

Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
3/10/2020 1:50 AM	Stephen Sage		For	This project was presented and sold as a place to store paper. However, it has become clear that the intent of Rohn is to establish a trucking hub on a wetland adjacent to Saint Anthony Park. There are houses within 350 feet of this development. We are on the other side of Highway 280, but the bridge over Kasota Ave. and the railway is an open space through which all of the noise and fumes created by these trucks will be funneled. There is no barrier between the site and our community. At the March 4 hearing we learned that while long term paper storage is a permitted use, parking is not. The city staffer argued that this was a technicality. I am writing to say that for those of us who live near this proposed development, this is not a technical matter. If approved, this development will exponentially increase the noise, pollution, and traffic congestion in our area. The community is clearly against this project. Please act accordingly.	
3/4/2020 9:34 PM	Cynthia Ahlgren		For	I favor this appeal. Rohn’s plans to develop here are an opportunity to consider alternatives. The toxic dump sits on a wetland that drains into the aquifer. (See Metcouncil’s St. Paul Community Pages “Surface Water Ground Water Interaction” map). It shows the NW quadrant of Kasota/280 marked “recharges aquifers.” As rain and groundwater flow through this contaminated soil, do they not leach toxins into the aquifer or carry them into the Mississippi? Should we not consider removing the contaminants? Also, the Humane Shelter has purchased the building adjacent to this site for its new headquarters. Animals need a nontoxic environment. And plans for completing the Grand Rounds will bring cyclists over the railroad tracks via a bridge to Kasota Ave. (called the Bridal Veil Trail), to be beautified by landscaping. These changes suggest the possibility of future high density housing on Kasota, if the area is decontaminated. The 2040 Plan should look to such improvements in water & housing.	
3/4/2020 7:45 PM	Ryder and Shanan Seeler		For	The development at 2495 Kasota by Rohn Industries runs in direct contrast to what the city of Saint Paul has committed to in their 2019 “Climate Action and Resilience Plan”. Our family supports the SAPCC appeal and strongly opposes the development of the 2495 Kasota land parcel.	
3/3/2020 10:59 PM	Robert & Carolyn Herman		For	Our family supports the SAPCC appeal and opposes the development of the Kasota land parcel. When development of the site was proposed 20 years ago it was determined that the contaminated materials from a former ash dump would be hazardous to disturb. What has changed since then? We know that public health is threatened by these toxic wastes and one would think we would be cautious about digging into this site since we are now even more aware of the dangers of contaminated soil disturbance. We expect our government officials to fulfill their obligation to protect their constituents’ health. The owner of Rohn, Ron Mason, has said that a paved parking lot is probably the least disruptive option. No, the least disruptive option is to leave the land fallow, with no digging or replacement of soil. We do not oppose Rohn in its need for a parking facility but urge the company and the city of St. Paul to work together to find an alternative site.	

Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
3/3/2020 10:32 PM	Ann Yetter			As a neighborhood resident, user of Energy Park Drive, and annual participant in the Kasota Ponds clean up every April, I am in favor of the appeal and against the truck parking plan. From a traffic perspective it would add to an already busy nexus of businesses and well-traveled roads, on and off ramps to Hwy 280, and from an environmental perspective digging up the polluted site without regard to the surrounding natural areas is nonsensical. We have precious few areas in the city for these birds and critters to make use of--why should destroying what is there for a parking lot for trucks take priority?	+1
3/3/2020 10:29 PM	David Fan		For	I live in Saint Anthony Park in District 12. For environmental reasons, I support the appeal. I do not want Rohn Industries to proceed.	
3/3/2020 2:44 PM	Mike Lukes		Against	I would non like to see a permiable surface within the city converted to an asphalt covered parking/staging lot when there are many, multiple more appropriate currently paved areas that can be used its stead. We learn in grade school about the hydrologic cycle and that paved surfaces concentrate runoff and the nasty chemicals that are on that surface. In order to be a good role model to our children, we must practice what we preach...so please deny the modification and use of this permiable land and set a good eample to those after us...find another paved place for this use	+1
3/3/2020 3:34 AM	Tracy Kugler		For	I am FOR the appeal and AGAINST development on this site. The history of this location as a tenuously stabilized dump site containing dangerous quantities of toxic materials is a clear indication that the site should not be disturbed. The fact that this area currently serves as an important remnant of wetland habitat further argues against paving it over. Let's stick to the commitments of the Climate Action and Resilience Plan when it comes time to make on-the-ground decisions like this.	
