



Midtown Corridor AA

TAC Meeting

August 14, 2013, 8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

Metro Transit- Heywood Chambers

TAC and PMT Members in Attendance

| Name | Organization | Present | Alternate | Absent |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------|-----------|--------|
| Dean Michalko | Hennepin County - HCWT | | | X |
| Tom Johnson | Hennepin County - Transportation | | | X |
| Lisa Johnson | Metro Transit - Bus Ops | X | | |
| Maurice Roers | Metro Transit - Eng/Fac | | | X |
| John Humphrey | Metro Transit - Rail Ops | X | | |
| John Dillery | Metro Transit - Serv Dev | X | | |
| Michael Mechtenberg | Metro Transit - Serv Dev | X | | |
| Jim Alexander | Metro Transit - SWLRT | | | X |
| Katie White | Metropolitan Council | X | | |
| Gina Mitteco | MnDOT | X | | |
| Paul Mogush | Minneapolis CPED | X | | |
| Don Pflaum | Minneapolis Public Works | X | | |
| Simon Blenski | Minneapolis Public Works | | | X |
| Charles Carlson | Metro Transit - BRT | X | | |

OTHER ATTENDEES

| Name | Organization |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Ginger Canon | Minneapolis Parks Board |
| Hilary Holmes | City of Saint Paul |
| Kerri Pearce Rush | Hennepin County |
| Faith Cable-Kumon | MCWP |
| Jill Hentges | Metro Transit |

Consultant team in attendance

| Name | Organization |
|----------------|--------------|
| Joe Kern | SRF |
| Mona Elabbady | SRF |
| Joy Miciano | ZAN |
| Lisa Rasmussen | KHA |
| Liz Heyman | SRF |
| Steve Wilson | SRF |



Notes

Alternatives Review

- Mike Mechtenberg reviewed the project alternatives and assumptions.
- What is the definition of 'rail' at this point in the project?
 - Considering the characteristics of the corridor (dedicated guideway, need for vertical circulation, etc.) the differences between a modern streetcar and an LRT in the corridor are minor.
 - Differences: Length of the car (the project is assuming a single LRV) and length of the platforms
 - Standardizing the fleets across the region will save on operating costs
 - Using an LRV would allow for more growth in ridership in the future
 - Jill Hentges said the Midtown Greenway Coalition (MGC) supports turf track streetcar in the Greenway.
 - At the public meetings the technical team will have visual examples of the differences between an LRV and a streetcar vehicle.
- Mike has more detailed information on ridership (number of new riders, transit reliant riders, etc.) if members of the TAC are interested
- TAC members asked that existing ridership in the corridor be provided for context
 - Show existing ridership on the 21 and 53.
 - Corridor numbers on par with the Blue Line
- Cost estimates include a 30% contingency factor
- A TAC member asked if new O&M facilities are assumed.
 - Yes, there is budget for a new facility for both rail and bus. This assumption is consistent with other AA's in the region.
 - The technical team has identified potential locations along the corridor that could accommodate a rail operations facility.
 - The technical team assumed a dollar amount that reflects a percentage of a new O&M facility for the enhanced bus alternative

Evaluation

- Mike Mechtenberg walked through the evaluation ratings
- Net Operating and Maintenance costs – what are we netting?
 - Includes the reduction in service on the 21 and 53
 - Does not include any subsidies
- The ROW impacts include impacts at the Hi-Lake Shopping Center, impacts near West Lake, and space for an O&M facility
- The TAC members asked that the impact to parking spaces be added to the evaluation sheet
- VMT: The number of new transit riders and a longer trip creates a higher reduction in VMT.
 - The TAC asked to reword the measure to say 'reduction.'
 - From a regional perspective these numbers are all very, very small; however, under MAP-21 VMT is analyzed at a corridor basis.
- Employment: ½ mile radius around each station.
 - This is consistent with MAP-21
- TAC member suggested using a consistent measure for the economic development potential and the land available for development measure.



- A TAC member asked if the pedestrian clear zones will be smaller at some station locations.
 - Station amenities can be designed to minimize the footprint of stations and to maximize the available pedestrian clear zone.
 - In most areas, pedestrian areas will be wider than existing
 - Existing Chicago pedestrian area is very narrow
 - A TAC member suggested analyzing the possibility of taking out the left turn lane at this location to maximize the space available for pedestrians.
- The Enhanced Bus alignment stops at Chicago on Lake Street – it does not go through the transit center.
- The travel time savings shown are in comparison to the existing travel time changes
- A TAC member asked how the rail alternative assumed speeds compare to the Blue Line.
 - The project assumed a range of speeds throughout the Greenway depending on the context.
 - There will be some noise impacts.
 - John Humphries said the Blue Line 35th Street Station is a comparative location to experience the speeds assumed for this project.
- All the goals are weighted equally
 - However some goals have more factors than the other goals
 - The plan going forward is to take feedback from the public to see what goals/measures are most important to the public and then potentially reassess the evaluation.
- Minneapolis Park Board would like to see the reasoning behind the ‘low impacts’ to parklands off line.
- Pier protection
 - The pier protection does not show the pier protection going east and west of the bridge
 - The amount of pier protection needed depends on the bridge type – it could extend 2 ft off the ends and could be between 6 and 12 ft high.
 - The bigger concern is the visual impact of the pier protection on the corridor.
 - Pier protection is needed with the reintroduction of rail in the corridor. It would also be necessary if a streetcar was introduced.
- Retaining walls
 - The technical team has identified the approximate height of the assumed retaining walls.
- The technical team is looking at an additional single track segment
 - Roughly between Hennepin and Nicollet –about a mile long.
 - The number of single track segments will be presented as a range of options.
 - The PAC will not be voting on the specific locations of single track segments.
- A TAC member asked that the project look at the context of personal safety within the Greenway design.
 - Retaining walls can create hiding places.
- Street crossings
 - The goal is to not use the full gate arms with dingling bells.
 - This is still under consideration.



Next Steps

- No need to do a special amendment to get the project into the TPP.
 - Met Council is holding a spot for this project in the TPP
- A TAC member asked for a review on the current outreach being done.
 - Mike is going to meet with all the neighborhood associations by the end of the year
 - Mike and Jill are going to table at the Uptown and Chicago transit centers.
 - May also ride the bus to provide information.
 - The team is going to try to schedule some more meetings with the diverse communities in the corridor.
 - Questionnaire/online survey on the project will be available on the website.
- A TAC member was concerned about how the assumed O&M facility inflates the cost estimate even though the region will probably not need an additional facility.
- Action items from the PAC meeting: Is the team providing a report back on the identified items?
 - Yes this will be addressed at the next PAC meeting.
- What kind of additional outreach will need to be done on the new PAC members?
 - There will be two new PAC members representing the City of Minneapolis and possibly a new mayoral representative.
 - Don Pflaum will find the appropriate process to get the project in front of the new council members.
 - The new members will most likely be assigned during the first week in January at the City Council's organizational meeting.