

Meeting of the Central Corridor Community Advisory Committee April 17, 2008

Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Kirstin Beach (Co-chair), Bill Carter, Larry Englund, Readus Fletcher, Denise Fosse, Metric Giles, Steve Grans, Richard Hanson, David Johnson, Jackie Lunde, Xiong Pao Lee, Jeffrey Peltola, Ken Rodgers, Tim Schwarz, Rozanne Severance, Art Sidner, Keith Thompson, Jessica Treat, Dave VanHattum, Chip Welling, Anne White, John Wicks, ThaoMee Xiong..

Members Absent: Jerry Blakey (Co-chair) Fredrick Blocton, Veronica Burt , Kristen Denzer, Mohamed Egal, Ken Erickson, Brian Hanninen, Doug Hennes, Maricruz Hill, Karen Inman, Margot Imdieke Cross, Richard Kleinbaum, Nick Rosenberry, Ross Skattum, Seng Tchaa, JoAnn Tesar, Chris Worthington.

Others Present: Jim Alexander, Laura Baenen, Robin Caufman, Dana Dellis, Donna Drummond, Mark Fuhrmann, Jessica Hill, Harvey Jaeger, Linda Jungwirth, Shoua Lee, Christina Morrison, Sarah Penman, Joe Scala, Rich Rovang, Dan Soler, Carol Swenson, VaMegn Thoj.

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

- a. **Chairs Reports.** Chair Beach announced the Jerry Blakey had resigned and introduced new CAC members, Patricia Carlson, replacing Laura Nevitt for District 6, and Doug Carlson from the Marcy Holmes Neighborhood Association. Co-Chair Beach reported on the Met Council's April 9, 2008 meeting noting that meeting started with an update of the legislative actions including passage of a transportation bill that includes ¼ cent sales tax. She also noted that five of the seven metro area counties approved the implementation of the sales tax that will take effect on July 1, 2008. She also reported that the Governor line item vetoed the \$70M for Central Corridor in the bonding bill.
- b. **CAC members report.** Chair Beach asked if anyone had anything to report. Dave VanHattum reported on the CCMC meeting and the resolution that was presented by Mayor Coleman. He noted that he understands that the CAC is not a voting body but asked that the minutes reflect his support for the resolution and suggested that other community groups consider passing a similar resolution. Anne White noted that the DCC passed a similar resolution and suggested that that CAC forward a resolution supporting appropriation of \$70M. Chair Beach reiterated the CAC is an advisory body and not structured to vote on issues.
- c. **COC reports.** Chair Beach invited Jessica Hill and Shoua Lee to report on their recent outreach activities

Jessica Hill and traffic engineer Dan Soler met with neighborhoods regarding the Washington Ave. transit mall traffic studies including Marcy Holmes, Prospect Park, Stadium Village, Cedar Riverside and West Bank to review traffic studies. Next week they'll be week meeting with Southeast Como. She noted that Prospect Park is concerned about traffic impacts at East river Road and Franklin.

Shoua Lee is working on issues related to on-street parking issues and business impacts. She co-hosted a meeting with Xiongpao, ThaoMee and Khue Yang from the BAC for Hmong community that was attended by nearly 40 businesses. She has also been meeting one-on-one with businesses to survey them and seek feedback from business and property owners on parking issues.

Rozanne Severance commented that accessible parking needs such as space for vans with lifts should be considered. She noted that it is difficult to find parking as it is.

ThaoMee Xiong asked when the survey results would be compiled. Robin Caufman noted that it was going to take over a month to complete the survey of the 2500 businesses in the corridor. As summary will be compiled and presented to the CAC as soon as possible.

2. TRAFFIC STUDIES FOR WASHINGTON AVE. TRANSIT/PEDESTRIAN MALL

[See Presentation.](#)

Dan Soler reviewed the traffic studies, starting with Traffic Study #1 that shows that Washington Ave. can be designed to accommodate buses, cars and LRT. Mr. Soler paused for questions on Traffic Study #1

Chair Beach asked if cross streets will be open to traffic. Yes, like Nicollet Mall.