3/3/2020 2:13 AM	Aaron Kerr		For	I am FOR the appeal. I am AGAINST the development. St. Paul's own Climate and Resilience Plan directly addresses the need for more green space in the city, and this contradicts that. Parking lots are imperious as well, further adding to excess runoff, pollution, and flooding. I don't think we need lost MPCA records to make a case for keeping this spot an undeveloped green space.	
3/3/2020 1:36 AM	Margot Monson		For	I am for the appeal of the SAPCC to the St Paul City Council. I am against the development of the Kasota Ave site proposed by Rohn Industries because it will require excavation in site preparation of this do***ented polluted property. Any disturbance to this site will potentially impact the ecological integrity of the surrounding wetland habitat, human health from the air pollution created by increased particulate matter from site preparation and the noise from braking and idling diesel engines for the neighbors living within 1/4 mile, increased safety issues from semis operating in already congested Kasota Ave. As committed active participants in the Transition Town movement, St Anthony Park has been working for several years to transition away from unnecessary uses of precious resources, especially reducing our dependence on fossil fuels. As we experience more effects of climate change, if allowed to proceed, this operation will increase our carbon footprint in very real terms.	

Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
3/3/2020 1:29 AM	Gregg Richardson			I've lived a couple of blocks from the proposed site for 32 years, and put in many hours of meetings and labor in trying to protect and improve adjacent wetland habitat. The proposed site is an old buried hazardous waste dump. Immediately adjacent are several pre-white-settlement wetland remnants that provide critical urban habitat for a number of species of wildlife, including migratory waterfowl. Due to continuing destruction of habitat across the continent, these urban remnants become increasingly important sanctuaries for organisms that support crucial ecological diversity. The proposed project constitutes an imminent threat to these ecological functions.	+1
3/2/2020 11:38 PM	Lynnette hansen			PLEASE do not allow the truck parking lot to be developed on Kasota for all of the important reasons already expressed in the opinions. We must not allow more toxic pollution in our middle of the city neighborhoods for the health of our residents children and grandchildren.	+1
3/2/2020 11:20 PM	Laurie Christopherson		For	I live on the other side of Hwy280 and I oppose the distrupction of buried hazardous waste just to provide more parking for trucks. It doesn't make sense to expose us and the remaining wetland to any number of toxins. Paving over an area which is still rich in wildlife is disgusting. I am amazed that I can still witness dragonflies and ducks flying around my industrialized intercity neighborhood which already bears the brunt of MUCH air, noise, light, and billboard pollution. Just stop. Surely there are safer alternatives for truck parking.	
3/2/2020 11:15 PM	Lori Hamilton			It is irresponsible to dig up a known toxic waste site - especially so close to where children live and play. I am for the appeal and against the development of this site.	+1
3/2/2020 10:58 PM	Rachel Fang		For	I support the SAPCC's appeal to the St. Paul City Council and I OPPOSE Rohn Industry's development of the site at 2495 Kasota Avenue. I live within a mile of the site (just the other side of HWY 280) and I have serious concerns about the pollution that development of the site will release into the land, air and water! As more housing is added to this area, it is foolish to further endanger residents by adding to the already considerable air pollution created by the industrial developments along Kasota, along with the considerable noise and light pollution that current industrial use has created. In addition, the site is a vital greenspace for wildlife and provides a watershed for the area.	
