

Meeting of the Central Corridor Community Advisory Committee
May 15, 2008

Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Kirstin Beach (Chair), Veronica Burt, Bill Carter, Larry Englund, Ken Erickson, Denise Fosse, Metric Giles, Brian Hanninen, Richard Hanson, Karen Inman, Jackie Lunde, Ken Rodgers, Tim Schwartz, Keith Thompson, Jessica Treat, Dave VanHattum, Chip Welling, Anne White, John Wicks.

Members Absent: Fredrick Blocton, Mohamed Egal, Readus Fletcher, Steve Grans, Doug Hennes, Maricruz Hill, Margot Imdieke Cross, David Johnson, Xiong Pao Lee, Jeffrey Peltola, Richard Kleinbaum, Nick Rosenberry, Rozanne Severance, Art Sidner, Ross Skattum, Seng Tchaa, JoAnn Tesar, Chris Worthington, ThaoMee Xiong

Others Present: Jim Alexander, Laura Baenen, Joey Browner, Robin Caufman, Dana Dellis, Donna Drummond, Gary Erickson, Jessica Hill, Kent Hranika, Linda Jungwirth, Shoua Lee, Karen Lyons, Sarah Penman, Rita Rodriguez, Joe Scala, Dave Showalter, Dan Soler, Carol Swenson, Kyle Williams.

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Kirstin Beach called the meeting to order at 5:10 PM. Larry Englund proposed a change to the April minutes and said he would email the correction. Anne White proposed that approval be held over until June meeting to allow more time to review.

a. Chairs Reports

Chair Beach noted that Kirsten Denzer resigned and welcomed Patricia Carlson to her first meeting.

b. Members Reports

Dave VanHattum handed out a list of 50 organizations that passed a resolution similar to Mayor Coleman. Last week, 30 people delivered the packet to Capitol leaders,

Anne White noted that the DCC passed a resolution on 5/14 to include representatives around each station on a committee to select artists and art design.

Jackie Lunde noted that the St. Anthony Park District Council passed resolution to reassess the area near the Raymond Ave. station on University Ave. to replace on street parking where possible.

c. Community Outreach Reports

Rita Rodriguez attended SANDAG fair, which is an opportunity for state agencies to share information

She talked about her conversations with businesses. She gave an example of a bar owner who is concerned about the loss of her patio, impacts to her property, loss of on-street parking. She still has not changed her mind, still doesn't like the project but realizes it is going to happen. Therefore she has decided to take action to address the issues so she is looking at making an investment in purchasing the property next to her and converting it into a shared parking lot.

Chair Beach asked for an update on the business surveys. Ms. Rodriguez explained that she has been going door to door and sending out surveys that addresses parking, access etc... We are receiving them via email, mail, fax and personal contact. We enter the data and then forward comments to appropriate them to City planning staff and engineers. She gave specific examples of AxMan and Metro Dental. She said we are trying to make this personal, so it is going to take time. We've been doing this for three weeks and will continue for several more months as we reach out to the estimated 2500 businesses.

Anne White noted that a MPR reporter called with questions after the meeting. She reassured him that the Central Corridor Project Office outreach staff is addressing it.

2. REVIEW MUNICIPAL CONSENT PROCESS

Chair Beach introduced Gary Erickson, the assistant project director, who presented the Municipal consent process. He started by identifying the statute that requires the process and the timeline for reviewing these plans.

Denise Fosse asked if there is a process in place for doing quality checks. Mr. Erickson indicated that the CCPO has a set of design criteria that we are following.

Ken Rodgers asked what is being done so that it is in a format so it is understandable to the blind community. Concerned that it is not accessible if it has to be asked for.

Veronica Burt asked if there were any open houses prior to the meetings where people can get the information. Suggests that we hold public meetings to share the information.

