

SWLRT Plan / RCSC Form

Plan / Document Phase: Municipal Consent Plans (Revised)  
 Reviewer: Paul Miller  
 Review Date: 1-Aug-14  
 Reviewer Organization: City of Minneapolis - Department of Public Works

Number	Segment	Sheet / Page Number	Discipline	Reviewer Comment Code	Comment
1					Apply Access Minneapolis Design Guidelines for Streets and Sidewalks throughout (as is reasonable), goto: <a href="http://www.minneapolismn.gov/publicworks/transplan/index.htm">http://www.minneapolismn.gov/publicworks/transplan/index.htm</a>
2			Civil	E - Editorial (Spelling, Style, Format)	At all station locations provide clear trail designations (bikes and pedestrians).
3			Signal	D - Design Criteria	For all MPLS signalized intersections, investigate and plan to implement new ped ramps, countdown timers and push buttons.
4			Civil	E - Editorial (Spelling, Style, Format)	Throughout the plans (E3, E4, and Exhibits) street lighting is identified by note, either as "Pedestrian Lighting" or "Lighting".....are these defined? Is there a difference between the two? Minneapolis standards for street lights and pedestrian level street lights should apply.
5			Urban Design	D - Design Criteria	At various locations throughout the plans, have bus shelter locations been identified? And adequate space available?
6			Traffic	D - Design Criteria	Bike Trail crossings of streets (including Cedar Lake Parkway and W. 21st St.) – should alternative materials be considered to differentiate the crossing? Or utilize enhanced pavement markings?
7			Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Clarify ROW acquisition types and purpose (indicated in yellow boxes on roll plots).
8	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Feasibility of sidewalk along the west side of W. 32 <sup>nd</sup> St is to be evaluated. Existing conditions would appear to require ROW acquisition, retaining wall construction, extensive tree removal, and impacts to adjacent properties including Minnekada Golf Course.
9	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Pedestrian enhancements at the intersection of W. 32 <sup>nd</sup> St. and Excelsior Blvd. at the entrance to Minnekada may require ROW acquisition. Clearly define property lines at this location.
10	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Review proposed pedestrian enhancements at the intersection of Abbott Ave. S. and Excelsior Blvd. – crosswalks over Excelsior Boulevard can only be proposed if signals are provided. Current "needs" would likely not justify crossing signals at this location. Note that the south side of Excelsior at this location is a Parking bay and not suitable for pedestrian crossing.
11	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	List Place (located between W. 32 <sup>nd</sup> St. and Abbot Ave. S.) is not identified on the plans. Pedestrian crossing enhancements should be proposed at this location (pedestrian crossing over List Place).
12	E3		Civil	I - Inaccuracy / Omission	Plan error – the typical sections identify the street ordinance for Abbott Ave. S. incorrectly. Plans show a 40' roadway within a 64' ROW. Actual dimensions are a 40' roadway within a 60' ROW.
13	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Re-aligned Abbott Ave. S. requires accommodation for future access to the development site east of the new roadway (the current Kiss & Ride layout would seem to prevent this). Is the proposed length of the Kiss & Ride based on a design requirement or is there some allowance for a shorter length?
14	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Typical sections along Chowen and Abbot propose 4' boulevards (3.5' of actual planting space); this is less than the recommended 5.5' minimum planting space for boulevards in Minneapolis.
15	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Feasibility of proposed sidewalks and boulevards along south sides of both Abbott Ave. S. and Chowen Ave. S. should be evaluated; some impacts to adjacent properties would appear to be necessary.

