended that the old-line heavy industries that are not particularly good for the health of the river eventually relocate, and the area be transitioned to light industry. Each of the panelists acknowledged the importance of public access to the river; getting people closer to the water will build constituencies and economic support. Finally the panelists said that the public agencies need to show the wider community an official commitment to the plan. whether through public policy, land acquisition, or commitment to the project.

Given these comments, and their implication to the alternatives, the preferred plan offered a balance between creating continuous publicly accessible open-space at the river's edge, furthering north Minneapolis' employment opportunities, creating residential opportunities desired by the City, and enhancing the river's recreational promise.

4) *Review and critique of planning work and Advisory **Panel comments** by City Council members*

Following each Advisory Panel, the City Council was invited to attend a briefing and review session to comment upon current planning and hear remarks of the Panel. Comments from the Council included the following:

- They agreed that maximizing green space, especially along the river was a good idea, as long as it was not at the expense of light industry.
- They agreed that light industry on the west side of the river should be encouraged.
- They agreed that some type of residential buildings along the west side was a sound idea.
- Regarding Northeast, they agreed that neighborhood revitalization should continue.

- They also liked the idea of developing more parkland and providing access on both sides of the river. There was support for providing increased docking and boat access for the upper river, although there was little support for a year-round marina.
- The only recommendation that was received with trepidation, was the closing of the UHT. Officials varied on their response, because of the degree of overall change prescribed for North and Northeast Minneapolis, because of the time frame needed for implementation, because of implications to old-line industries, because they lacked complete economic impact information since provided, and because officials do not yet share a common vision for the upper river.

5) *Review, commentary and direction from Minneapolis City Planning Commission*

Following full presentation and review of the three alternatives and the preferred plan, Planning Commission members expressed strong support for the preferred plan. To paraphrase Commissioners' statements:

the great planning in Minneapolis has been done in long range plans
 this plan offers direct quality of life improvements to affected communities
 this plan does not ignore jobs and industrial use and should continue to investigate underutilized industrial areas
 the preferred plan offers the opportunity to start on a clean page on the west side
 the provision of a higher density of employment is critical
 the housing densities proposed between 20 and 50 dwelling units per acre are needed
 the west side has already been designated as a housing opportunity area
 this appears to be a wonderful plan that is expensive

In addition, Commissioners identified elements that required additional refinement and development and are being addressed in the Master Plan's third phase:

- Land use policy
Of the existing heavy industrial uses in the corridor, how many are likely to change future locations? Can relocated industrial operations be accommodated within the City?
- Transportation policy
What is the future of commercial navigation on this reach of the river?
Can Marshall Street be turned into a true parkway, eliminating commercial truck traffic?
- Implementation feasibility
Is there an intermediate future for the heavy industry being considered for relocation?

6) *Development and application of Master Plan evaluation criteria (Tasks L 9 & IL 13)*

Through out public small group and large group meetings, a range of criteria proposed for use in evaluating alternatives was discussed. The criteria were organized under five categories:

1) economic and fiscal impacts, 2) recreation impacts, 3) natural environment impacts, 4) neighborhood impacts, and 5) heavy goods movement. Within each category, several more detailed criteria were developed and are summarized below:

- Economic and Fiscal Impacts
Net change in jobs, net change in tax base, public cost for park improvements, operations and maintenance required for locks and dams
- Recreation Impacts

Access to and along the riverfront, length of parkway trail improvements, acres of new open space, linkage to park and trail networks, opportunities for recreational boating, effects on excursion boating

- Natural Environmental Impacts
Riverbank restoration, habitat protection and creation, water quality improvements, remediation of possible environmental contamination sites
- Neighborhood Development Impacts
Number and type of housing units created, amount of retail and service business development, light industrial and business park development/redevelopment, riverfront entertainment, physical image improvements, neighborhood traffic management
- Heavy Goods Movement Impacts
Effects on barge traffic, rail traffic, truck traffic

