

Summary & Comments

Draft Preferred Long-Term Vision for the East Downtown Pedestrian Augmentation Study

Contents

This document contains four sections:

- Summary of Comments
- Stakeholder Outreach
- Specific Comments
- Summary of the DRAFT Preferred Long-Term Vision

Summary of Comments

There were 5 major themes or categories to the comments received on the Draft Vision. Each category is presented below with a summary and a general response to these comments.

DESIGN DETAIL

Many of the comments were related to the design details which would occur next in the process. These design details include implementation, schedule, design characteristics and considerations.

- The types of design details commented upon included but not limited to: timing, streetscape/landscape areas, centerline of streets, street cross-sections, catch basins, traffic signals, light poles, lane widths, planting areas, curb bump out design, bikeway design, maintenance, bus stops, signage, pavement markings, driveway access and curb cuts, impervious surfaces, drainage, storm water, etc.

Overall, this Draft Vision presents the basic approach and direction for each block and is not a plan of the design details. These design detail comments will be reviewed and considered when specific project(s) or an element of the plan is developed and designed for implementation.

TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

Several comments were related to the specific traffic operations assumptions, options, analyses and conclusions for this Study and Vision. A summary of these items follows:

- The traffic operations approach, assumptions, and process sought to reduce the travel lanes where possible and narrow the pedestrian crossing width as much as possible. First, Public Works used the information from the Stadium EIS, Downtown East AUAR, and the City's recent downtown traffic signal retiming efforts to analyze and gauge the existing and future needs for traffic operations. Based on that effort, Public Works has determined that some streets can be narrowed, some modified/enhanced, and other streets stay basically the same. Two general assumptions were identified early in this effort:

- The existing bikeways (on or off-street, striped or protected) are assumed to continue in their same locations unless noted otherwise; and
- Each intersection corner should be assumed to provide curb extensions (aka bump outs) and proper geometric radii due to multilane one-way streets which can accommodate wide bus/truck turning maneuvers unless needed for a turn lane. Turn lanes where needed will be designed to be as short as possible to maximize either pedestrian or parking use.
- Traffic needs and implications of such changes were not analyzed outside of the Study Area. However, each street's transition into and from the Study Area were considered and addressed within the Vision. If future changes are desired or considered outside of the Study Area, these will need to be analyzed further.
- The City's 2007 "Access Minneapolis – Downtown Action Plan" examined one-way versus two way streets throughout downtown. One-way streets were planned to continue in this Study Area with the exception of Park and Portland Avenues. Park and Portland Avenues in downtown and south to Franklin Avenue were identified for two-way conversion with four total lanes, two lanes in each direction. The Downtown Action Plan's proposed two-way conversion would widen these streets from the existing three-lane one-way streets to four-lane two-way streets which would result in either parking and/or bikeway removals. Since 2007, Park and Portland Avenues south of Franklin Avenue have been restriped two lanes with buffered bikeways. Likewise the re-development in East Downtown has progressed and protected bikeway planning has been proposed. Based on these recent changes, it was concluded through this effort that two-lane one-way streets for Park and Portland Avenues were preferable to either of the 3-lane or 4-lane scenarios. Also, to maximize the pedestrian space and provide protected bikeways along these streets, it is more optimal to keep these streets as two-lane one-way streets than four-lane two-way streets. This is a change from the Access Minneapolis – Downtown Action Plan.
- The City and County are participating in the Commons design discussions including how Park and Portland Avenues along with other perimeter streets will be addressed. Both Park and Portland Avenues will be two lanes. Two lanes on Park Avenue for the entire distance were analyzed, but a third lane will be needed on Park Avenue between 6th Street and 4th Street during peak periods. This third travel lane will be used as parking off-peak, so most of the time Park Avenue will operate with two travel lanes.
- Three lanes are still needed on several streets. 5th Avenue, along with 4th Avenue, is the main connection from/to Interstate 35W and both connect to the 3rd Avenue Bridge. 3rd and 4th Streets are main connections to Interstates 94, 394 and 35W.
- The conclusions for the Vision were presented on April 7, 2015 at the T&PW Committee meeting, a summary of the Draft Vision changes for travel lanes was presented both in text and visual form. The text summary and web links have been reprinted on page 16 following the Specific Comments below.