3/2/2020 10:56 PM	Anna Pease		For	I am a five year resident of 55108 and strongly believe the 2495 Kasota Avenue development should not proceed. It is 2020 and we are having on-going global conversations about environmental concerns. Preserving the small wild spaces we have in our community seems like a no-brainer. We don't need more exposure to pollutants! We urgently need as many clean and healthy spaces as possible that support wildlife and human life. Hurting those spaces is ultimately killing us and creatures that have no say in the matter. By developing the site, we would be stepping backward. We need to be walking forward by thoroughly cleaning up the 22 feet of buried contaminants and restoring the space to a source of health, not disease. Look ahead. Our wealth is held in green healthy spaces - this is the future. This is an opportunity to be a leader in environmental justice - for the sake of our future, please	

Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
3/2/2020 9:51 PM	Tom Lucy		For	do not allow this development to continue. Decisions like this need to be made through the lens of Saint Paul Climate Action and Resilience plan. When that happens the answer becomes clear. These wetlands need to be protected as in doing that we are protecting our residents as well. I for one thank Council Member Jalali for her leadership on this matter.	
3/2/2020 9:50 PM				Decisions like this need to be made through the lens of Saint Paul Climate Action and Resilience plan. When that happens the answer becomes clear. These wetlands need to be protected as in doing that we are protecting our residents as well. I for one thank Council Member Jalali for her leadership on this matter.	+1
3/2/2020 9:07 PM	Jeffrey Hanson		For	Wetlands are critical is all watersheds, even small wetlands. Ducks, frogs, turtles, geese, beetles and all sorts of living things like small wetlands, often more than larger ones. This being a small wetland is no excuse to destroy it. Have worked for many years in the SAP area on recycling and the creation of Floating Treatment Wetlands. It is amazing how small, incremental wetlands can have a positive benefit. It is far worse when we destroy any wetland.SAP needs more wetlands, not less. This appeal should be supported and the building of this parking should NOT be allowed.	
3/2/2020 8:58 PM	Naomi Cohn		For	I support SAPCC's appeal of the 2495 Kasota Avenue project. I'm a 20 year resident of the 55114 zip. Developing the site would ~Expose my neighbors to contaminants from the old ash dump as well as adding to the already heavy burden of heavy truck traffic and air pollution (from 280/94 and industrial traffic). Since the City has, in recent years, approved many new units of residential housing in 55114, the number of residents who would be exposed to the health and safety risks of this development would be greatly increased. ~Reduce our resilience to stormwater and flooding events. Unpaved open space, pristine or not, is vital for human health. Saint Paul should be looking at creating more unpaved open space in our community. Not destroying it. 55114 is already woefully short of open space. Maintaining and adding to wetlands and pervious open space will improve our community's ability to absorb storm and other flooding events, and limit/reduce the heat island effect in the area	
3/2/2020 8:54 PM			For	I mistakenly said I was against. I am against the development. I am FOR the appeal. Here is a repeat of my comment-- We are responsible for more than the economic development of our city. We are also responsible to maintain water purity, human health, wildlife corridors, wetlands, and green space. Covering this site with impermeable surface destroys nesting grounds for turtles that live in the adjacent pond, exposes workers to hazardous waste (the do***entation of which has been lost), further destroys a natural wetland, goes against the city's climate goals, degrades the water in the adjacent natural ponds, and goes against the work of the local community who have been caring for and working to rehabilitate this area. While parking may be needed for Rohn Industries, other sites are available for lease. We need to be restoring wetlands, not paving over them.	