The three initial alternatives were evaluated against these specific criteria. This evaluation, completed in January 1999, is included as Appendix A. In comparison with the initial alternatives, the preferred plan carries with it these features:

- approximately 2000 net additional jobs,
- approximately \$ 17 million net additional annual property tax revenue,
- approximately \$105 million public parkland cost,
- approximately 15 miles of trails and over 5 miles of parkway created,
- approximately 90 acres of net additional continuous riverfront parkland/open space,
- BN bridge used exclusively for trails, one additional boat launch ramp location created,
- approximately 4.6 miles of riverfront restoration,
- approximately 40 acres of wildlife habitat creation,
- improvement in water quality due to limited open yard storage and more fully treated stormwater runoff,
- less environmental remediation opportunities than in the "river green "plans but with strategic opportunities to place higher density urban uses on top of suspected west side pollution,
- proposes increased density at sites with more expensive remediation costs,
- plans for approximately 2400 additional housing units,
- approximately 160,000 square feet of retail/service space,
- 1 million square feet of new light industrial/business park space.
- 350,000 square feet of office space;
- commercial truck traffic remaining on improved Marshall Street,
- BN rail corridor in Northeast converted to bike/ped trail and, should it eventually occur,
- the discontinuation of barge traffic.

7) ***Response from public participation process***

Public review and comment on planning progress was solicited by complementary methods including public workshop/open house meetings, informal small group "kitchen table" meetings with interest groups, community comment workbooks, project website, and voice mail comment line.

Not surprisingly, many conflicting opinions were expressed, depending on the general interests of the group or individual providing them. However, the following themes emerged as considerations for the planning process:

- Examine the **intrinsic value of the river-** as major waterway, as a community [focus](#) as a source of drinking water, as a geographic feature of national significance.

- Use **the river's ecology**, including effects on instream, riverbank and upland [habitat](#) as evaluation criteria for the alternatives.
- Balance the goals of **public access** and **habitat restoration** in planning the use of parks and open space.
- Evaluate the future of the **Upper Harbor Terminal**, as the most critical issue in determining the long-term outcome of the plan.
- It is imperative to calculate, evaluate, and compare the **costs of each alternative**.
- Continue to pursue the longstanding objective of **linking neighborhoods to the river**.
- Use the plan to help **North and Northeast Minneapolis** come closer the South Side in their level of amenities, especially parklands.

In summary, public responses to the referred plan were:

- Area residents and adjacent neighborhoods were in favor of the preferred plan
- Environmental advocates were in favor of the preferred plan, but thought that more could be done to improve it, such as enlarging open space along the riverfront
- Those light industries whose operations would be strengthened by the light industrial revitalization emphasis were either neutral or in favor of the preferred plan
- Those river-adjacent commercial and industrial land uses subject to eventual phasing out in the preferred plan, were not in favor of it
- Commercial navigation and transportation interests were not in favor of the plan, largely due to possible long- range effects on barging activity and shifting commodities movement to rail and road.

8) ***Master Plan response to policy direction in the Minneapolis Plan***

City-wide goals were incorporated into *The Minneapolis Plan (1997)*, and eight goals for the City were developed by the Mayor and the City Council in April of *1998*. Several of these goals have a direct bearing on policies influencing generation of initial alternatives and the preferred plan.

Comparing all alternatives, the preferred plan best

- increases the City's population and tax base by proposing and supporting city-wide housing choices through preserving existing housing and new construction,
- creates stronger commercial corridors (along Broadway, Lowry, Dowling) through mixed use development,
- preserves and enhances a city-wide sustainable natural and historic environment.
- maintains a diverse, resilient economy that creates needed employment opportunities, and
- strengthens the City through investments in infrastructure.

9) ***Master Plan response to City of Minneapolis Housing Principles***

The City Council officially adopted four city-wide Housing Principles to help guide policy decisions affecting housing. Comparing all alternatives, the preferred plan best:

- Increases the variety of housing types, giving prospective renters and buyers greater choice where they may live,
- Preserves and strengthens housing markets that are already strong,
- Improves the quality of city housing stock, and
- Proposes to provide appropriate levels of affordable and subsidized housing.