BICYCLE

These comments focused on specific comments or recommendations on the design and/or implementation of bikeways in the study area. The two themes from the comments were:

- Desire that all bikeways are protected bikeways. Desire for consistent application of bikeway design.
- More discussion is needed about how both the 4th and 5th Street corridors will implement bikeways. Several comments were received about 5th Street and the proposed bikeway addition.

Overall, these comments will be considered with the existing Bicycle Master Plan and the draft Protected Bikeways Plan. Some comments will be addressed when the bikeways are designed.

PARKING

A couple of comments were received related to specific parking locations or considerations which are summarized below and are consistent with the intent and purpose of the Vision.

- Parking lane widths should be as minimal as practical to maximize pedestrian areas.
- Parking remains where practical to serve adjacent property demand and serves as a buffer to the pedestrian/bicycle space. The parking supply for the area needs to be available and flexible for a variety of needs and users.

OTHER/CONCEPT STUDY

Comments not falling into one of the categories above or comments about the Concept Study not the Draft Vision are labeled respectively as “Other” or “Concept”. These few comments are addressed as *underlined italic* statements in the following list of Specific Comments.

Stakeholder Outreach

The stakeholder outreach for the DRAFT Preferred Long-Term Vision included the following organizations and property owners.

<p>Organizations that were sent email with the info about the project.</p>	<p>To date, we have identified the following organizations that may have interest in this topic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hennepin County • Metro Transit • Private developers such as Ryan Companies and Sherman Associates • DID/Downtown Council • East Downtown Council • Neighborhoods – Downtown East, Downtown West, Elliot Park • Commons TAC & consultant team • Bicycle Advisory Committee • Pedestrian Advisory Committee • Disability Committee • Downtown TMO • Park Board • MSFA • Minnesota Vikings • Various City departments and the Public Realm Enhancement working group -- a cross-divisional city staff group • Other property owners (SEE NEXT)
<p>Study Area property addresses that were mailed info seeking their input.</p>	<p>3rd Street South: 400, 500, 530, 614, 700, 708, 724, 800, 800 ½, 810, 811, 818, 822 4th Street South: 401, 418 5th Street South: 415 6th Street South: 500, 619 9th Avenue South: 300 Chicago Avenue: 243, 247, 247 ½, 249, 530 Park Avenue: 233, 240, 250 Portland Avenue: 240 Washington Avenue South: 501, 513, 515, 517, 519, 607, 713, 811</p>

	<p>N/S Streets between 6th St. & Washington Ave.</p> <p>5th Avenue (northbound one-way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize the third travel lane during non-peak times for parking to create a buffer for pedestrians and calm traffic. At 3rd St. & Washington Ave, intersections, use the third travel lane as the left turn lane so pedestrians don't have to cross four travel lanes. <p>Portland Avenue (southbound one-way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain two travel lanes throughout the corridor at non-peak using on-street parking as a buffer for pedestrians. Implement traffic calming as Portland moves through the forthcoming Commons Park. <p>Park Avenue (northbound one way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Match the two, 10.8' travel lanes like Portland Avenue along the Commons Park. Maintain two travel lanes throughout the corridor at non-peak times using on-street parking as a buffer for pedestrians. <p>Chicago Avenue (two-way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add bump outs to portions of intersections that do not affect turn lanes. <p>E/W Streets between 5th & Chicago Avenues</p> <p>3rd Street (westbound one-way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider allowing on-street parking in the third travel lane at non-peak times as a buffer for pedestrians. <p>4th Street (eastbound one way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider using some of the space gained from elimination of the reverse-flow bus lane for wider sidewalks rather than on-street parking. <p>5th Street (westbound one-way adjacent to LRT)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement traffic calming such as speed bumps to slow motorists using this one lane road adjacent to LRT. Consider ways to eliminate all car traffic as a long term goal." 	<p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p>
<p>Matthew Hendricks 5/1/2015 email/letter</p>	<p>Below are my comments. Following up on your question about who I'm speaking for: I'm CCing CPED colleagues on this message, but I'm by no means speaking for Brian, Miles, or Peter. I'm speaking solely as a City staff member on the Downtown East Commons team.</p> <p>Thanks for all your good work. My comments are heavy on questions/suggestions because I'd guess that's what you're looking for. Please let me frame all of my feedback by saying there's a lot to like in this plan, and I can't wait to see it implemented.</p> <p>The changes to 5th St. and 6th St. near the stadium site will be major upgrades for the pedestrian and bicycling realm in the neighborhood. Kudos to you, and all of the Public Works team, that recognized the opportunity to make dramatic improvements there. It's a significant</p>	

