



West Broadway Transit Study

Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #6

October 31, 2016 2:30– 3:30 PM

Davis Center, Minneapolis Public Schools

1250 W Broadway Avenue, Minneapolis, MN 55411

Room N1-101

Meeting Agenda

- | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Introductions | 2:30 – 2:40 | |
| 2. Study Results Refresher | 2:40 – 2:50 | Information |
| a. Review of study results | | |
| b. Information on other regional transit projects | | |
| 3. Potential LPA Recommendation | 2:50 – 3:20 | Discussion |
| a. Consideration of shorter alignment | | |
| b. Review of potential LPA resolution | | |
| 4. Final PAC Meeting to vote on Recommended LPA | 3:25 – 3:30 | Information |



West Broadway Transit Study Policy Advisory Committee Meeting

April 15, 2016 1:00– 2:30 PM
Davis Center, Minneapolis Public Schools
1250 W Broadway Avenue, Minneapolis, MN 55411
Assembly Room

PAC Member and Alternate Attendees

Chair Gary Cunningham, Metropolitan Council
Pat Backen, City of Robbinsdale Member
Sean Broom, City of Minneapolis Alternate
Peter Wagenius, City of Minneapolis Alternate
Don Samuels, Minneapolis Board of Education
Larry Fonnest, City of Golden Valley Member

Joanie Clausen, City of Golden Valley Alternate
Alexis Pennie, CAC Co-Chair
Tina Sanz, Hennepin County Alternate
Rob Hanson, West Broadway Business and Area
Coalition Alternate

Other Attendees

Charles Carlson, Metro Transit
C Terrence Anderson, Metro Transit
Michael Mechtenberg, Metro Transit
Kelly Hoffman, Hennepin County
Faith Xiong, West Broadway Business and Area
Coalition
Steve Hay, City of Minneapolis

Cole Hiniker, Metropolitan Council
Kristen Murray, Juxtaposition Arts
Scottie Tuska, Jordan Area Community Council
Emily Goellner, City of Golden Valley
Mona Elabbady, SRF Consulting
Adele Hall, SRF Consulting
Charleen Zimmer, Zan Associates

1. Introductions

- Councilmember Cunningham started the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves.

2. Study Results Refresher

- Mona Elabbady provided an overview of the technical analysis that was completed over the summer. She started by reviewing the two alternatives that were studied:
 - Streetcar from Nicollet Mall to North Memorial Hospital: nearly 5 miles long with 19 stations.
 - Arterial BRT from downtown to Robbinsdale Station: approximately 7 miles long with 23 stations.



3. Study Updates

- Mona Elabbady provided the results of the two ridership “what if” tests conducted to answer questions the PAC raised at their last meeting. The first test was to determine how ridership would be affected if streetcar was extended to Lake Street with 15-minute frequencies and the Route 14 operated with 30-minute frequencies. The second test was to determine how ridership would be affected by extension of the streetcar to Lake Street with 15-minute frequency, 30 minute frequency and limited-stop service on Route 14, and additional streetcar stations at Logan Avenue, 4th Street, and 3rd Avenue North.
- The results of the first tests showed an increase of approximately 100 daily forecast riders. The results of the second test showed an increase of approximately 200 daily forecast riders. These results are for West Broadway streetcar stations only, and do not include ridership on the Nicollet-Central line.
- Staff dug into the test results to see why ridership growth was modest with these new assumptions. There are two strong reasons:
 - The ridership model assumes implementation of all projects included in the Transportation Policy Plan. This includes Bottineau LRT, C Line, and D Line, in addition to existing regular-route bus service in other corridors and the service changes planned for as part of the West Broadway project. The North Minneapolis transit market is large, but ridership is spread over multiple lines.
 - There are fewer than 40 people each day transferring between Routes 14 and 18 today, indicating that there are not many people who are currently making this trip. This observation was not an input to the model, rather it was used to check the sensibility of the results.
- Gary Cunningham noted that Green Line changed many routes when it was implemented; and asked if the ridership forecast assumes all existing routes are in place. Charles Carlson responded that the forecast assumed that local buses stay for local access but at a lower frequency. Several improvements to connecting routes were also assumed.
- Mona Elabbady also updated the PAC regarding revisions to the economic development analysis. The economic development benefits were based on two types of improvements conferred by transit: infrastructure and mobility. Infrastructure improvements for arterial BRT and streetcar are nearly identical, and no changes were made to calculated benefits. However, the team found that economic development benefits of arterial BRT were overstated in the first version of the report because the report accounts for a significant increase in bus service throughout the corridor. However, the increase in service between downtown and the intersection of Knox Avenue and West Broadway is marginal compared to existing service. So, the added value of BRT in this segment of the corridor is marginal, not significant. The economic benefit of arterial BRT was therefore revised downward.
 - Job growth shown represents jobs that would occupy the estimated additional square footage of commercial development in the corridor. Because most real estate development growth is predicted for the North Loop, most job growth is concentrated there, as well.