The preferred plan proposes creating a new residential neighborhood in north Minneapolis with housing revitalization and selected infill east of Marshall Avenue in northeast Minneapolis. Some 2400 new dwelling units are planned, in a variety of types from small lot single family detached units to multifamily dwelling units for both renters and home owners. Along with providing new and rehabilitated housing for a broad market range, comes the need to ensure that a portion of new housing would be directed to meet the City's affordable housing demand.

10) *Critical Area/MNRRRA Plan policies and goals*

The Critical Area/MNRRRA Plan sets forth those policies and implementation strategies the City needs to protect the natural, cultural, historic, commercial, and recreational value of the river corridor. The Critical Area Plan's general land use policies emphasize improving public access to and movement along the river, creating more park space, enhancing river-oriented recreation opportunities, reducing the visual impact of industry and open storage, attracting development that is compatible with the river, protecting natural features, reducing adverse visual impacts, and protecting historic properties and districts. Outside the downtown area, the height and setback of structures along the river are carefully restricted.

Stated river corridor goals are:

1. **Natural Resources:** Preserve, enhance and interpret natural resources. Protect and preserve the biological and ecological functions of the corridor.
2. **Visual Quality:** Protect and enhance the views to and from the river, and up or down the river, so that people may enjoy the natural beauty of a major waterway in an urban setting.
3. **Cultural Resources:** Preserve, enhance and interpret the archeological, ethnographic and historic resources of the river corridor.
4. **Economic Resources:** Provide for continued economic activity and development in a manner consistent with the other goals of this plan. Protect and preserve the river as an essential element in the systems of transportation, water supply and recreation.
5. **Neighborhood Revitalization and Stabilization:** Leverage the natural beauty, recreation and economic development features of the river as a means of sustaining the quality of nearby neighborhoods and the city as a whole.
6. **Outdoor Recreation and Tourism:** Enhance opportunities for outdoor recreation, education and scenic enjoyment. Continue to build the riverfront as a major element of the local and regional parkway systems.
7. **Public Understanding:** Improve the public's understanding of the river and promote public stewardship of its resources. Recognize and strengthen people's relationships with the river as a dynamic part of this community's heritage, quality of life and legacy for future generations.

Within the framework of these policies and goals, planning team members have evaluated initial alternatives and the preferred plan. The preferred plan **balances** the accomplishments needed to satisfy State and Federal requirements, represented as river corridor goals. The planning team anticipates that only the height and setback of development proposed along a short segment of the river's west bank will need further review and discussion with the Metropolitan Council and DNR.

11) *Potential intplementationfunding from regional, state, and national sources*

The need to fund approximately \$ 230 million of public improvements over the life of the preferred plan (approximately 20 to 30 years) will require cooperation and agreement among all possible sources. The plan must possess a visionary quality and sufficient benefit to attract

support beyond the local level. Planning team members believe the preferred plan best achieves this. Although less costly alternatives were considered and evaluated, they possessed fewer broad based benefits needed to attract national and foundation funding. Potential sources of funding for the preferred plan include:

- City and County
 - Tax Increment Financing
 - General Obligation Bonds
 - Housing Revenue Bonds
 - County Transportation Capital Improvements Programs

- Watershed
 - Middle Mississippi Watershed Grants

- Metropolitan
 - Livable Communities Program Grants
 - Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Grants

- State
 - LCMR Grants
 - State Transportation CIP
 - Great River Road Grants
 - Hazardous Waste Remediation Grants

- Federal
 - Federal Transportation Grants - TEA 21
 - Hazardous Waste Remediation Grants
 - MNRRRA Grants
 - Federal Empowerment Zone Grants
 - U.S. Economic Development Administration
 - U.S. Maritime Association
 - U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 - National Park Service
 - U.S Environmental Protection Agency
 - FHWA
 - U.S Forest Service
 - Federal Railroad Administration
 - Natural Resources Conservation Service
 - Council on Environmental Quality
 - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mississippi River Division