	<p>change that won't be fully appreciated until the construction of the new bike facilities and pedestrian realm is complete.</p> <p>I also think the Public Works team deserves much credit for including protected bikeways in the plan, as a potential option. Protected bikeways will go a long way towards making this neighborhood feel comfortable for the average person to bike in. This, in turn, will make it a much more marketable location for residents and developers. With major trails just a few blocks away, providing bike connections that the average person feels safe on will be a game-changer for this neighborhood.</p> <p>For 3rd St and 4th St, could 2 lanes function as well as 3 if signals were optimized for the E-W routes? Phrased differently: how much coordination of green lights among intersections would be necessary to make 2 lanes work better than 3?</p> <p>How much is gained from moving traffic quickly through this neighborhood, if it runs into delays a few blocks away? For example (and using purely made-up numbers), is it helpful for 4th Street S to move 2,000 cars/hour towards a freeway on-ramps that can only accommodate 1,200 cars/hour? Similarly, is there much benefit to rushing cars westbound on 3rd Avenue through Downtown East, if they will simply be delayed in (and exacerbate) congestion on 3rd Avenue in the downtown core?</p> <p>Does 5th Avenue South need 3 lanes north of 5th Street?</p> <p>Can Park Avenue function as a 2-lane street at the intersection with 5th Street? Reducing to 2 lanes at this intersection would make the pedestrian crossing of Park at 5th much shorter, and this is a key pedestrian crossing between the Commons and the LRT & Stadium. I understand that a 'pull out lane' for cars turning into the parking garage may be useful, but this wouldn't have to impact the width of the street at the intersections.</p> <p>Can Park Avenue function as a 2-lane street at the intersection with 4th? I.e. would one right-turn lane and one through lane be enough to handle the typical traffic, considering that Park Avenue terminates 3 blocks from this intersection? Having 2 lanes to cross instead of 3 at the corner would be helpful for pedestrians moving between the Commons and the LRT & Stadium.</p> <p>Can Portland Avenue at 4th Street function with one through lane and one turn lane?</p> <p>Within the Commons, one of the scenarios involves a 2-lane street that is 26 feet wide. Can the lanes be narrowed to 10' or 11', to discourage speeding through the park?</p> <p>Why are the parking bays 10' wide when the adjacent lane is motorized, but only 8' wide when the adjacent lane is a bike lane? Making the parking bays 8' wide consistently would enable the addition of 2-4 feet for the pedestrian realm throughout the area. It would also benefit pedestrians by reducing the perceived width of the street, which makes pedestrians safer by encouraging drivers to observe the speed limit.</p> <p>The planting areas near curb bump-outs could be expanded by removing one additional parking space near corners. This improves streetscape aesthetics (doubling or tripling the size of the planted areas), while the impact on total parking in the neighborhood would be</p>	<p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>DD</p> <p>P/DD</p> <p>DD</p>
--	---	---