- The difference in economic development magnitude of streetcar and arterial BRT was arrived upon by conducting case studies of real estate development around BRT and streetcar in several peer cities.
 - The full economic development report is available on the study website and will be emailed to the PAC.
- Peter Wagenius commented that there are few transfers between Routes 14 and 18, but if there were no forced transfers, more people would ride. Charles responded that these extra riders on West Broadway are accounted for in the sensitivity test results.
- Gary Cunningham added that he has confidence in the analysis, but questions the assumptions especially since the ridership forecast underestimated for Green Line. He asked what the ridership would be if it accounted for development. Mona Elabbady responded that the ridership forecast is based on projected growth as documented in the cities' comprehensive plans.
- Don Samuels commented that reinvestment in north Minneapolis has been lacking and the area has not been able to attract middle class residents and jobs. He wants to make an investment that cannot be taken away; he wants to "build a building rather than pitch a tent". He asked if this is accounted for in the analysis. Mona Elabbady responded that that impact—on economic development—is captured in the economic development analysis.

4. Community Engagement Summary

- Charleen Zimmer presented a summary of community engagement conducted throughout the study. Gary Cunningham asked if community members were directly asked which mode they prefer. Charleen responded that they did not, but instead asked questions about physical features that people preferred, in order to get at that question. The intention was to help people weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each, rather than just give a quick answer.
- Gary Cunningham commented that the team did a great job with engagement. He has heard from people that they were engaged. Juxtaposition Arts was terrific and the young people that worked on the study were especially great.
- Charles Carlson updated the PAC on other improvements Metro Transit is making in north Minneapolis, aside from the West Broadway Transit Study Planning. These include new bus shelters with heat and lights, additional service on Routes 19, 30, and 32, and planning for C Line, as well as reconstruction of several segments of Penn Avenue by Hennepin County in 2018. It also includes increased police presence around several shelters. Several PAC members and attendees expressed praise for the improvements.
- Alexis Pennie provided an update on the final CAC meeting which occurred on March 22. He noted that a sub-group brought a resolution to the CAC but did not bring it up soon enough and people were not prepared to sign on. After the meeting everyone was invited to contribute to a revised version; ten people signed on. Not everyone supported the resolution and there were concerns raised regarding safety, driverless vehicles, etc. The supporters do not technically constitute a majority of the CAC, but they do constitute the majority of people who regularly came to the meetings.



5. Study Alternatives Discussion

The PAC engaged in a discussion about the alternative—arterial BRT or streetcar—that is best suited to the West Broadway corridor.