3/2/2020 8:35 PM	Rosemary Slowiak		For	I support the appeal "2495 Kasota Ave - St. Anthony Park Community Council." As a St. Paul resident who has engaged with the St. Paul Climate Action and Resilience	

Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
3/2/2020 8:20 PM	Anna Graber		For	<p>Plan and been very involved in gr*** roots environmental justice work with St. Paul 350, I stand in solidarity with the St. Anthony Park Community Council and all the work they have done to protect their community from harmful pollutants buried at this site that would be released if it is developed. I live next to a brown field that was once considered for development, but dedicated neighbors chose to transform it into green space instead. It is now known as Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary, a community ***et treasured by many. The decades of research and remediation SAPCC has done at the Kasota site exemplify the vision and goals expressed for natural infrastructure and citizen engagement in St. Paul's Climate Action and Resilience Plan. Please grant their appeal.</p> <p>I support the appeal "2495 Kasota Ave - St. Anthony Park Community Council." I am an expectant mother living in SAP near Kasota Ave. I am deeply concerned that sufficient environmental testing has not be performed on this site. Development of this former dumpsite could very well release toxic materials into the air that will settle on my property and that of our neighbors, making it hazardous for our children to play in our yards or for us to garden on our property. We are a young family hoping to live decades in our recently purchased home in this beautiful neighborhood--this kind of development could lower our property values, harm the city's tax base, and push us to a cleaner environment in the suburbs.</p>	
3/2/2020 7:32 PM	Frank Steen			<p>I'm in favor of the appeal. The issue was dealt with 20 years ago - was a good decision at the time. Why would we back track? Safety of the people and environment should take precedence over profit.</p>	+1
3/2/2020 4:11 PM	Chelsea DeArmond		For	<p>I support the appeal “2495 Kasota Ave - St. Anthony Park Community Council.” As a St. Paul resident who has engaged with the St. Paul Climate Action and Resilience Plan and been very involved in gr*** roots environmental justice work with St. Paul 350, I stand in solidarity with the St. Anthony Park Community Council and all the work they have done to protect their community from harmful pollutants buried at this site that would be released if it is developed. I live next to a brown field that was once considered for development, but dedicated neighbors chose to transform it into green space instead. It is now known as Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary, a community ***et treasured by many. The decades of research and remediation SAPCC has done at the Kasota site exemplify the vision and goals expressed for natural infrastructure and citizen engagement in St. Paul's Climate Action and Resilience Plan. Please grant their appeal.</p>	
3/1/2020 11:06 PM	Betty Wheeler		For	<p>Wooden beams, metal pipes, nails, broken bricks, concrete, gl***, etc. (in many soil borings at varying depths) are ample evidence of demolition materials. Widespread asbestos use in 1930s-60s strongly suggests asbestos was discarded here too. Friable asbestos in soil cannot be reliably identified in the field; it must be identified by high tech lab equipment. MN rules require inspection by a certified, licensed AHERA inspector if asbestos is suspected. But NO testing for asbestos has yet been required here. CFR 40, pt. 61, subp. M (NESHAP) requires strict criteria for asbestos removal.</p>	

Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
3/1/2020 10:32 PM	Betty Wheeler		For	<p>The project consultants are not proposing to follow these rules; the MPCA's NAD letter doesn't require them either. The MPCA's current approval basically states the proposer's on-site manager should stop digging if s/he (happens to) 'see' or 'smell' asbestos. Relying on sight and smell are unacceptable criteria. Either leave the site alone or have it remediated, rigorously following NESHAP and MN rules.</p> <p>Many soil borings show both lead and demolition materials across this Kasota site and at all depths of waste. MPCA and MDH have not taken this issue seriously. From Water Gremlin's lead exposure case: The judge required "new changing areas and shower facilities, to ensure workers are free of lead when they leave the facility. [T]he judge ordered Water Gremlin to clean up lead contamination in employees' vehicles and test their homes for lead contamination and abate if needed...It is essential that no lead leave the facility where it may continue to poison children." How will on-site workers change or shower here? They will drag lead home on their clothing. How much lead will blow our way, when the contractors are digging, dumping and sending up clouds of lead into the air? MDH says "no amount of lead exposure is safe for children." Will MPCA, MDH and the City ignore the health of the workers' children here? The children in our community? Development 'as usual' here would be dangerous.</p>	