	<p>less than 1% of total available spaces. The attached diagram tries to show what I mean – it’s admittedly very rough. Respectfully submitted, Matthew Hendricks, 5/1/15</p>	
<p>Hennepin County Kelley Yemen 4/29/2015 email</p>	<p>HENNEPIN COUNTY COMMENTS ON PARK/PORTLAND</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Vision for Downtown East. The County supports protected bike lanes or raised cycle tracks along Park and Portland in Downtown. I understand that developer has expressed concerns about the use of flexible delineators and would prefer sometime of curb. I am concerned about the use of a low curbs (or something like this http://nacto.org/wp-content/gallery/cycletrack_3dgallery/onewaycycletrack_curb.jpg) if the purpose is to create a more pedestrian friendly street when the street is closed for events, a curb in along the edge of the protected bikeway would create a tripping hazard. I think delineators would be less of an issue than some type of curb for pedestrians. A women in our office just broke her arm on a low curb like the one in the link which just brings home its injury potential during events. At this time, I don’t have a solution besides construction of a full curb level cycle track or delineators along the blocks in question, but I would be happy to discuss any other concepts that may be proposed.</p> <p>My main comment on the concept study is that I would prefer to show a section with a protected bike lane and one with a cycletrack for Park and Portland and not have an option of a buffered bike lane. If we’re going to go with a protected facility, it needs to be constant along the corridor. My only other comment is whether it would be possible to narrow the parking lanes on Park and Portland to 8’ and allot the extra width to the sidewalks. It could also increase pedestrian comfort to maintain parking along the The Commons rather than remove parking, but I understand there are much larger conversations occurring about those blocks.</p> <p>T&PW RCA – page 4 comments Regarding Portland Avenue -- Is there a location where this is not feasible? I feel like if we're committing to a parking protected bike lane and/or cycle track it has to either be that for the length of Portland Ave in downtown or not at all. Worst case would be something piecemeal. Regarding Park Avenue -- Same comment as with Portland</p> <p>Concept Study graphic comments <i>(These comments are about the Concept Study and not the Preferred Long-Term Vision.)</i> PAGE 1: show protected bike lane rather than buffered? why are we showing a buffered bike lane as its neither the existing nor what we'd like to see if the developer does not build Section A-1. reduce parking lanes to 8’? PAGE 2: same comment on as page 3. reduce parking lane to 8’ if these bumpouts are built, it would preclude parking protected bike lane using delineators - conflicts with protected bikeway study</p>	<p>B/DD</p> <p>B/P/DD</p> <p>B/DD</p> <p>B/DD</p> <p>Concept</p> <p>B/DD</p> <p>P/DD</p> <p>P/DD</p> <p>P/DD</p> <p>B/DD</p>

	<p>recommendations</p> <p>PAGE 3: I would like to see parking preserved along this side of the street to provide a buffer to pedestrians</p> <p>PAGE 4: same comments as above</p> <p>PAGE 7: could this be reduced to 8'? Same comment as on the next page about not showing a buffered bike lane and instead showing a protected bike lane</p> <p>PAGE 8: Why is such a wide parking lane needed? 8' should suffice.</p> <p>In order to be consistent with the proposed protected bikeways study, should there be a section showing a parking protected bike lane? I'm reticent to show an image of a buffered bike lane if both the city and county are really thinking about protection parking lanes seem overly wide. it would be great to see that space given to the sidewalk</p> <p>PAGE 9: This should be a parking protected lane at a minimum, if not a cycletrack. Would hate to see bumpouts built that would prevent protected bike lanes I would prefer to see parking remain as a protective barrier for pedestrians along this block of Portland for the east side of the street at least, but recognize much bigger conversations are going on as involves this block and portland.</p> <p>PAGE 11: This bumpout would preclude a parking protected lane without having to remove it</p> <p>PAGE 12: with only 12' of pedestrian zone, what minimum clear zone will be required? What will be the constant pedestrian clear zone?</p>	<p>P/DD</p> <p>P/DD</p> <p>P/DD B/DD</p> <p>P/DD</p> <p>B/DD</p> <p>P/DD</p> <p>B/DD</p> <p>P/DD</p> <p>B/DD</p> <p>DD DD</p>
<p>Minneapolis DID Ben Shardlow 4/28/2015 email 4/22/2015 email</p>	<p>4/28/2015 Thanks for the call yesterday – that was a useful conversation, and I'm going to largely take you up on your offer to treat the questions I sent earlier (below) as our comments on the study.</p> <p>We would still like to discuss all issues raised in those questions, but I'd just like to clarify a few points for now. We plan to provide comments on the draft Protected Bikeways plan, so we'll hold off on making specific comments on the protected bikeways specified in the draft long-term vision. We're requesting more information about some of the underlying assumptions of the study – specifically: why two through lanes on Park Ave were not evaluated, why one-way to two-way conversions were not considered, and the ramifications of proposed changes for these streets outside the study area.</p> <p>4/22/2015 We're planning to submit comments on the study, but it would be useful to learn more about the project first. If you'd be open to connecting with us to discuss the following questions one way or another before the deadline next week, that would be greatly</p>	<p>TO</p>

