



PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING Meeting Minutes

Date: February 2, 2006
Time: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Location: Room 319, City Hall
Attendees: See attached roster

Agenda

1. Housekeeping
 - a. Approval of minutes from last meeting
2. Downtown Two-Way Analysis
3. System Planning Framework
 - a. Street Types and Place Types
 - b. Pedestrian and Bicycle Gap Analyses
4. Streetcar Study
5. Public Workshops

Summary of Items Discussed

Housekeeping

Minutes of the November 10, 2005 meeting were approved by the PSC.

Downtown Two-Way Analysis

A map showing the base two-way scenario in Downtown Minneapolis was handed out to the PSC group for their review (see Base Two-Way Alternative figure). Charleen Zimmer indicated that the base scenario shown on the map is not a proposed plan but shows the maximum possible extent of a two-way system in downtown. Several factors, such as impact on on-street parking, intersection turn lanes and access to parking garages, will be considered in determining if two-way operation in downtown is feasible and to what extent and where it would make sense.

Questions raised by the PSC regarding the analysis are as follows. Responses are noted where made:

- How will two-way operation affect on-street parking? Zimmer indicated that the goal is to keep as much parking as possible. On streets where parking would only be allowed on one side, the side with the potential for the most spaces (longest length of uninterrupted curb) or the side where the adjoining buildings most need on-street parking or other curb activities such as valet parking, taxis or drop-off would be used.
- Would it make more sense to study the two-way scenario with the current contraflow bus lanes as the base rather than the double-width, two-way transit lanes on Marquette?

Zimmer noted that the consultant team was asked to study the two-way transit lanes on Marquette as part of the base analysis because this allows the greatest extent of two-way street operation and provides an opportunity to assess the traffic impacts of the Marquette transit scenario. Other transit alignments will be explored with two-way and/or one-way operation.

- In addition to traffic flow, will other factors like safety implications, impact on air pollution, and costs be also analyzed? The intent is to start with the analysis of traffic flow and other factors will be analyzed as needed.
- Will impact to bike routes be considered as part of the analysis of two-way operation (for example what will be the impacts on the bike lanes on Hennepin Ave)? Yes, the impact to bike routes will be considered.
- When will the two-way analysis be ready? The base scenario will be ready by the next PSC meeting and iterations will follow.

System Planning Framework

Street Types and Place Types

Draft copies of the System Planning Framework were handed out to the PSC members including the planning process flowchart and tables showing street type and place type characteristics (see System Planning Framework). Fred Dock provided a summary of the planning process using the flow chart. The following questions were raised by the PSC. Responses are noted where appropriate:

- Does this planning process reflect current thinking? Yes.
- Are we looking at building characteristics also? Yes.
- Will the forecast volumes from the Metro Council regional model be used for the analysis? Yes.
- Does this process reflect a shift in the City's thinking on street design? Yes. Zimmer noted that traditionally we looked at only how streets function and this is not always consistent with the land uses and people activities taking place along particular streets. Trip characteristics on many streets have changed over time. There is a need to recategorize streets based on both the function of the street and the places and people activities along the street.
- Does the process take in consideration only cars or all modes? Zimmer noted that this process will help to identify places where there is modal competition for space. The needs of all modes will be evaluated. This will provide a basis for developing a corridor design process that establishes modal priorities for the utilization of building face to building face space.
- What is the source of the 'Place Type' data? The source of the Place Type data is *The Minneapolis Plan* prepared by CPED. CPED is currently working on updating the comprehensive plan for the City.
- Will the input of neighborhood groups be involved in this process? Yes, through the public meeting process established for the project.

- Does this process take into account the major changes to the zoning code? Yes. Pam Miner indicated that the last zoning overhaul was done in 1999 and that the CPED is currently working on updating the zoning in Downtown Minneapolis.

Dock gave a brief description of the characteristics of street types and place types. He indicated that streets are segmented and different street types can occur along various segments of a single street corridor that currently has a single functional classification. The following comments/questions were raised by the PSC. Responses are noted where appropriate:

- Connie Kozlak noted that there are parkway streets that are under Park Board jurisdiction that have a “collector” functional classification. This needs to be defined better. Tim Brown indicated that the Park Board would not favor a higher classification for parkways and that they should be treated differently as they have a unique function and character.
- In Table 2, what is the meaning of providing ‘limited’ driveway access? Dock said that limited means that access to individual properties would be preferred from side streets or the rear of the lot but would be provided when no other alternative exists. This would be determined on a parcel by parcel basis.
- Is the pedestrian aspect missing from the process? No. Another layer addresses the pedestrian space and details of this layer will show up later in the process.
- Is the intent to classify all the streets in the City? It is the intent to classify all the major roads (functional classification collector and above). All downtown streets will be included.
- Tim Brown indicated that the table, under “transit on parkway streets” should say ‘No’ rather than ‘Limited’ to reflect the parkway model. There are some parkways on which there are bus routes but that is not desirable. After some discussion, it was suggested to use ‘Provisional’ or “By Exception” for transit on parkways.
- Pam Miner suggested that an “activity center” category be used rather than the “downtown” category because some activity centers outside downtown may have characteristics most similar to the downtown street category (for example the Uptown area). An Uptown small area plan is underway with CPED which can provide more direction on this.
- Jim Grube indicated that ‘provisional’ connection to freeway system for connector streets should allow connection to freeways only in cases where it is absolutely necessary.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Gap Analysis

Praveena Pidaparathi provided a summary of the sidewalk and bicycle gap analysis and maps showing gaps in the sidewalk and bicycle system were handed out to the PSC. The following questions/comments were raised by the PSC:

- Are future bicycle projects based on recommendations from the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)? Don Pflaum indicated that there is a process for future projects which includes input from BAC and neighborhood groups. The BAC is the appropriate forum for decisions on bicycle projects. The materials presented are based on work by the BAC.

