



Midtown Corridor AA

PAC Meeting #3

May 8, 2013, 8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

Colin Powell Center

PAC Members in Attendance

| Name | Organization | Present | Alternate | Absent |
|------------------|---|---------|-----------|--------|
| Peter Wagenius | City of Minneapolis - Mayor's Office | X | | |
| Gary Schiff | City of Minneapolis - City Council | | X | |
| Robert Lilligren | City of Minneapolis - City Council | X | | |
| Peter McLaughlin | Hennepin County | | | X |
| Gail Dorfman | Hennepin County | X | | |
| Dave Burrill | Lake Street Council | X | | |
| Joyce Wisdom | | | | |
| Ronald Lezama | Latino Economic Development Center | X | | |
| Gary Cunningham | Metropolitan Council - PAC Chair | X | | |
| Adam Duinick | Metropolitan Council | X | | |
| Janet Olson | MCWP | | | X |
| Adam Juul | MCWP | | X | |
| John DeWitt | Midtown Greenway Coalition | X | | |
| Andrew Rankin | Mpls Bicycle Advisory Committee | | | X |
| Kenya McKnight | Transportation Advisory Board | X | | |

PAC Alternates in Attendance

| Name | Substituting for: |
|-------------------|--|
| Heidi Ritchie | Gary Schiff - Minneapolis City Council |
| Faith Cable Kumon | Adam Juul - MCWP |

PMT Members in Attendance

| Name | Organization | Present | Absent |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------|
| Dean Michalko | Hennepin County - HCWT | X | |
| Michael Mechtenberg | Metro Transit - Serv Dev | X | |
| Don Pflaum | Minneapolis Public Works | X | |
| John Levin | Metro Transit - BRT | | X |
| Katie White | Met Council | X | |



OTHER ATTENDEES

| Name | Organization |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| Rebecca Harnik | Midtown Greenway Coalition |
| Mike Wilson | CIDNA rep to CAC |

CONSULTANTS

| Name | Organization |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Joe Kern | SRF |
| Mona Elabbady | SRF |
| Charleen Zimmer | ZAN |
| Liz Heyman | SRF |
| Lisa Rasmussen | KHA |

Meeting Notes

1. Introductions

- Councilmember Gary Cunningham, PAC chair, welcomed attendees and had participants introduce themselves.

2. Purpose and Need

- Mike Mechtenberg gave a quick summary of the final Purpose and Need Statement. He asked for questions/comments; none were given.
- Gary Cunningham asked for a motion to approve the Purpose and Need Summary. The motion was made and the final Purpose and Need Summary was unanimously approved.

3. Universe of Alternatives and Initial Screening

- Mike Mechtenberg gave a presentation on the project’s universe of alternatives and the initial screening process. He clarified that the scoring process went as follows:
 - i. Consultant team held multiple work sessions to craft the first draft of scores
 - ii. Then Metro Transit staff and the PMT had multiple work sessions to refine/discuss scoring.
 - iii. Scores were presented to the TAC for input
 - iv. Scores were presented to the CAC for input
 - v. Current PAC meeting is to ask the PAC for input and approval of the results of the initial screening process.
- A PAC member asked for clarification on how Criteria 6 was scored, specifically the bullet about economic development.



- i. Mike Mechtenberg explained the economic development piece was scored on the general perception that the public has regarding the ability of rail modes versus bus modes to attract economic development.
- A PAC member asked why many of the modes scored 'FAIR' for Criteria 2.
 - i. Mike Mechtenberg explained the methodology behind Criteria 2 (# of jobs and residents within ¼ mile and ½ mile of each station). Since Streetcar on Lake has the most stations and no vertical circulation issues, it received a higher score.
- A PAC member wanted to see how the scoring on Nicollet/Central AA compares to scoring for this project. Mike will look into that.
- Mike explained that the Combination Streetcar + BRT alternative will allow the study to assess whether there is enough demand for two transit solutions in the corridor.
 - i. The chair asked how the study could make “apples to apples” comparisons if this alternative is much longer.
 - ii. The CAC representatives stated they were pleased to see this alternative, because they felt it was responsive to community needs/requests.
- A CAC representative asked how the BRT or the Streetcar would interface with existing transit stations. He asked if the PMT had considered extending the BRT line to the existing Belt Line Park and Ride location.
- A PAC member asked if the PMT had looked at a possible location for an OMF.
 - i. It was explained that Nicollet/Central AA is struggling to find a suitable location for an OMF. It was also explained that finding a location for an OMF is part of the later stages of the study.
- The Chair pointed out that if the BRT extension is studied, the PMT should coordinate with City of Saint Paul staff/organizations.
- A PAC member mentioned that he was worried that if the Arterial BRT was built first it use up all the developable space in the corridor, but not develop as intensely as the corridor would if a streetcar line was built. Then, when the streetcar was built, there would be no space for more development.
- Council Member Lilligren commented that he thinks the “story of the corridor,” with the connections to other regional transitways, vibrant business corridor, etc., is what will sell this project to the FTA.
- A PAC member asked if Arterial BRT on Lake Street is built, will it preclude a streetcar in the Greenway from ever being built.
 - i. It was explained that this issue will be discussed/analyzed in the study.
- The chair requested that the PMT contact staff in Portland, Oregon to discuss successes/failures of the Portland system.
 - i. Charleen mentioned that Portland is part of a peer city review being conducted through the Nicollet-Central project. The PMT will look at this research.
- A PAC member asked where economic development could occur in the project area.
 - i. Mike Mechtenberg explained that considering the corridor is surrounded by stable residential neighborhoods, he believes that the area between the

Greenway and Lake Street has the greatest potential for increased development.