	<p>appreciated. If that's not possible, please let me know and we'll plan accordingly.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the long-term plan for the ROW where 5th St previously ran between Park and Chicago? Is there potential for this space to be integrated into the design process for the Commons or MSFA plaza? <i>(A bikeway will traverse over the 5th St ROW between Chicago and Park. Various stakeholders are discussing the best use for the remaining space such as plaza.)</i> 2. We're aware that several of these streets are being evaluated as potential protected bikeways (i.e. Park, Portland, 5th St, 6th St). Between the Protected Bikeways Update and this study, how will the determination of the appropriate bike facility design be made for these streets, and when? 3. Alternately, this study contemplates a protected bikeway on 5th Avenue, which is not an option being evaluated in the Protected Bikeways Update. Is 5th Avenue under serious consideration as a protected bikeway throughout downtown? We've participated in conversations about some streets prioritizing different modes, and had presumed that 5th Ave would prioritize cars and peds. 4. What is the schedule for deciding between the alternatives shown in this study? <i>(The schedule as presented for the Vision adoption.)</i> 5. Are there examples of protected bikeways near large-capacity venues? We're curious about potential conflicts between bikes and peds on gamedays. 6. Is there a functional reason why travel lanes that are wider than standard (13') are proposed in some alternatives? That would appear to be ROW that could be added to pedestrian space. 7. Looking at the Transportation Demand Management System, Park and Portland both see roughly 7,000 cars a day. In this study, Portland is contemplated to go from three travel lanes to two, but Park would stay at three lanes – was removing a travel lane on Park considered? Same question for 3rd and 4th Sts – are three travel lanes needed there? 8. If adopted, would the changes in roadway design for streets in the study area have ramifications for those corridors throughout downtown? 9. In Section 2 – 5th Ave between 3rd St and 4th St, would all design options contemplate a full-block turn lane, or would there be an opportunity to create more pedestrian space by starting the turn lane mid-block? 10. This question relates to issues beyond the scope of this study, but what is PW's current thinking on how snow removal will be addressed on bikeways downtown? 11. With the conversion of Hennepin and 1st Avenue from one-way to two-way streets, and the supporting research on the benefits of 	<p>Other</p> <p>B/DD</p> <p>B</p> <p>Other</p> <p>B</p> <p>DD</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO/DD</p> <p>B</p> <p>TO</p>
--	---	---

	<p>doing so for traffic calming and economic development, was any consideration given to converting any of the current one-way streets in the study area to two-way streets?</p> <p>12. If part of the intention in substantially increasing the pedestrian space in the study area is to support a better pedestrian experience with streetscape enhancements, we should discuss the possibility that MDID would be engaged to assume maintenance responsibilities.</p> <p>13. Assuming that proposed changes in travel lanes were made using existing TDM modeling, how was the future demand for on-street parking determined?</p> <p>14. With the proposed removal of the counter-flow bus lane on 4th St between Park and Chicago, was any consideration given to eliminating that counter-flow lane further to the west? We would be curious to learn how the Green Line coming on-line has affected ridership at transit stops on the north side of 4th.</p> <p>15. How would the midblock transition from two drive lanes to four lanes on Chicago between 3rd and 4th Sts work?</p>	<p>DD</p> <p>P</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p>
<p>Metro Transit Jim Harwood 4/28/2015 email</p>	<p>Metro Transit's comments regarding the Draft vision for East Downtown are below.</p> <p>Let me know if you have any questions.</p> <p>General Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All bus stops currently located in this area should not be removed as part of the long-term vision plan. As signal phasing is reviewed as part of the proposed improvements it is requested the City look to include TSP, train detection or other elements to improve LRT operations through the area. <p>5th Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain all bus stops. <p>Park Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine signal phasing at 5th Street with LRT Operations. <p>Chicago Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine signal phasing at 4th Street with LRT Operations. <p>3rd Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can on-street bus layover be included in south parking lane? Retain all existing bus stops. A new bus stop will be required between Portland Ave and 5th Ave S (past fire station) due to removal of 4th street reverse flow 	<p>DD</p> <p>DD</p> <p>DD</p> <p>DD</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>P/DD</p> <p>DD</p> <p>DD</p>