- Don Samuels stated that investments in North Minneapolis must be compared with other investments in the region such as Green and Blue Lines and Nicollet-Central. Arterial BRT is thinking small and streetcar is not a costly proposal compared to other investments.
- Joanie Clausen reminded the group that Penn Avenue was a proposed route for Bottineau LRT and neighborhood residents did not want it. Pat Backen countered that residents' sentiments were mixed and there were major impacts from the LRT project. He added that whatever the investment is in this corridor, it's not doing enough for West Broadway, since most growth is projected to be in the North Loop.
- Sean Broom commented that the West Broadway study was in reaction to the Bottineau route and was meant to get transit through the core. The Metropolitan Council's support of C Line is not strong enough and the Governor's tax proposal isn't likely to pass this year. We need to the legislature to become more transit-friendly.
- Peter Wagenius noted that it is true that Minneapolis had reservations about Bottineau LRT on Penn Avenue. The question posed wasn't "how do we serve north Minneapolis?" it was "how do we get LRT from the northwest suburbs to downtown Minneapolis?" We need to ask what the per-rider cost is of the large regional projects and compare them. The two cheapest projects per riders are Orange Line and Nicollet-Central. Bottineau and Southwest are more than twice as expensive; Gateway is more than three times as expensive. If projects were rates this way we would have more service and investment in Minneapolis and Saint Paul. Gary Cunningham asked if he could have the cost-per-rider analysis. Charles Carlson will follow up on this request. Peter Wagenius continued stating that the core cities and inner-ring suburbs don't have to apologize for wanting investments. The implementation timeline shown for West Broadway streetcar and arterial BRT assumes the two projects start at the same time. This is not necessarily true. Arterial BRT is a regional program. A Line in Saint Paul comes first, then C and D Lines in north Minneapolis. After C and D Lines, north Minneapolis will be waiting a long time for the West Broadway arterial BRT. If we choose streetcar the project would be second in line and the City of Minneapolis could help to fund it.
- Tina Sanz asked how West Broadway could be added to the list of projects in the Transportation Policy Plan. She cautioned that we still need to advocate for our other regional transitway projects.
- Don Samuels noted that negative statements about the cost of streetcar may reflect people who are not accustomed to having money spent on them.
- Peter Wagenius stated that he is not using the cost-per-rider metric to diminish other projects, but to advocate for projects in the core cities so that we get our fair share. Recognizing that phasing is a possibility, Peter asked what the estimated cost of streetcar to Penn Avenue is. Charles Carlson responded that it is \$180 million. The consultant team provided cost estimates by segment; Charles will share these with the PAC.



- Sean Broom requested that at the next PAC meeting the group identify the process for project development. Charles Carlson responded that with the Midtown project the PAC selected a locally preferred alternative (LPA) but the project is in the “Increased Revenue Scenario” in the TPP so it can’t be amended unless additional funding is approved.
- Rob Hanson asked if streetcar can qualify for Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) funding. Charles Carlson responded that CTIB could provide funding for the project if it arises from a county-led planning process. Cole Hiniker added that CTIB has a program of projects that commits their funds through 2040. This program is unlikely to be amended.
- Gary Cunningham and Peter Wagenius commented on how this policy may be excluding certain communities.

6. Next Meeting Date

- The final PAC meeting will be held in June on a date to be determined.



Information on Project Cost and Ridership- Regional Transit Projects

Corridor	Capital Cost	2030 / 2040 Weekday Rides	Capital Cost/ Weekday Ride	Source
West Broadway BRT	\$ 40,000,000	4,800	\$ 8,300	http://www.metrotransit.org/Data/Sites/1/media/about/improvements/westbroadwaytransitstudy/2015-08-03-westbroadwayridershipforecast.pdf
West Broadway Streetcar	\$ 239,000,000	3,900	\$ 61,300	http://www.metrotransit.org/Data/Sites/1/media/about/improvements/westbroadwaytransitstudy/2015-08-03-westbroadwayridershipforecast.pdf
West Broadway Streetcar-Penn*	\$ 180,000,000	3,600	\$ 50,000	Based on remaining station boardings and estimated cost reductions from project study documents
Orange Line (35W BRT)	\$ 150,700,000	11,400	\$ 13,200	http://www.metrotransit.org/metro-orange-line
Green Line (CCLRT)	\$ 957,000,000	40,000	\$ 23,900	https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Projects/Current-Projects/Central-Corridor/Project-Facts.aspx
Blue Line Extension (Bottineau)	\$1,536,000,000	27,000	\$ 56,900	https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Projects/Current-Projects/METRO-Blue-Line-Extension/Project-Facts.aspx
Green Line Extension (SWLRT)	\$1,858,000,000	34,000	\$ 54,600	https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Projects/Current-Projects/Southwest-LRT/Project-Facts-2.aspx
Nicollet Central Streetcar	\$ 200,000,000	9,200	\$ 21,700	http://www.minneapolismn.gov/nicollet-central/
Gateway/Gold Line BRT (I-94 East)	\$ 475,000,000	8,000	\$ 59,400	http://thegatewaycorridor.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/October-2016-Gateway-Commission-Packet_.pdf
*Shortened streetcar alignment would reduce capital cost ~\$60M, ridership effects are unknown but are estimated by subtracting eliminated station boardings.				

