



Midtown Corridor Alternatives Analysis

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

February 7, 2012; 2:30 PM – 4:30 PM

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		
Anna Flintoft	Minneapolis Public Works			X
Simon Blenski	Minneapolis Public Works	X		
Charles Carlson	Metro Transit - BRT	X		

TAC alternates in attendance

Name	Substituting for:
Mark Benedict	John Humphrey - MT Rail Ops
Tom Domres	Jim Alexander - SWLRT

Other Attendees

Name	Organization
Kyle Burrows	Metro Transit

Consultants in attendance

Name	Organization
Joe Kern	SRF
Mona Elabbady	SRF
Joy Miciano	ZAN
Joe Kapper	SRF



Meeting Notes

- I. Introductions
- II. Summary of Open Houses (Joy Miciano)
 - a. Promotion and Outreach
 - i. 245 flyers, 100 posters were distributed to neighborhood organizations, businesses, and property owners in the corridor. These included but were not limited to:
 1. African Development Center
 2. Disabled Immigrant Association
 3. Chicano Latino Affairs Council
 4. Transit for Livable Communities
 5. PAC Members
 6. Residential developments
 7. Uptown Association
 8. LynLake Business Association
 - ii. In addition a news release was sent out (Star Tribune posted on a blog), and the open houses were promoted on social media via Metro Transit and posted on the project website.
 - b. Open houses were held on 1/28/13 and 1/29/13
 - i. Very good turnout: 56 participants on 1/28 and 74 participants on 1/29, 29 comment cards received on first night and 39 received on the second night, 5 comments received via email.
 - ii. Open house activities
 1. Participant assessment map activity: dot map identifying workplace, home, frequent destinations, and opportunity to offer comments/notes.
 - a. Lakes, Calhoun Square noted as key western destinations
 - b. Center of corridor is a key employment destination
 - c. Other key destinations identified
 2. Priority setting activity (poker chips), results:
 - a. Faster travel times #1
 - b. Easy connection to LRT #2
 - c. Bike/ped connections #3
 - d. Frequent transit service #4
 3. Comment cards
 - a. What are the transportation needs in the corridor?
How can transit use in the corridor be increased?
 - i. Fast/reliable service. Improve the experience currently offered on Lake Street
 - ii. Mix of responses prioritizing Lake St. or the Greenway
 - iii. Extend study area east of Hiawatha Ave., to St. Paul



1. Paul Mogush noted that turnout was good, and that a broad constituency was represented
 2. John Dillery noted that there was a lot of educating on the various modes, and that individuals expressed interest in anything that can speed up the boarding process and make transit faster. There were also two different attitudes toward the Greenway that were apparent, 1) preservation, and 2) improving it via a streetcar.
- c. CAC Update
- i. Jill Hentges, Metro Transit Community Outreach, is coordinating this effort.
 - ii. Neighborhoods are nominating representatives, and Metro Transit is in the process of nominating 5 at-large members who volunteered at the open houses.
 - iii. 30 members total will be on the committee, chaired by John Dewitt and Joyce Wisdom.
 - iv. First CAC meeting will be 2/19/13
 - v. This group will be the conduit of information to/from neighborhood groups, and connection to other advisory committees.
- III. Purpose and Need Overview (Mona Elabbady)
- a. The purpose and need statement is a building block for crafting alternatives.
 - b. Consultant team is looking for TAC input on the direction and tone of the purpose and need statement
- IV. TAC Input on Purpose and Need (Mona Elabbady)
- a. Purpose Statement
 - i. Adjust purpose statement to incorporate “environmental” objectives into the sustainability discourse to make it a little bit more specific.
 - ii. Purpose should also look to contribute to the already vital nature of the area
 - iii. Address VMT
 1. Consultant team will evaluate the two points above in relation to the whole document, to see if needs and goals address these comments, and present it as a cohesive document.
 - b. Needs
 - i. Re-phrase need statements to make them sound less like goals
 - ii. “Lack of fast and convenient transit service”
 1. Must be clear in describing why current service is inconvenient. Area is well served by transit. Speak to capacity, travel time, etc.
 - iii. Frame as problems instead of needs
 - c. Goals and Objectives
 - i. Increase transit use...
 1. Note that there is induced demand resulting from improved transit
 - ii. Improve mobility...
 1. Should look at adding or incorporating an objective of capturing new transit riders (increasing modal split), and emphasizing that pedestrian access is critical due to its impact on travel time.



2. Noted the importance of station spacing and access opportunities on the Greenway.
 - iii. Catalyze development...
 1. Change “expand” to “attract investment along the length of the corridor”
 2. Revise fourth objective to say “Minimize construction impacts to businesses, residents, and corridor users”
 3. State housing as a development objective
 - iv. Cost-effectiveness...
 1. Revise objective #1 to say “ Develop a transitway operating plan that coordinates well with existing service”
 2. Make “minimizing operating resource requirements” a separate objective.
 - v. Support active communities...
 1. Enhancing what is already there vs. solving a problem. This is one of the most vibrant parts of the region, we should look to improve upon recent trends
 2. Improve parks, not maintain
 - d. Evaluation measures
 - i. Consider adding access time to travel time
 - ii. Add corridor ridership to regional system ridership for Goal #1, and use regional ridership as a measure for Goal #2
 - iii. Add New Starts measures (cost per linked trip, annualized capital cost, affordable housing, transit dependent rides)
 - iv. For follow up, discuss development measures with Paul Mogush to refine
- V. Next TAC Meeting 4/9/13
 - a. Discuss universe of alternatives
 - b. Initial screening criteria
 - i. Develop cross-sections
 - ii. Identify criteria for fatal flaws
 - c. Consultant team follow-up
 - i. Produce plot printouts of map exercise from open house
 - ii. Contact Paul Mogush to discuss development evaluation criteria