	<p>bus lane.</p> <p>4th Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain east bound bus stop between Portland Ave and Park Ave. <p>5th Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The eastbound and westbound movements of bikes and trains heading into the 5th St and Park Ave present a significant safety risk as proposed. Can the bike lane from Park Ave to Chicago Ave be moved to the southern half of existing 5th Street? This would be a safety improvement for both the bicycle/LRT crossing as well as bicycle/pedestrian interactions along the DTE plaza. Additionally it would reinforce the need for both eastbound and westbound bikes to utilize the signals at 5th St and Park Ave to cross the LRT. This intersection needs considerable thought. A physical barrier will be required the westbound LRT tracks and proposed pedestrian/bike lane for safety. A short poured concrete wall would be preferred. This will also help focus people crossing 5th street heading to the Commons to controlled intersections. We request including a no right turn movement across tracks from westbound 5th Street at 5th Avenue with associated signage and pavement markings for reinforcement. 	<p>DD</p> <p>B/DD</p> <p>B/DD</p> <p>TO/DD</p>
<p>People Serving People Daniel Gumnit 4/23/2015 voicemail and email confirmation</p>	<p>Thanks for the recap. You got it. Please see my added notes in red below.</p> <p>From: Wertjes, Jon M. Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2015 10:27 AM To: Daniel Gumnit Subject: RE: Draft vision for East downtown area as presented at TPW 4/7</p> <p>Hello Daniel: I just listen to your voicemail. My summary of your points are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3rd & Portland intersection area Concern regarding bumpouts regarding driveway access to off-street parking lot Challenges with parking/loading/unloading for 30-60 school buses both am and pm times – can we ban/restrict parking 24 hours a day on 3rd Street in front of our property to better to accommodate the buses? (The 24 hour ban request is because even though parking is restricted at certain hours, cars are blocking the busses in the AM and we have not been able to get them towed) (Public Works is working directly with this property owner on this curbside parking challenges/request.) increased interest for parking in the area (The lack/high cost of parking in general will have a major impact on our 4500 volunteers, many of whom are elderly) 	<p>DD</p> <p>DD</p> <p>Other</p> <p>P</p>