Gary continued to review the process, stating that the cities and counties must take action to approve or disprove the plans with changes by July 13 in advance of the Met Council's Sept. 2008 submission to the FTA. He reviewed the plans content including track location, station location, roadway features, sidewalks, pedestrian crossing, traffic signals etc... Next he reviewed the suggested process for reading the plans as described in the Citizen's Guide to reading the municipal consent plans.

Anne White and Veronica Burt asked for clarification on the May 29 public hearings. There will be a one hour open house prior to the hearing, followed by a presentation about the process and then an opportunity for the public to provide written and oral comments.

Larry Englund asked for clarification by going through the example. He could go to a library, look at the plans, find the appropriate page and then review the information he was looking for.

If he had a comment, he could write it on the comments sheets provided and submit them to his/her respective City for consideration in their consent decision.

Veronica Burt asked if this would be the last public hearing for this project. There will be SDEIS public hearings later this summer. We will continue to work with the project partners and hold public meetings.

Ms. Burt asked about the SDEIS process. This is design details, the SDEIS will be related to the environmental and community impacts.

Metric Giles asked what happens to comments and how the public comments will be addressed. In this process, the cities and counties will be reviewing comments and deciding what to forward to the Met Council to address this process.

Dave VanHattum asked what expectations we can have that the cities and counties will listen to their comments.

Mr. Englund asked who we should lobby with our comments. County commissioners and city councilors.

Chip Welling asked if there would be a hearing on the FEIS. No, but there will be one later this summer for the SDEIS.

Anne White asked if the public could attend the briefings we make to the county and city. The meetings are part of the board or council meetings so they will be open to the public.

Ken Rodgers asked Robin Cauffman to send the dates of all the meetings to the CAC.

3. STATION DESIGN PROCESS

Jim Alexander introduced the station design process and timeline. He stresses that we are just introducing the concepts and will be working on station design over the next 8 months or so.

Ken Rodgers reminded us to explain the stations in detail.

Kyle Williams reviewed the design team that has over 100 years of combined experience on projects around the country and many with local roots. He reviewed the general principles that influences station design such as safety, accessibility and experience. He talked about issues such as wind protection, safety and comfort. Next he reviewed the slides showing the location of station components such as ticket vending machines and shelters. He reviewed pictures of column wraps with metal, brick or concrete applications, decorative railings and platform surfaces made with brick patterns.

Next, Mr. Williams reviewed the station concepts for split side platforms, side platform and center platforms. He stressed the importance of making timeless, durable structures. They are looking at metals such as copper, zinc or stainless steel because of their durability. We are

looking at sustainability components such as adding solar panels to the top to capture energy from sunlight in summer peak days. Other principles include transparency of shelter for security and to not block views. Stations include heating elements,

Richard Hanson said he has a suggestion for the Snelling Station to reflect the former street car shops. It will be included

Mr. Englund said he likes the concept of keeping some elements consistent, concerned about lack of public artists on the design team. Mr. Williams did note that James Garrett with 4RM+ULA is a local artist.

Chip Welling said he is concerned about plastic wrapping on shelters as well as buses because it limits visibility; it is hard to see where you are going. He said he'd favor safety over art. Kyle indicated that it would have to be extremely transparent.

Ms. White thanked Kyle for his presentation. She likes the clean style we are presenting. However, she is concerned about balance between consistency and public's desire to have both the station design and public art reflect each neighborhood. She thinks the proposed station design is not appropriate or reflective of most of the neighborhoods along University Avenue and considers the opportunities for artwork far too restrictive and limited. Invited Kyle to talk to the DCC about the station design and how it can reflect each of the neighborhoods. Kyle noted that the purpose was to have a delicate station. He did note that the artists will have plenty of time to comment on the station design once they are under contract.

Mr. Rodgers appreciated Kyle's note that we are only at 10% design and have time to design. Ken asked if we would have a model. Yes, we will have

Mr. Giles asked if the infill stations are being designed. They will have a consistent design. Metric Giles asked if there are opportunities for green or living art (plants) in the station. Kyle noted that we looked at it, but maintenance and vandalism is an issue. Also, while the plants are immature, it looks like a cage for the vines to grow on.