**SWLRT Plan / RCSC Form**

Plan / Document Phase: Municipal Consent Plans (Revised)  
 Reviewer: Paul Miller  
 Review Date: 1-Aug-14  
 Reviewer Organization: City of Minneapolis - Department of Public Works

Number	Segment	Sheet / Page Number	Discipline	Reviewer Comment Code	Comment
16	E3		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	Area-wide traffic study to include neighborhood parking issues, need for any additional signalization, development of any new or additional ped crossings and alternative ped crossing treatments where signalization is not warranted. Accessibility/Pedestrian improvements at Lake/Market Plaza, Market Plaza/Excelsior, etc.
17	E3		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	All signalized intersections in study area to receive countdown timers, APS, and improved ped ramps/bumpouts, reduced radii, etc.
18	E3		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	Abbot/Chowen roadway curvature design (City on standard fire truck axle spacing and length)? Rc
19	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Evaluate feasibility of widened sidewalks along Excelsior Boulevard?
20	E3		Urban Design	D - Design Criteria	Is a "bus shelter" planned for the "Kiss & Ride" location, and on W. Lake St.? Where? Is there room within the established ROW?
21	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Feasibility of sidewalk along the west side of W. 32 <sup>nd</sup> St is to be evaluated. Existing conditions would appear to require ROW acquisition, retaining wall construction, extensive tree removal, and impacts to adjacent properties including Minnekada Golf Course.
22	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Pedestrian enhancements at the intersection of W. 32 <sup>nd</sup> St. and Excelsior Blvd. at the entrance to Minnekada may require ROW acquisition. Clearly define property lines at this location.
23	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Review proposed pedestrian enhancements at the intersection of Abbott Ave. S. and Excelsior Blvd. – crosswalks over Excelsior Boulevard can only be proposed if signals are provided. Current "needs" would likely not justify crossing signals at this location. Note that the south side of Excelsior at this location is a Parking bay and not suitable for pedestrian crossing.
24	E3		Civil	I - Inaccuracy / Omission	List Place (located between W. 32 <sup>nd</sup> St. and Abbot Ave. S.) is not identified on the plans. Pedestrian crossing enhancements should be proposed at this location (pedestrian crossing over List Place).
25	E3		Civil	I - Inaccuracy / Omission	Plan error – the typical sections identify the street ordinance for Abbott Ave. S. incorrectly. Plans show a 40' roadway within a 64' ROW. Actual dimensions are a 40' roadway within a 60' ROW.
26	E3		Urban Design	P - Preference of Reviewer	Re-aligned Abbott Ave. S. requires accommodation for future access to the development site east of the new roadway (the current Kiss & Ride layout would seem to prevent this). Is the proposed length of the Kiss & Ride based on a design requirement or is there some allowance for a shorter length?
27	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Typical sections along Chowen and Abbot propose 4' boulevards (3.5' of actual planting space); this is less than the recommended 5.5' minimum planting space for boulevards in Minneapolis.
28	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Feasibility of proposed sidewalks and boulevards along south sides of both Abbott Ave. S. and Chowen Ave. S. should be evaluated; some impacts to adjacent properties would appear to be necessary.
29	E3		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	Area-wide traffic study to include neighborhood parking issues, need for any additional signalization, development of any new or additional ped crossings and alternative ped crossing treatments where signalization is not warranted. Accessibility/Pedestrian improvements at Lake/Market Plaza, Market Plaza/Excelsior, etc.
30	E3		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	All signalized intersections in study area to receive countdown timers, APS, and improved ped ramps/bumpouts, reduced radii, etc.
31	E3		Civil	D - Design Criteria	Abbot/Chowen roadway curvature design (City on standard fire truck axle spacing and length)? Rc
32	E3		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Evaluate feasibility of widened sidewalks along Excelsior Boulevard?

**SWLRT Plan / RCSC Form**

Plan / Document Phase: Municipal Consent Plans (Revised)  
 Reviewer: Paul Miller  
 Review Date: 1-Aug-14  
 Reviewer Organization: City of Minneapolis - Department of Public Works