- Joyce Wisdom pointed out that the rezoning of the Midtown Greenway made some existing industrial uses non-conforming uses. She asked that this issue be considered as the study moves forward.
- Joyce Wisdom said that she believes attention needs to be given to the connections between the Midtown Greenway and Lake Street. She said that they are currently very unwelcoming to both pedestrians and cyclists.
- A PAC member asked if the project will focus on attracting ‘moderate income’ housing versus affordable or high-end housing.
 - i. It was explained that the FTA likes to see affordable housing as part of a project.
 - ii. It was mentioned that the project will take its cues on land use issues from the many small area plans in the corridor.
- A PAC member asked how much more would a streetcar cost than the Arterial BRT?
 - i. The PMT explained a good range for Arterial BRT is \$4-\$10 million a mile for Arterial BRT and around \$50 million a mile for streetcar.
 - ii. The PAC member asked why the PAC would want so much investment within two blocks, when it could be used in other parts of the region.
 - iii. Another PAC member commented there may be a need for two different types of transit solutions (express service offered in the Greenway versus more local service offered on Lake Street) in this corridor. He said he thinks it makes sense to provide two transit solutions if there are two transit problems.
- A PAC member commented that he didn’t see any language addressing EJ populations
 - i. Mike Mechtenberg explained how the Purpose and Need addresses EJ populations.
- A motion was made to accept staff recommendation and narrow the alternatives for further study down to the three recommended alternatives.
 - i. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Overview of recommended alignments

- A PAC member asked if the Arterial BRT would exit Lake Street to serve the Hennepin Transit station.
 - i. It was explained that it is currently assumed that the BRT would not leave Lake Street, but this detail is still to be determined.
- Lisa Rasmussen explained that ideally Arterial BRT would have farside stations, because nearside stations slow down traffic.
- The PAC asked that an initial station be added at the intersection with the 35W BRT (Orange Line).
- The chair asked that special consideration be given to the residents/businesses in the “triangle” between the SWLRT line and the Midtown Greenway line as they will be affected by both transit lines.

5. CAC update – Joyce Wisdom and John DeWitt

- The CAC asked for a presentation at the upcoming open houses.
- CAC representative asked what the cost of vertical access would be.
 - i. It was explained that this will be analyzed as part of the study.
- The CAC wanted to know what *other* transit will still exist on Lake Street if any of the alternatives move forward
 - i. It was explained that transit operations for each alternative will be described in the study.
- The CAC wants some type of transit improvements on Lake Street if funding cannot be secured for any of the alternatives.
- The CAC representative asked if there is greater funding available for streetcar or BRT?
 - i. It was explained that funding for both modes would come from the same FTA programs.
- The CAC representative noted that students at MCAD are working on station design concepts.

6. Public Meeting and Outreach update

- Charleen explained the proposed agenda/setup for the upcoming public meetings.
 - i. There will be a looping presentation
 - ii. Both Spanish and Somali interpreters will be present
 - iii. The PMT will ask for input on station locations.
 - iv. Flyers were sent out to the CAC, local business, and neighborhood contact lists.
- Rebecca Harnik, the new outreach coordinator for the Midtown Greenway Association, was introduced.
- The chair asked that the PMT keep track of the number of people of color who are attending the public meetings.
 - i. The chair wants a measurable goal regarding outreach to populations (people of color, low income populations) who generally don't attend meetings.
 - Charleen commented that one way the project is attempting to reach out to these populations is by attending events that are already scheduled in these communities as well as going to these communities for personalized presentations. For example, the meeting at the Mercado Central was very successful for getting feedback from Hispanic business owners.
 - ii. The chair asked for a memo from staff on the how project's outreach efforts will be measured.
 - iii. Ron Lezama commented that he did not think word to the businesses was getting out. He spoke to employees at McDonalds and OfficeMax and they did not know about the project.



- Joyce Wisdom commented that the owners of these properties were aware of the project. She said that McDonalds and OfficeMax are very large franchises, so it makes sense that the employees wouldn't be aware of the project.

7. Other discussion at the end of the meeting

- The chair asked if the Combination Streetcar + Arterial BRT alternative constituted an extension of the scope of the project. He asked if the PAC needs to get authorization to extend the scope of the project.
- The chair stressed again that outreach efforts would need to be made to City of Saint Paul staff/organizations.
- Peter Wagenius commented that the project needs to be careful with what terminology we use, because the "streetcar" the project is describing conflicts with the way the City of Minneapolis has been branding streetcar service.
- It was discussed that there is not a consensus on the official term Metro Transit will be using to describe its "Arterial BRT" service. Rapid Bus is definitely not agreed upon.