	<p>Did I get these correct? Please elaborate more if you like. We can chat by phone if that works as well. Thanks for your input!</p>	
<p>Minneapolis BAC 3/24/2015 Committee Minutes</p>	<p>Actions The Minneapolis Bicycle Advisory Committee supports protected bicycle facilities wherever possible as part of the East Downtown Pedestrian Realm Augmentation Study, and supports investigating better options for eastbound bicyclists from the intersection of Park Avenue and 4th Street S to the Hiawatha LRT Trail connection.</p> <p>Summary of Discussions East Downtown Pedestrian Realm Augmentation Study presented by Jon Wertjes – ACTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Study’s aim is to identify opportunities to make pedestrian enhancements. • Curbs are being removed during construction; how do we want to put them back? • Bike lanes will be restored on Portland; two possible layouts presented. • Our feedback requested ASAP. • All bicycle lanes will be maintained. • Robin asked about plans for bicyclists heading eastbound from Park and 4th to the LRT trail. • Plan is to probably remove reverse flow bus lane. Peter asked what will happen when the LRT isn’t working? • Robin’s motion to support protected bike lanes in this project passed unanimously with an abstention from Joe. 	<p>B</p>
<p>Simona Fischer Designer MSR Design 4/16/2015 email</p>	<p>From the perspective of an architect trained in sustainable design, I would like to offer the following thoughts.</p> <p>First, I am concerned about the lack of mention of integrated environmental performance aspects of the draft proposal, specifically the amount of impervious surface area in the East Downtown area. It seems like more than just a couple of feet of sidewalk need to be pervious, and that a functional landscape of trees, plantings and drainage needs to be considered as more integral part of the design. In terms of volume, the streets in this neighborhood are not currently able to cope with rain events such as the ones we have had in recent summers, and quality-wise, many pollutants wash from roadways into the river when there is no filtration pathway for water. I think a detailed neighborhood storm water plan with would be most effective as an integrated part of this early development phase so that the architects, landscape architects and planners can keep pervious paving and infiltration systems, filtration pathways leading to the river, and even more ambitious alternatives such as green roofs firmly in mind during design development.</p> <p>Second, I’d like to recommend the Living Community Challenge to your attention, as I think our city of Minneapolis would be a fantastic candidate for pioneering resilient urban design in the Midwest: https://living-future.org/lcc/case-studies</p> <p>The redevelopment of East Downtown is a great opportunity for high performance urban environmental design. Other neighborhoods around the Twin Cities are thinking at this scale, and we shouldn’t let the chance slip by.</p>	<p>DD</p>

<p>Scott Engel 4/13/2015 Questions sent prior to PAC meeting on 5/6/2015</p>	<p>I spent some time this weekend reviewing recommendations described in the Downtown East Pedestrian Realm Study. Overall it is exciting that Public Works is conducting the study and considering how to make our streets more pleasant for all users. I look forward to hearing more detail at the PAC Infrastructure & Engineering committee meeting on Thursday.</p> <p>Below, I have some comments and questions that I hope can get addressed at some point:</p> <p>N/S Streets Between 6th Street & Washinton Avenue</p> <p>5th Avenue (northbound one-way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - Why 3 lanes of one-direction traffic at all times? • - Could parking take up the thir lane at non-peak times? • At 3rd St. & Washington Ave, use the third travel lane as the left turn lane so pedestrians don't cross four travel lanes. <p>Portland Avenue (southbound one-way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could this street be converted to two-direction traffic as described in Access Minneapolis? • What would happen if the stret was closed through the Commons Park? • Maintain pedestrian bump-outs at 4th & 6th Streets and use the easterly travel lane as the left turn lane. <p>Park Avenue (northbound one way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally recommendations look okay. • Same 2-way conversion question as Portland. <p>Chicago Avenue (two-way traffic)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans look great. • What is the "pedestrian bridge" that is noted? <i>[explained at 5/6 PAC meeting]</i> <p>E/W Streets between 5th & Chicago Avenues</p> <p>3rd Street (wetbound one-way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an awful street for pedestrians- especially to cross. More bump-outs and fewer & narrower traffic lanes- the better, wider sidewalks. • Can the three lanes of one direction traffic be reduced to two with off peak parking? <p>4th Street (eastbound one way)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we go to two travel lanes during off-peak times? • Explain how the elimination of the reverse bus lane will work. <i>[explained at 5/6 PAC meeting]</i> 	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p></p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p></p> <p>TO</p> <p>TO</p> <p></p> <p>TO</p> <p>Other</p> <p></p> <p>DD</p> <p></p> <p>TO</p> <p></p> <p>TO</p> <p>Other</p>
--	---	---

	<p>5th Street (westbound one-way adjacent to LRT)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we eliminate all traffic on this street or at least create a Wunerf? <p>General Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could travel lanes be converted to “bus only” at peak times? • Is there possibility of signal priority for buses to reward those taking transit? 	<p>TO/DD</p> <p>TO TO</p>
--	--	----------------------------------

Summary of the DRAFT Preferred Long-Term Vision

From the April 7, 2015 Transportation & Public Works Committee meeting

(RCA letter and presentation – see Item #10 at <http://www.minneapolismn.gov/meetings/tpw/WCMS1P-139582>)