- Private Sources
 - Foundation Grants

Conclusion

The previous discussion has addressed a wide range of considerations in formally assessing alternative plans. All eleven assessment criteria were applied, with the overall assessment recorded in the attached *Assessment Summary* chart. As discussed and illustrated, in comparison with initial alternatives, the preferred plan is superior because:

- It best meets the Master Plan objectives while being shaped by the Master Plan principles.
- Features of the preferred plan, many of which were partly contained in previous alternatives, received strong support from the National Advisory Panel, Planning Commission members, and the broadest segment of the public.
- It best accomplishes policy directions established in the Minneapolis Plan and the City's Housing Principles.
- It best responds to Critical Area/MNRRRA policies and goals.
- It has the most potential to attract implementation funding from all levels and sources
- It establishes a long term vision for this reach of river which strengthens the rivers future economic development potential.

5/27/1999

Upper Mississippi River Master Plan

Preferred Plan Basis of Selection: Assessment Summary

May 1999

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	PLAN ALTERNATIVES			
	Alternate A1 (Park and Neighborhood)	Alternate A2 (Park and Light Industry)	Alternate B (Working River)	Preferred Plan
1) Consistent Objectives of 25 Years of Planning & Objectives of 1999 Upper River Master Plan			0	0
2) Upper Mississippi River Master Plan Principles			0	0
3) Review/Critique of Planning by National Advisory Panel		0	0	0
4) Review/Critique of Planning and Advisory Panel Comments by City Council				0
5) Review/Critique of Planning by City Planning Commission	0	0		0
6) Development and Application of Evaluation Criteria (Tasks 1.9 & 11,13)		0		0
7) Response from Public Participation Process				0
8) Response to Policy Directions in the Minneapolis Plan				0
9) Response to City of Minneapolis Housing Principles				
10) Critical Area MNRRA Plan Policies and Goals				
11) Potential for Implementation Funding from Regional, State, National Sources			0	

- LEGEND**
- Plan Supports Assessment Criteria
 - Plan Neutral to Assessment Criteria
 - Plan Does Not Support Assessment Criteria

Appendix A

Upper Mississippi River Master Plan
Alternatives Evaluation Summary
January 1999

	Alternatives		
	Park & Neighborhood (A1)	Park & Industry (A2)	Working River (B)
Economic and Fiscal Impacts			
Net Change in Jobs	Approximately -30	Approximately 1,460	Approximately 1,080
Net Change in Tax Base	\$ 6.192 Million	\$ 4.867 Million	\$ 1.774 Million
Public Cost for Park	\$152 Million	\$150 Million	\$ 92 Million
Locks: Operations and Maintenance	Initial costs to 'mothball' 3 locks and reduced O & M costs would be necessary.		Total annual O & M costs continue: approximately \$ 3.0 million (including dredging).
Recreation Impacts			
Access to and Movement along the Riverfront	Nearly continuous access along the riverfront and increased access into.		1.7 mile gap on west side of river.
Parkway and Trails	14.6 miles of bike/pedestrian trails. (16.2 mi. @ park & ind) 5.23 miles of parkway		7.45 miles of bike/pedestrian trails. 2.91 miles of parkway. Parkway separated from waterfront north of 24th Avenue N. would be a significant reduction in quality.
Open Space	Approximately 205 acres of parkland created. Park related OS is both linear and broader at locations for park use. More opportunities for both active recreation and natural spaces, regional and neighborhood needs.		Approximately 98 acres of parkland created Entirely linear. Oriented toward parkway and smaller parks. More difficult to reintroduce forest activities, create large, quiet spaces or accommodates major activities.
Linkage to Park and Trail Networks	BN Bridges shared with railroad or not available to pedestrians. Two new ped bridges over 1-94.	BN bridge used exclusively for pedestrians and bikes. One new ped bridge over 1-94.	BN bridge used exclusively for pedestrians and bikes. One new ped bridge over 1-94.