Ms. Burt asked about the substations. These are not part of the stations

Chair Beach asked each CAC member to share one comment or concern about the station design.

- Ms. White's primary concern is ability of community to participate in selection of the artists.
- Jackie Lunde echoes Ms. White's concerns and ability to reflect history of their neighborhood
- Ken Erickson thinks that the proposed station design has a lot of flexibility.
- Margot Imdieke stressed importance of balancing transparency and safety. Concerned about vision loss and people not being able to see the clear glass partitions.
- Ken Rodgers reiterated the need to make sure that information kiosks and other features have alternative formats. Braille only is not a suitable way.
- Larry Englund likes the general direction. Suggests that the community process be presented soon to inform people how they can participate.

- John Wicks liked the general simplicity of the design and thinks it will work throughout the corridor. Transparency is definitely a must. Suggests enlarging the seating area to accommodate more people. Concerned about roof coverage.
- Veronica Burt said she would like to have a schedule for both the SDEIS and municipal consent process.

4. NEXT MEETING

The next CAC meeting is scheduled for June 19, 2008 at 5:00 PM.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Co-Chair Beach asked that CAC members turn in their comments sheets and adjourned the meeting at 7:01 PM.

Prepared by Robin Cauffman, Manager of Public Involvement

Attachment 1: Future Meeting Topics

Responses to the following question: Identify the topics you are most interested in learning more about and presentation ideas for future CAC meetings.

- Flexibility in locating/adding stations (13) Reported analysis on 12/20/2007 CAC agenda.
- Reason for U tunnel (10) Presented tunnel and at grade route at 11/15/2007 CAC meetings.
- Job Opportunities (8) Noted need for 75 part time bus drivers and 26 mechanics due to transit demand following the collapse of the I-35 Bridge, 8/16/07 CAC. Forwarded CAC DBE press release 12/17/07. Handed out new DBE brochure and notified CAC that DBE links added to website, 3/20/08.
- Issues of cost and under-lying assumptions (6) – Presented overview of project budget at 6/21/07 CAC meeting. Analysis and costs of additional stations on 12/20/2007 agenda.
- Connecting Bus Service (6) – Presented at 6/21/07 CAC meeting.
- Construction mitigation (6) Karri Plowman shared work of BAC at 10/18/2007 CAC.
- Future expansion (cut short now or extends system in future) (5). Presented potential routes to connect to Union Depot 11/15/2007 CAC
- Access to businesses and community services during construction (4) 1/17/08 CAC talked about University Ave. reconstruction.
- Environmental Justice Analysis (4) Initiated conversation 8/16/07 CAC; submitted summary memo at 9/20/07 CAC.
- Parking, including Hide and Ride (4) Discussed at 3/20/08 CAC meeting
- St. Paul's Development Plan (4) Presented at 5/17/07 CAC meeting.
- EIS Presentation (3) Presented at 7/19/07 CAC meeting. Presented review of SDEIS on 11/15/07. Noted SDEIS timeline at 3/20/08 CAC meeting.
- Station information including design (3) Presented Dale, Lexington, Snelling, Fairview, Raymond and Westgate station at 9/20/07 CAC. Station standard design and Capitol stations planned for 10/15/07 CAC. Discussed West Bank at 11/15/2007 CAC.
- Timelines with deadlines for decisions (3) Presented issues matrix at 9/20/07 CAC. Noted SDEIS timeline and municipal consent dates at 3/20/08 CAC meeting.
- Community Benefits Agreement (2)
- Gentrification (2)
- Historic sites along the line/route (2) - Pointed out historic buildings on 4/19/07 CAC tour.
- Residential development and safety (2) Outreach staff reported at 3/20/08 CAC meeting that they received safety certification and will be putting together a safety program.
- Signal pre-emption or prioritization for LRT (2) 1/17/08 CAC presented initial traffic signalization and street crossing plans. Talked about signalization at 3/20/08 CAC.
- Summary Report on RFP process (procedure) (2)
- Access to line (1) Discussed pedestrian access at 1/17/08 and 3/20/08 CAC meetings.
- Bike Lane (1)
- Techniques to reach all constituencies (1) Brainstormed stakeholders and public involvement strategies at 2/15/07 CAC.
- Union Depot (1). Presented potential to connect to Union Depot 11/15/2007 CAC.
- Very detailed information must be provided (1)
- Visual simulations of corridor design (1) – Include at beginning of CAC meetings. Showed visualization of 5 block segment of corridor with potential design elements at 3/20/08 CAC meeting.
- Working groups and clear outputs/products (1). Started using workstation format at 10/18/2007 CAC.
- Balance budget outcome with outcome of meeting people
- Best way to Reach ELL
- Communication Plan – Presented to the CAC on 3/15/07.
- Discussion around overlapping service “sheds” for downtown stations vs. lack on parts of University (How was station placement determined)/equitable access.
- Financing (other options)
- Streetscaping - 1/17/08 CAC talked about University Ave. reconstruction.