- There seem to be a lot of off-street bikeways in NE Minneapolis? In NE Minneapolis, there is more street width available to accommodate future off-street bikeways.
- Jim Grube mentioned that Hennepin County has conducted a countywide Bike Gap Analysis and has worked with the City to coordinate city, county and regional trail systems. Pflaum indicated that findings of the Hennepin County Bike Gap analysis were incorporated into the gap analysis.
- Why is there an on-street as well as an off-street gap identified on 26th Street? Pflaum replied that, based on neighborhood input, an on-street bikeway was feasible on 26th Street in the short-term. The long-term goal is to have an off-street bikeway.
- It was suggested that improvements on bikeways should also be based on their function (for example recreational vs. commuter). North-south bikeways are mostly used for commuting and facilities like showers should be provided in Activity Centers along these routes.
- Has quality of sidewalk been considered in the gap analysis? Not at this stage, but condition will be included in later stages to the extent possible.
- Some of the gaps in the sidewalk system are along cemeteries - why? Answer will be researched with City staff.
- It was suggested that gaps on the sidewalk system caused by lack of plowing should be included. This is an implementation, rather than a facility system issue, and will be addressed when implementation strategies and action items are discussed.
- Is there a similar mapping of urban forest available? Tim Brown noted that the Park Board is in the process of mapping every tree in the City in GIS.
- The downtown skyways, tunnels, crosswalks and bridges on freeways were also suggested by the PSC to be added to the pedestrian facilities.

Street Car Study

Charleen Zimmer indicated that the scope for the street car study is currently under preparation. She asked if the PSC would be willing to take on this additional responsibility and meet once a month. The PSC agreed to this and requested that a schedule of meetings be sent out soon. Zimmer stated that this process would proceed with the caveat that, if the schedule for the streetcar study began to impact the Action Plan negatively, the streetcar project might move forward on a separate track.

Public Workshops

The next round of public workshops to be held in April 2006 is currently being scheduled. The PSC will be provided information when the dates and locations of the meetings are determined.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Action Items

Tim Brown	Provide Tree GIS layer
MMA	Verify state statute concerning not allowing sidewalks adjacent to cemeteries

**PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE
RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

Meeting Date/Time: February 2, 2006, 4:00-6:00 PM

Location: Room 319, City Hall

OFFICIAL MEMBER	NAME	ORGANIZATION	PRESENT
X	Abadi, Fred	Minneapolis Public Works	X
X	Akre, John	Northeast Sub-Area	X
X	Anderson, Richard	Mpls Bicycle Advisory Committee	X
X	Brown, Tim	Mpls Parks	X
X	Dewar, Caren	Southwest Sub-Area	X
X	DeWitt, John	East Sub-Area	X
X	Fabry, Klara	Minneapolis Public Works	X
X	Gerber, Darrell	Southwest Sub-Area	X
X	Greenberg, Bob	Downtown Sub-Area Business Rep	X
X	Grube, Jim	Hennepin County	X
X	Harrington, Adam	Metro Transit – Service Dept.	X
X	Indieke Cross, Margot	Mpls Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities	X
X	Johnson, William	Transit Rider Representative	X
X	Keysser, Janet	Transit Rider Representative	X
X	Kjonaas, Rick	Mn/DOT – SALT	
X	Kozlak, Connie	Metropolitan Council	X
X	Larson, Mike	Minneapolis CPED	
X	McLaughlin, Mike	Downtown Council	
X	Moe, Susan	FHWA	
X	O’Keefe, Tom	Mn/DOT – Metro	X
X	Pearce Ruch, Kerri	Northwest Sub-Area	X
X	Qvale, Pat	Opt-Out Provide Representative	X
X	Scallen, Maureen	Mpls Convention & Visitors Assoc	
X	Schuster, Lea	Southeast Sub-Area	X
X	Scott, Pat	Mpls TMO	X
X	VanHeel, John	Downtown Sub-Area Resident Rep	X
X	Walter, Doug	Southeast Sub-Area	
X	Miner, Pam	Minneapolis CPED	X
Alternate	Olson, Glenn	Mpls TMO Alternate	X
Alternate	Opatz, Mike	Op-Out Provider Alternate	
Project Mgr	Zimmer, Charleen	Mpls Public Works (Zan Associates)	X
Mailing	Gieseke, Mark	Mn/DOT – Metro State Aid	
Mailing	Griffith, John	Mn/DOT – Metro	