Doug Carlson asked for clarification whether there would be one or two lanes in each direction if Washington Ave. remained open to traffic. One lane west bound and one lane east bound.

Rozanne Severance asked how students would be kept from traffic. Mr. Soler acknowledged the concern and that level of detail would come later with more detailed engineering.

Mr. Soler continued by reviewing Traffic Study #3 that looks at traffic impacts on 48 intersections around the University of Minnesota. This study shows that there are currently 6 intersections that fail. Closing Washington Ave, to through traffic would create 5 more failing intersections. Mr. Soler than reviewed potential mitigation strategies for those 5 intersections before pausing for questions.

Ken Rodgers asked how the I-35 closure affects traffic studies. Mr. Soler noted that some data was gathered before the collapse. New data collected after the collapse is adjusted based on a correction factor that the City of Minneapolis calculated using before and after studies.

Doug Carlson stated that he understood that there are 25,000 cars and 1500 buses a day on Washington Ave. The 25,000 estimate reflects post 1-35W bridge collapse. Prior to Aug. 1, 2007, there were approximately 19,000 cars per day.

Chair Beach asked about the scope of the study and whether emergency vehicles were included. The study looked at a 2.9 square mile area and 48 intersections. Access of emergency vehicles will be discussed with emergency service providers.

Mr. Soler continued by reviewing Traffic Study #4 that looks at traffic impacts to the intra-campus road network. The purpose of this study was to identify improvements needed to mitigate traffic impacts. He paused for more questions.

Ken Rodgers asked if all of the intersections mentioned in this study signalized and will they be accessible? Yes, if the improvement is made as part of the project they will be ADA accessible to meet requirements.

Richard Hanson suggested more pedestrian ways.

Next, Dan Soler reviewed 4 potential bus route scenarios.

- Scenario 1: Buses terminated at intermodal stations at edge of campus
- Scenario 2A: Buses rerouted to 10th Ave. Bridge
- Scenario 2B: Buses rerouted to Pleasant St.
- Scenario 3: Buses remain on Washington Ave. transit/ped mall

He noted that regardless of whether or not buses operate on Washington Avenue, there will need to be a west bound and east bound traffic lane to allow for fire, police and ambulance access.

Rozanne Severance asked about the campus connector. UofM would need to decide. It would generally follow the same route as the Rte 16. However they may choose to replace with a circulator.

Chip Welling asked what would happen to the campus connector between St. Paul and Minneapolis campuses. They would continue to operate.

Doug Carlson asked if scenarios 2A and 2B would have a reduced number of buses. There will be a reduction in buses due to elimination of Rte 50 and reduction of Rte 16.

3. NEXT STEPS

University Avenue Design Elements Update

Robin Caufman gave an update on the University Ave. design elements and reported on the community outreach activities. The outreach team has held multiple public meetings and is starting to survey the businesses.

Chip Welling suggested sampling transit riders regarding their destinations and cross checking the survey responses with transit boarding data.

Anne White commented that neighborhoods are concerned about “park and hidlers” parking in the residential areas.

ThaoMee Xiong suggested surveying ethnicity of the businesses and their clients.

Station Design Process

Jim Alexander reviewed the station design process.

Denise Fosse stated that it is important to provide protection from the elements.

Larry Englund questioned the process by which public art opportunities were identified and wondered if artists had been involved in identifying the opportunities as presented. The citizens at the city’s development planning meetings identified a number of opportunities for public art, some of which were not necessarily within the stations themselves. He noted that the best design occurs when artists are part of the design team. CCPO is working on finalizing the process for selecting the artists that will be focused on the station. We want to avoid “plop” art.

Anne White expressed her concern about the process and not engaging the artists earlier on.