Attachment 2: Responses

1. Identify one thing about the proposed station design that works well and why?

- Waiting with local artists to customize the look to fit the neighborhood.
- I like the open feel, the consistency and simplicity, even though it is a bit dull. I think keeping it simple will allow the stations to last and not become tired looking or easily look dated.
- Simplicity of design is very powerful
- Like it simple with flexibility for community character portrayed thru the art.
- Solar energy opportunity on platform shelter roofs. Can we use this to power the heaters & message signs?
- Need to be as transparent as possible.
- Overall station design (all 3) appears to meet the needs of the customer.
- Design seems to have a lot of flexibility for the length of the corridor.
- I appreciate the principles of transparency and safety. Not obstructing views through the station seems important.

2. Identify one thing about the proposed station design that needs improvement and why?

- I still believe we can do better as far as number of stops. I think it is extremely important to the working people especially with ever increasing cost of gas and the need to move away from vehicle dependence. My hope is that the counties, cities and the Met Council will come together and do the right thing for our communities.
- I'd suggest electronic signs that show the number of minutes until the next train arrives, such as the next train arrives in 7 minutes. I have seen these in other cities and counties.
- Enlarge enclosure areas to enable many people to wait in them.
- Yes needs more space to stay warm in the winter and must have early community involvement in art. Art cannot appear too commercialized.
- Please make sure you have a group committee for each station that's brought together to give ideas for public art to give flavor of the area (history, growing live plants). I would love to see greenery.
- I am concerned about the vinyl treatment on station glass. If that is the same as the wrap put on buses and light rail vehicles then I am not supportive because this would reduce visibility and so undermine safety.
- Flat roof design may be good for non snow weather but it seems that snow would stay on roof.
- It is premature to speak about this.
- Don't use the vinyl wrap used on the buses. They are obstructive.

Attachment 3: CAC meeting March 20 17, 2008 – Meeting Feedback

1. Results

Results tallied from feedback forms distributed toward end of meeting. Form asked members to grade overall meeting performance and today's meeting format on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 was the lowest and 5 the highest. Grades are replicated in columns to the right.	Overall Meeting Performance	Today's Meeting Format
	2	3.5
	4	4
	5	5
	4	4
	3	4
	4	4
	4	4
	4	4
	4	4
	4	4
Average	3.8	4.1

2. Comments

- Too much lecture with detail that CAC members do not need to know. I feel much of tonight's presentation was past information that was re-iterated. I think review of on-line material supplies, some preliminary overview but the meetings drill down to a level of detail that is repetitive or only different in such subtle nuances that nothing is really new information.
- Very good presentation