3/1/2020 9:35 PM	Perry So		For	<p>Pat, thank you for pointing out the mistake that I and others have made. Please register my opinion in my earlier comment as being FOR the appeal, and therefore against the development.</p>	
3/1/2020 8:46 PM	Mari Hirabayashi		For	<p>I would respectfully submit that it is irresponsible to excavate this site unless a full removal/clean-up of contaminants is planned, and that especially in areas with very few wetlands it is important to preserve what wetlands exist.</p>	
3/1/2020 7:03 PM	Sherman Eagles		For	<p>For the last twenty years of my work career I analyzed the safety of life-critical medical devices. Because a failure of these devices could cause severe injury or death, they were rigorously designed and tested to ensure they worked as intended, and analyzed that if they did fail could the consequence of the failure be mitigated. If there was no mitigation, an analysis was performed to justify that the benefits received by the patient population was worth the risk of a failure. If this was not satisfactory, the device could not be used. The safety analysis performed by MPCA for this site is, in my opinion, inadequate to show that there will be no hazardous pollution released if the site is disturbed. When considering whether this is acceptable and worth the risk to health if hazardous material is released, please consider environmental justice, over 26% of the residents at risk downwind of the site in SSAP are in poverty. Please support the appeal.</p>	+1
3/1/2020 3:34 AM	Pat Thompson		For	<p>Please note that multiple commenters have checked the incorrect box for their stance (Against when it should be For), indicating how confusing this form is. They are for the appeal and against the development. I ***ume this will be reconciled in City Council review rather than just counted as-is.</p>	+1
2/29/2020 10:59 PM	Karlyn Eckman			<p>I live in South Saint Anthony and am a water quality researcher at UMN. This site</p>	+1

Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
2/29/2020 7:41 PM	Lisa Habeck			<p>contains 22 feet of buried contaminants from the historic Elm Street Ash Dump. I have studied the pond complex for about 35 years and read the original documents at MPCA, which are now missing. Approvals by City staff, MPCA and Health Departments were not informed by a thorough document review, because archived documents are now lost. Disturbing the soil will release contaminants (asbestos, lead, arsenic, cadmium) that are difficult to detect by observation alone. These will be carried by wind, and if wetted, will flow into the ponds, sewers and Mississippi. I strongly disagree with development at the site and urge you to reconsider this appeal. Doing otherwise negates decades of community, agency and business investment at the Kasota Pond complex.</p>	
2/29/2020 3:29 PM	Pat Thompson		For	<p>I am fully against the proposed parking hub to be built on a known toxic waste site. This is an opportunity for St. Paul to be forward-thinking, follow their own Comprehensive plan, and preserve green space. Land and soil management is crucial to climate change mitigation, and this is a chance for members to show they are not stuck in "business as usual". To ignore glaring detrimental environmental factors and expose citizens to toxins is irresponsible. The Kasota Ponds are teeming with life, thanks to the help of hundreds of volunteers over the last 33 years. The run-off and pollution caused by this development will harm the ponds and the people.</p>	+1
2/29/2020 1:06 PM	Tom Hysell			<p>The Planning Commission members who voted against SAPCC's appeal and city staff have relied on MPCA's opinion. But MPCA has lost important records about this site. 20 years ago SAPCC members read the contents of boxes of files describing the toxic contents of the Elm Street Ash Dump, including 2495 Kasota. Despite this, MPCA has signed off on plans that don't meet its published sampling guidelines for depth and spacing. Will MPCA now approve development on all the brownfields where they have lost records? Is that the standard St. Paul wants for its people? The toxins on this site can't be seen or smelled--the recommended method in the approved work plan--and by the time an "onsite expert" might be called to run a test, the toxins will be exposed to air. Planning Commissioner Taquee Khaled, who studied epidemiology at the U, said during the Commission's discussion, "these things don't get proven out until the people are dead." I don't want that for my city. Please vote yes!</p>	+1
2/28/2020 10:22 PM	Steven Yetter		Against	<p>The development of 2495 Kasota Avenue should NOT proceed. The only appropriate action at this site is to remove the polluted material and restore it to its original wetland. Or, at a minimum, leave the polluted ash dump undisturbed. I am for the appeal of the CUP and against the development.</p> <p>Please, please, please DO NOT ALLOW the development of 2495 Kasota Avenue to proceed. This proposal should never have been approved in the first place. The only appropriate actions at this site are to either remove the polluted material and restore it to its original wetland or leave the polluted ash dump undisturbed. There are other places nearby for Rohn Industries to put their trailer transfer station. Amy Brendmoen, Mitra Jalali, Jane Prince, Dai Thao, Chris Tolbert, Nelsie Yang, Rebecca Noecker, please do the right thing and vote against this proposal.</p>	+1

Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
2/28/2020 10:08 PM	catherine ryan			<p>I am not sure what I think about this proposal yet because I haven't been following it clobusin sely. On the surface, it seems to me that it would be good to have the business use the lot, remain in St. Paul and pay taxes. I have participated in the Kasota Pond clean up and I don't see why having the parking lot across the street would harm the pond, since it is already immersed in not only an urban environment, but also an industrial one. Why would one more business there cause any further damage? Couldn't Rohn's relocation be off-set by a commitment to contribute to the well-being and upkeep of the pond? Or planting more trees in SAP, which has been devastated by Emerald Ash disease? I think it's best to keep our businesses here in St. Paul and require them to be good stewards of the surrounding land.</p>	+1 -3 2
2/28/2020 8:13 PM	Tim Wulling		For	<p>Some of the policies in 2040 Comprehensive Plan that support retaining natural, open spaces follow. Policy LU-21 The Kasota Ponds natural habitat should be protected rather than be split into smaller, unconnected pieces. Policy LU-48 To be consistent with this policy, it would be better to make use of existing parking surfaces in South St. Anthony Park for Rohn Industries' trailer parking, rather than break apart Kasota Ponds which is one of the few remaining natural areas amid the industrial area along Kasota Avenue and extending into South St. Anthony Park. Policy LU-57 With the Kasota railroad crossing and Hwy 280 ramps opposite the driveway to the proposed parking, congestion could back up to the railroad crossing. Policy PR-28 The project would inhibit the ecological function of the performed the the existing larger, contiguous natural space. Kasota Ponds is valuable open space serving ecological functions. Do not diminish it.</p>	+1
2/28/2020 8:07 PM	Ranae Hanson		Against	<p>We are responsible for more than the economic development of our city. We are also responsible to maintain water purity, human health, wildlife corridors, wetlands, and green space. Covering this site with impermeable surface destroys nesting grounds for turtles that live in the adjacent pond, exposes workers to hazardous waste (the do***entation of which has been lost), further destroys a natural wetland, goes against the city's climate goals, degrades the water in the adjacent natural ponds, and goes against the work of the local community who have been caring for and working to rehabilitate this area. While parking may be needed for Rohn Industries, other sites are available for lease. We need to be restoring wetlands, not paving over them.</p>	+1
2/28/2020 8:05 PM	Tim Wulling		For	<p>I live in St. Anthony Park. I support the appeal "2495 Kasota Ave - St. Anthony Park Community Council." I oppose the Rohn Industries Trailer Storage Project at 2495 Kasota Avenue. The project would pave land that is now undeveloped, natural habitat. Further, the land is part of approximately 17 acres of undeveloped land, ponds, and wetlands. Even though the project would affect only 1.67 acres, that land is in the middle of the 17 acres and would break the larger natural habitat into smaller, separated pieces. The four Kasota Ponds and ***ociated wetlands are identified as "public waters and wetlands" in the St. Paul For All 2040 Comprehensive Plan (Map WR-1, p. 201) and by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (map at https://www.fws.gov/wetlands). Kasota Ponds provide habitat for both resident and</p>	+1

Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
2/28/2020 7:27 PM	Sandra Jacobs		Against	migratory species. I support the Rohn Industries development and I oppose the appeal by the council. I think there is a way to get this done in a safe manner. Rohn Industries is a good St. Paul company and we should support our businesses. I am a neighboring business in the district.	-1
12/7/2019 1:04 AM	Perry So		Against	We are new to the neighborhood, and our house is located 1500 feet from the proposed site. Any potential release of toxins from construction work at the site is unacceptable to us particularly as we are expecting our first child. As we work to mitigate against toxins within our structure, this one decision could potentially render all our efforts useless. Langford Park, St Anthony Park Elementary School, the Co-op Pre-School are all well within 3000 feet of this site, so the number of children at risk is much higher than those who live in the immediate vicinity of the site. Rohn Industry is a valued member of our community and we should work together to find sustainable and safe ways for them to grow. It simply shouldn't take precedence over the safety and health of the neighborhood.	+1
12/2/2019 11:42 PM	Mary Boyd-Brent		Against	For those of us living in this area who daily drive past the site where Rohn proposes to build without remediation, this development poses a real threat to health. I do not oppose the development in principle but most definitely do unless remediation occurs first. Thank you.	+1