The preferred visions are presented on 11x17 sheets one for each of the seven streets (see attachments). The top half of the sheet shows the Augmentation Study concepts and the lower half shows the preferred vision. A brief summary of the preferred vision for each street is as follows:

North-South streets

5th Avenue – from 6th Street to Washington Avenue

- Retain three northbound travel lanes from 6th Street to Washington Avenue
- Retain east side midblock parking with curb extensions/bump outs to serve the Commons users and other area properties.
- Add pedestrian area next to Haaf and Gateway parking ramps from 4th Street to Washington Avenue where no parking exists today and continue to provide the left turn lanes at 3rd Street and Washington Avenue.
- Retain west side parking lane next to the jail and Government Center ramp from 6th Street to 4th Street.
- Add a buffer to the existing bike lane.

Portland Avenue – from Washington Avenue to 6th Street

- Retain two southbound through lanes
- Remove the third (westerly/right-hand most) through lane between 3rd and 6th Streets
- Add a protected bikeway facility behind the curb where feasible
- Remove parking for the one block adjacent to the Commons between 4th and 5th Streets
- Add curb extensions/bump outs and retain midblock parking on other blocks where appropriate to serve the area properties and Commons users.
- Provide southbound left turn lanes instead of parking and bumpouts at both 4th and 6th Street intersections.

Park Avenue – from 6th Street to Washington Avenue

- Retain three northbound travel lanes from 6th to 4th Streets that can accommodate peak periods.
- Allow parking in the right hand lane during off-peak periods.
- Add a protected bikeway facility behind the curb where feasible.
- Retain two through lanes from 4th Street to Washington Avenue and accommodate northbound turn lane(s) prior to both the 3rd Street and Washington Avenue intersections.
- Remove parking for the one block adjacent to the Commons and LRT station between 4th and 5th Streets, except off-peak parking in the right hand travel lane.
- Add curb extensions/bump outs and retain midblock parking on other blocks where appropriate to serve the Commons users and other area properties.

Chicago Avenue – between Washington Avenue and 6th Street

- Between Washington Avenue to 4th Street
 - Retain one travel lane and one parking lane each direction with parking restrictions needed for some stadium events
 - Add a southbound left turn lane at 4th Street – (This critical pedestrian intersection will be re-examined with the stadium Transportation Management Plan which includes the new pedestrian bridge, other area developments, the new I-35W 4th Street entrance ramp and event activities.)
 - Plan for future east side pedestrian promenade/plaza between River/Guthrie and stadium with alignment matching the built segments north of Washington Avenue.
- Between 4th to 6th Streets
 - Retain 1 travel lane each direction and the east side parking bay consistent with planned stadium changes.
 - Plan for a new bike/pedestrian crossing and signal approximately at former 5th Street intersection.

- Modify north lag to align with added southbound left turn lane at 4th Street.

East-West streets

3rd Street – from Chicago Avenue to 5th Avenue

- Retain existing cross-section with on-street bike lane.
- Add curb extensions/bump outs and retain midblock parking to serve the area properties.

4th Street – from 5th Avenue to Chicago Avenue

- Metro Transit has agreed to the removal of the reverse flow bus lane from Norm McGrew Place west to 5th Avenue due to changes for the Green Line related bus operations.
- Replace reverse flow bus lane with midblock on-street parking and add curb extensions/bump outs to serve the area properties.
- Add a buffer to the existing bike lane.
- Retain three eastbound through lanes.
- Add midblock parking and curb extensions/bump outs on the south side to serve the Commons users and other area properties.

5th Street – from Chicago Avenue to 5th Avenue

- Retain the left hand through lane (southerly side, left of LRT).
- Convert the right hand through lane (northerly side, right of LRT) to a two-way bikeway and/or pedestrian space.

Attachments:

East Downtown Pedestrian Realm Augmentation Study dated 1/28/2015

<http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/www/groups/public/@cped/documents/webcontent/wcms1p-138489.pdf>

DRAFT East Downtown Preferred Long-Term Vision dated 4/03/2015

<http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/www/groups/public/@cped/documents/webcontent/wcms1p-139701.pdf>