



PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING Meeting Minutes

Date: November 10, 2005
Time: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Location: Room 319, City Hall
Attendees: See attached roster

Agenda

1. Housekeeping
2. Public Workshops
 - a. NE Workshop
 - b. Summary of workshop findings
3. Primary Transit Network
4. Approach to Downtown Transit Service
5. Next Steps

Summary of Items Discussed

Housekeeping

Minutes of the September 15, 2005 meeting were approved by the PSC.

Public Workshops

Charleen Zimmer provided a brief summary of the three public workshops held on October 18th, 19th, and 26th. A total of 124 people signed in for all workshops (12 people for the North Public Workshop, 58 people for the Downtown Public Workshop, 46 people for the Sabathani Community Center South Public Workshop, and eight people for the satellite South Public Workshop held at the Keewaydin Recreation Center). General comments from the workshops included:

- LRT is one of the best things, but it should be expanded
- The City has great bike paths, but more paths are desired
- Increased frequency of bus service and additional routes are desired
- Transit system needs to do a better job connecting modes
- The plan should be pedestrian friendly
- The plan should focus on connecting communities and creating inviting space
- Transit should be the focus; not additional parking spaces
- Environmental considerations such as noise and air pollution reduction should be a priority

- Better accessibility to transit for the disabled and elderly is desired
- Personal safety and comfort issues should be taken into consideration
- A desire to bring back streetcars
- Avoid extensive walking distances to a transit stop and avoid multiple transfers
- Avoid short term thinking
- Engage the community

A detailed workshop summary was emailed to the PSC members in advance for their review. Attachment 8 of the summary containing marked up table maps from the workshops was handed out to the members during the meeting. Charleen noted that a subsequent workshop for the Northeast has been calendared for Tuesday, November 22, 2005, from 6:30 - 8:30 p.m. at East Side Neighborhood Services, 1700 2nd Street NE at the request of Councilmember Paul Ostrow. Once comments from this pending workshop are included in the summary report, the report will be posted on the project web page.

Questions raised by the PSC regarding the workshops are as follow. Responses are noted where made:

- Were bike messengers/couriers involved? Charleen indicated that invites were sent to courier firms, but it was not known if those representatives attended the workshops.
- What promotional activities and outreach was conducted? Charlene noted that the outreach activities are summarized in the report.
- Why were two meetings held in the South? The South meeting was moved at the request of the Councilmember to a more central location. Because of the change and the early advertising of the Keewaydin site, a meeting was held at Keewaydin concurrent with the Sabathani meeting for any who could not move to the new location at Sabanthani.
- How may more rounds of meetings will occur? Two more are scheduled, one set in February 2006 and one set in May 2006.
-

The PSC requested the following actions:

- Future workshop notices should be translated (rather than just the request for translation services)
- Phone contact follow up with neighborhood groups was requested in addition to email notification
- Updates to NRP groups were requested. Neighborhood representatives can get materials from Charleen Zimmer or wait for the the website update scheduled for the following week.

Primary Transit Network (PTN)

Draft copies of the Primary Transit Network report were handed out to the PSC members. Jarrett Walker (Nelson Nygaard) summarized the report and noted that the PTN concept was derived by working from Minneapolis Plan vision of transit taking a larger role in city transportation. The mapping for the PTN indicates three priorities of routes as follows: red routes – first priority, blue routes – second priority, green routes – not currently PTN, but have potential to grow into

red/blue. Regional transit corridors (Central Corridor, Southwest Corridor, etc.) are not shown on the PTN maps.

Jarrett indicated that the PTN does not include all of the transit services in the City. There is a need for a secondary transit service (local service) that has not been included in any of the maps. He recommended that the PTN service levels be implemented in the PTN corridors before other service is changed or eliminated. If the PTN is providing a high level of service, some of the secondary network will phase out naturally as people self-select the PTN service. The PTN might require consolidation of routes and service changes that might result in more transfers. The inconvenience caused by increasing the number of transfers can be reduced by locating transfer points at vibrant retail nodes where people can access smaller scale retail stores and other activities while transferring.

Jarrett Walker then discussed the next steps for the PTN network. This will include arriving at reasonable standards for speeds and efficiency on the PTN corridors, identifying deficiencies, prioritizing the needs of the system, and finalizing the PTN service plan. He mentioned that speed goals are not about maximum operating speed, but about reducing delay to transit vehicles. The proposed approach is to compare current transit speeds to speed limit and to evaluate against a standard, such as Seattle used, which is 30% of speed limit.

The following questions were raised by the PSC. Responses are noted where appropriate:

- What threshold criteria were used for the PTN? Jarrett noted that the criteria are defined in report and include employment and residential density within ¼ mile of a transit line.
- Will streetcar/LRT planned routes be shown on the PTN and how will density in potential streetcars corridors be shown? Charleen Zimmer noted that the regional corridors are part of the system in the 30-year timeframe and are the subject of a separate report for the project. Connie Kozlak indicated that in the 10-year horizon, Northstar commuter rail could be shown, but that the other regional transit corridors are beyond the 10-year time frame.
- It was noted that I-94 service is already at 15 minute headways, but not shown on the map
- What is the PTN experience with farebox revenue? Jarrett noted that the subsidy per passenger is much lower on these routes, since the PTN is about running full buses. Examples of frequent transit networks from Portland, OR and Vancouver BC were cited as having greater than 50% farebox recovery.
- A request was made to add the primary bicycle network to the map
- Can density of employment/residents be shown on a map to assist with showing where upgrades can occur? Jarrett noted that the highest potential for upgrading the PTN to streetcar are the older streetcar streets like Nicollet in the South, Central in the NE, and Washington to West Broadway
- Are the other dense corridors that are not on PTN? Jarrett noted that these are the green lines on the map. Specifically, in the NE, Central to the River has lots of density but is

not organized around one street, 2nd Avenue NE/Washington has more node-based density. Jarrett also noted that parallel PTN routes should not be closer than ½ mile, which was used to explain the spacing of PTN routes in North Minneapolis