At the April 15, 2016 PAC, members of the PAC requested information on capital cost, weekday ridership, and the ratio of the two for West Broadway alternatives and other projects. Cost and ridership methodologies, horizon years, and other factors do not allow for direct comparison, but available information was assembled as the PAC requested, presented here.



West Broadway Transit Study

Locally Preferred Alternative Recommendation – October 31, 2016 DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

WHEREAS, the West Broadway corridor is identified in the Metropolitan Council’s 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (adopted January 14, 2015) as a future transitway in the “increased revenue scenario”, with the appropriate mode and alignment to be determined through further study, and

WHEREAS, West Broadway is identified in the Metropolitan Council’s 2040 Transportation Policy Plan as a future arterial BRT corridor in the “increased revenue scenario”, and

WHEREAS, on April 2, 2010 the City of Minneapolis identified the West Broadway corridor as part of a long-term rail network, and

WHEREAS, the City of Minneapolis has identified the West Broadway corridor as a recommended primary transit network corridor in the Access Minneapolis: Citywide Transportation Action Plan (published July 2009), and

WHEREAS, on June 26, 2012 the Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority adopted resolution 12-HCRR-0038 recommending the alignment and mode for the Bottineau Transitway which resolved to “work closely with project stakeholders, including cooperating and participating agencies, in addressing issues and concerns”, and

WHEREAS, on June 15, 2012 the City of Minneapolis approved a resolution of support for the Bottineau Transitway to the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority and the Metropolitan Council that included reference to key initiatives to advance other transit initiatives in north Minneapolis, including the West Broadway Study to “advance the vision shared by many in the community of a vibrant commercial corridor served by transit”, and

WHEREAS, the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority, and the Metropolitan Council entered into an agreement to advance a study of transit options along West Broadway, developed as the West Broadway Transit Study (Transit Study), and

WHEREAS, the Transit Study identified seven needs to address: economic and physical revitalization, service to high proportion of residents who rely on transit, transit facilities and amenities commensurate with transit demand, predictable transit service, service to forecast population and employment growth, and consistency with city and regional policy, and

WHEREAS, the Transit Study identified seven goals to achieve with the West Broadway transitway, stated as more businesses and affordable housing, better public transportation to jobs activities and



other places to go, more access to opportunities for people of color living in the corridor, no impacts to parks and the environment, improved transit service, more transit riders, and an inclusive public outreach process, and

WHEREAS, the Transit Study has shown that the streetcar alternative or arterial BRT alternative addresses the corridor needs and achieve project goals, but Transit Study results indicate the streetcar alternative has significantly higher potential for economic development effects with transitway implementation, and

WHEREAS, through a robust public engagement process the study process found strong community support for transitway improvements along the West Broadway corridor, including by participants serving on the project's Community Advisory Committee (CAC), and

WHEREAS, the technical advisory committee (TAC), with representatives from Metro Transit, the Metropolitan Council, Hennepin County, the City of Minneapolis, the City of Robbinsdale, and the City of Golden Valley, has provided input in this resolution,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the West Broadway Transit Study Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) has taken into consideration the technical information on each of the alternatives, along with input from the TAC, CAC and community, and recommends the streetcar mode and alignment as the locally preferred alternative.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that further evaluation of the length of the streetcar project corridor should be developed in future phases of project implementation, and that the PAC recommends development and consideration of advancing a streetcar alternative along the study alignment from West Broadway Avenue and Penn Avenue North to downtown Minneapolis.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in addition to optimizing corridor length, subsequent phases of technical analysis will continue to engage policymakers, technical experts, adjacent property owners and the community to address key issues not covered in the LPA recommendation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the PAC encourages parallel investment in improved bus service and additional transit infrastructure in the West Broadway corridor as funding allows and as demand warrants.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution for the recommended locally preferred alternative by the West Broadway Transit Study PAC be forwarded to the Metropolitan Council for consideration in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.