Number	Segment	Sheet / Page Number	Discipline	Reviewer Comment Code	Comment
33	E3		Urban Design	P - Preference of Reviewer	Is a "bus shelter" planned for the "Kiss & Ride" location, and on W. Lake St.? Where? Is there room within the established ROW?
34	E3		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	"Trail actuated signal": further study and design for this very complex area shall consider range of options such as overhead flashers, rapid flashing beacons, and full signalization. Design shall consider various methods for bike detection. Design must include appropriate integration of rail crossing, determination if gates are required for rail crossing and method for controlling approach from Burnham Road.
35	E3		Civil	D - Design Criteria	Analyze lighting at the crossing. Is lighting level adequate/appropriate for the crossing situation?
36	E4		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Feasibility of proposed sidewalks and boulevards along Wayzata Boulevard should be evaluated; there are apparent impacts to adjacent properties including landscaping and parking lots, some ROW acquisition would be required and possible retaining wall construction.
37	E4		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	The intersections of Penn Ave. at I-394 and Oliver Ave/. S. requires further study.
38	E4		Traffic	P - Preference of Reviewer	Consider eliminating the dedicated right-turn lane on south bound Penn Ave. to West I-394 and re-align the curb to match with curb lines on Penn Ave. crossing the bridge. Traffic counts should be checked to verify change to lane configuration is defensible.
39	E4		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	All signalized intersections in study area to receive countdown timers, APS, and improved ped ramps/bumpouts, reduced radii, etc.
40	E4		Urban Design	P - Preference of Reviewer	Bike connection from Penn Ave. to Cedar Lake Road – Hennepin County? Is the bridge sidewalk a shared use Bike/Ped (over the I-394 Bridge)?
41	E4		Civil	I - Inaccuracy / Omission	Existing conditions around the new Van White Bridge do not appear to be shown correctly on the plans; new sidewalks and trail connections are either missing or shown differently than existing conditions. Specifically in the "under-bridge" areas along Dunwoody Boulevard; sidewalk exist through this area but lighting is inadequate.
42	E4		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	The median modification at Dunwoody Boulevard and Stadium Parkway includes signal relocation.
43	E4		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Proposed Van White Ped Bridge is a "place-holder" at this time. Consider a connection of the Pedestrian Bridge to the Van White Station platform.
44	E4		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	Will the 394/Dunwoody interchange now require signals? (Conduit was installed in anticipation of future signals.)
45	E4		Traffic	D - Design Criteria	At Van White - City (Allan) will let us know if the NB RT lane to Linden is needed or can/should the curb be modified there to increase sidewalk width.

**SWLRT Plan / RCSC Form**

Plan / Document Phase: Municipal Consent Plans (Revised)  
 Reviewer: Paul Miller  
 Review Date: 1-Aug-14  
 Reviewer Organization: City of Minneapolis - Department of Public Works

Number	Segment	Sheet / Page Number	Discipline	Reviewer Comment Code	Comment
46	E4		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	Feasibility of proposed sidewalks and boulevards along Holden, Border, and Royalston Ave. should be evaluated; there are apparent impacts to adjacent properties including landscaping and parking lots, some ROW acquisition would be required and possible retaining wall construction.
47	E4		Civil	D - Design Criteria	Typical sections along Holden Ave. propose 4' boulevards (3.5' of actual planting space); this is less than the recommended 5.5' minimum planting space for boulevards in Minneapolis.
48	E4		Civil	P - Preference of Reviewer	The proposed sidewalk connection from the station to 5 <sup>th</sup> St. N. along the top of the Royalston Maintenance Facility Retaining wall, resulting in an enclosed corridor, should be evaluated from a CPTED perspective.
49	E4		Urban Design	P - Preference of Reviewer	Bike Connection from Royalston Station east to 11 <sup>th</sup> /12 <sup>th</sup> ? Can secondary sidewalk serve this purpose?
50	E4		Civil	D - Design Criteria	Two-way Border Avenue: Analyze the intersection of Border/Lakeside/Royalston/Olson to ensure that two-way operation can safely be accommodated at this complicated "dual intersection" and how will the signal operate at Olson.
51	E4		Civil	D - Design Criteria	Farmers Market – the three (3) vehicle entrances along Border Ave. should be constructed as City standard concrete driveway aprons.
52	E4		Urban Design	P - Preference of Reviewer	7th Protected Bikeway design needs further analysis by the City. Implementing the Toronto bikeway idea may not be feasible.
53	E4		Civil	D - Design Criteria	Need CAD file for intersection update the 12th/7th/Van White intersection.