- What about Lake Street as an upgrade example – how long before an upgrade could occur? Jarrett noted that over time by building stop amenities, the perception of value would develop and drive an increase in density. Density builds its own local constituency for transit. In that context, rail brings dramatic redevelopment, while bus brings incremental redevelopment. On Lake Street, the focus should be on modifying building orientation to mitigate the current auto-orientation of the street and better support transit over time.
- A request to provide examples from Portland, OR was made.
- Have different riders physical characteristics been factored into the PTN? It was noted that 1/3 of seniors in Minneapolis don't/can't drive. Jarrett noted that the criteria were focused on getting as many riders as possible on the bus. The criteria used would be acceptable to 80-90% of the population. The others not served by the route spacing would have (ADA) alternative service provided (Metro Mobility). Jarrett expected to see diversity of ridership increase with the PTN
- Were temporal patterns taken into account? Jarrett noted that such patterns were intentionally not taken into consideration – routes were chosen to build the all-day two-way market that fits with the vision of mixed urban use and helps to use capacity efficiently
- Is there a commitment to add more red lines, particularly across town? Jarrett noted that the PTN is designed that way – future PTN routes would be drawn from the blue lines. Other new PTN lines would need a commitment to denser land use to support the network. Johnson Street and Bryn Mawr were noted as examples of areas where land use patterns did not support PTN service

Downtown Transit Service

A handout providing an outline of approach for evaluating downtown transit service alternatives was provided to the PSC members. The presentation that followed categorized the downtown service needs and issues into three broad categories:

- Provide adequate and attractive facilities for bus service to/from city and region
- Serve edge-of-downtown neighborhoods
- Provide circulation for local trips within downtown core

The overall proposed strategy to address these issues is to develop solutions that address multiple problems. These included focusing on the largest of the needs in terms of ridership and the demand placed on downtown street space. A flowchart showing this process was handed out to the PSC members. Two alternatives are being considered: (1) interception of peak hour routes at transit stations coupled with a high frequency shuttle service, and (2) a system of one and two-lane transit spines through the downtown that consolidates bus service to these spines, providing high frequency service through the downtown.

The following questions/comments were raised by the PSC:

- What about the number of induced transfers with the dual hub system? A trip would take three buses to get to St. Paul from the western suburbs. Jarrett noted that through routing was limited by the length of lines, as lines that are too long operate unreliably. The service pattern through downtown introduces a shortening of long lines and reduces through routing. The I-394 to St. Paul trip would be accomplished by a transfer at 8th/Marquette similar to the transfer at the Fifth Street today
- The parking ramps on Marquette need to be shown in total on the map
- Hotels and future development need to be added to the map
- Concerns about the added circuitry of car travel with one ways and Nicollet and Marquette as transit were noted. The perception was that the transit alternatives would push cars further out of the core of downtown. It was noted that other cities use fringe streets as transit service corridors, rather than routing transit through the core. Why could that not be the case here? Charlene Zimmer noted that the three yellow lines that show the north-south transit spine on the map indicate optional locations for the spine that are being tested. Not all of them would be built. Charleen also noted that the two-way street analysis is in process and that an analysis of transit on both one-way and two-way street patterns plus an optimum mix of one-way/two-way/transit would be made. The concepts shown on the map are key components to start the alternatives analysis.
- Why is the transit alternative considering 25 year needs on downtown plan when the study is for a 10-year Action Plan? Charleen noted that the study has 10 year and 25 year elements so that projects that can be implemented within the next 10 years can be identified consistent with a 25 year vision
- The suggestion was made to initiate implementation of peak intercept as new service (35W BRT) comes on line rather than changing existing. In that context, the capacity of the Leamington Ramp for buses was questioned. Charleen noted that the current capacity of the Leamington Transit Center won't handle all of the projected south end service

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Action Items

Consultants	Update maps
	Provide examples from Portland, OR
All	Send comments on Public Meeting Summary and PTN Report to Charleen Zimmer

**PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE
RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

Meeting Date/Time: November 10, 2005, 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	Dewar, Caren	Southwest Sub-Area	X
X	DeWitt, John	East Sub-Area	X
X	Eikaas, Gary	Minnesota Freight Advisory Comm	
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 Alternate	
X	Imdieke Cross, Margot	Mpls Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities	
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	McCarthy, Arlene	Metro Transit – Service Devpt	X
X	McLaughlin, Mike	Downtown Council	X
X	Moe, Susan	FHWA	
X	O'Keefe, Tom	Mn/DOT – Metro	X
X	Pearce Ruch, Kerri	Northwest Sub-Area	X
X	Scallen, Maureen	Mpls Convention & Visitors Assoc	X
X	Schuster, Lea	Southeast Sub-Area	X
X	Scott, Pat	Mpls TMO	X
X	Simich, Len	Opt-Out Provider Representative	
X	VanHeel, John	Downtown Sub-Area Resident Rep	X
X	Walter, Doug	Southeast Sub-Area	X
Alternate	Byers, Jack	Minneapolis CPED Alternate	
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	