Rozanne Severance noted her concern over the material used in the platforms because tile or other materials can be slippery in snow and rain. Also suggested that the wraps on the columns or other art avoid sharp edges, things that jut out, etc...

Richard Hanson recalled a previous discussion about station design; that Central Corridor LRT will be less than Hiawatha. Budget for Central of \$3.7 million is similar for Hiawatha. From lessons learned on Hiawatha, we will not be doing “plop” art.

Jeff Peltola said that it seems we are ahead of the how the process went for Hiawatha because we are still in preliminary engineering. Mr. Alexander noted that we are working on a process to get artists under contract.

ThaoMee Xiong asked about the artist’s selection process and the role of the CAC. We’ll provide more detail next month.

Dave VanHattum suggested that trains be wrapped as part of the art program.

Municipal Consent

Jim Alexander continued by reviewing the municipal consent process. There were no questions.

4. NEXT MEETING

The next CAC meeting is scheduled for May 15, 2008 at 5:00 PM.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Co-Chair Beach asked that CAC members turn in their comments sheets and adjourned the meeting at 7:00 PM.

Prepared by Robin Caufman, 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, 4/17/18 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

CAC members were asked which of the alternative bus route service scenario they prefer and why?

- Scenario 1: Buses terminated at intermodal stations at edge of campus
- Scenario 2A: Buses rerouted to 10th Ave. Bridge
- Scenario 2B: Buses rerouted to Pleasant Street
- Scenario 3: Buses remain on Washington Avenue transit/ped mall

Following is a summary of the CAC comments:

Responses to the following question: Which bus route service scenario do you prefer and why?

- Scenario 3: I prefer having the buses remaining on Washington Avenue to ensure that public transit is available to as many as possible. We need to get to of what is convenient for cars. Public transit nurtures economic development & strong communities.
- Scenario 3: Bus routes need not be cast in stone, if the scenario preliminary elected does not work well it can always be revised.
- Scenarios 2A & 2B: I believe that bus service should be continuous between the downtowns. 10th Avenue Bridge seems a good compromise. Pleasant Avenue route would impact Washington Avenue Bridge. What structural modifications would differ if either route was preferred?
- Scenario 3
- Scenario 3: Hard to say without ridership & CEI impact. This was shared with CCMC; why not share it with CAC? A major absence in my opinion. Question?
- There are too many variables to feel strongly about any one scenario. The idea of putting all the buses on University & 4th isn't ideal for residents but it might be better for the mall environment. As a transit rider who may want to take a bus through the area, the idea of getting off to switch to a train and then getting off again to go back on a bus may not be ideal.
- Scenario 2B: The northern part of east bank campus needs transportation options. People need a choice of which destination gets them closes to where they work or go to school, especially in the winter. I don't want the bus routes that go through the Seward neighborhood to be eliminated because of Washington Avenue pedestrian mall.
- Scenario 3
- No comments in regard to bus routes.
- Scenario 2A: Important to keep bus service available to cross the river. 10th street is better than Pleasant to Washington Avenue Bridge.
- Scenario 3
- Scenario 3: Most effective for transit services.

Attachment 3: CAC meeting April 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
	3	3
	5	5
	4	4
	4	4
	4	4
	4	4
	3.5	3.5
	--	1
	4	4
	5	4
	4	4
	Average	4.1
Number of respondents	10	11

2. Comments

- Getting better
- Need more time to address community concerns
- Provide more relevant information in regards to status of funding and impact on neighborhood. Example; Washington Avenue, we believe that “x” amount of people would be impacted in certain ways by a reduction or increase in transit options. There is a lot of talk about the changes proposed & models created. Please connect those changes to the impacts on communities.
- Add more time for evaluation discussion & shouldn't restrict CAC from a collective voice on this. Bring up funding impasse at future outreach with business community, etc.
- The power points are difficult to see, maps in particular.
- Can CAC members be more actively involved in artist selection & station design? I think it's important that CAC or the community has more influence over this issue.