Alternatives

	Park & Neighborhood (A1)	Park & Industry (A2)	Working River (B)
Recreation Impacts (continued)			
Recreational Boating	Current levels (1997 data) of recreational boating discontinued (approximately 2000 trips through upper and lower locks at St. Anthony Falls.		Lock operations provide recreational boating access to upper & lower pools at St. Anthony Falls.
Excursion Boating	Closing of locks disrupts excursion boats currently docked below Plymouth Avenue Bridge @Boom Island Park. (Approximately 500 excursions per season, 3 full-time and 25 seasonal employees.)		Excursion boats could continue operations.
Natural Environment Impacts			
Riverbank Restoration; Habitat Protection and Creation;	<p>Approximately 4.6 miles of riverfront restoration Approximately 59.8 acres of habitat creation Opportunities maximized because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entire riverfront except for the NSP site would be in public ownership, • There would be broader open spaces, offering more opportunities to create a natural environmental setting, • There would be less open storage of materials, resulting in less polluted runoff, • Barge operations would be discontinued. 		<p>Approximately 2.2 miles of riverbank restoration. Approximately 36.8 acres of habitat creation Fewer opportunities because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The western riverbank north of the Burlington Northern Railroad bridge would remain in private ownership, • Park spaces would be narrow, • Heavy industrial operations would continue • Barge operations would continue.
Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in water turbidity caused by barge propellers, if commercial navigation ceases 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational craft wakes continue to affect bank erosion.
Remediation of Hazardous Waste Sites	Greater remediation potential as more land area would be shifted from industry to open space/habitat.		Less potential because there would be fewer land use changes on the west side.
Neighborhood Development Impacts			
Number and Type of Housing Units Created	Approximately 1,700 new housing units.	Approximately 200 new housing units.	Approximately 50 new housing units.
Retail and Service Business Development	Potential for approximately 150,000 gross leasable sq. ft.	Potential for approximately 98,000 gross leasable sq. ft.	Potential for approximately 98,000 gross sq. ft.

	Alternatives		
	Park & Neighborhood (A1)	Park & Industry (A2)	Working River (B)

Neighborhood Development Impacts (Continued)

Light Industrial and Business Park Development or Redevelopment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 55 acres, Approximately 950,000 gross sq. ft. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 95 acres. Approximately 1,650,000 sq. ft. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 62 acres. Approximately 1,080,000 gross sq. ft.
Riverfront Entertainment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 11 acres of redevelopment, 250,000 gross sq. ft. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 11 acres of redevelopment, 250,000 gross sq. ft. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 5 acres of redevelopment, 150,000 gross sq. ft.
Physical Image Improvement	New park space and housing provide the greatest opportunity to dramatically change character and riverfront in North & Northeast Minneapolis.	Less opportunity for substantial change. Northside would remain as a location for light industrial and business park employment.	Least opportunity for physical image improvements, mostly in Northeast Minneapolis.
Traffic Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trucks diverted from Marshall Street to railroad corridor. Marshall Street enhanced and converted to conventional MPRB parkway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trucks diverted from Marshall Street to railroad corridor. Marshall Street enhanced in present alignment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trucks would stay on Marshall Street. Parkway alignment diverted onto Washington Avenue north of the 31st Avenue North.

Heavy Goods Movement Impacts

Barge Traffic	Discontinued.	Discontinued.	Continued.
Rail Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> West side: Eliminated between Soo Line and BN bridges. East side: Eliminated south of BN bridge. Bridges: No change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> West side: No change. East side: Eliminated south of NSP. Bridges: Service on both bridges eliminated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> West side: No change. East side: No change. Bridges: Service eliminated on BN bridge.
Truck Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trucks diverted from Marshall Street to railroad corridor. Negative impact on adjacent neighborhoods, Bottineau Park and other adjacent community facilities. Improved north-south truck movement between Fridley and 16th Avenue NE. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trucks would stay on Marshall Street. Negative impact on housing along Marshall Street and on riverfront park.