

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
4	Page 4	Steering Committee Composition	Although the steering committee is made up of numerous respected University of Minnesota staff/faculty, it does not appear that neighborhood representatives or jurisdictional partners were asked to participate as part of this group. Given that there are numerous references to the University of Minnesota "Area of Influence" it is important that serious consideration be given toward neighborhood comments and questions. The recent numerous open houses and public forums have helped to address this concern, however implementing many of the stated growth initiatives in the report may create conflicts that could be potentially passed to neighborhoods or other jurisdictions to help solve.	Public Works
4	Pages 4 and 6	The document refers to increasing ownership of master plan by community.	Is Jan Morlock the only member of the University Alliance work group represented on the staff team? Having some neighborhood group representation would add a strategic element to the team and give the document legitimacy in the surrounding community context. Pag3 6 makes references to community forums, but it seems these were on campus. I would like more elaboration on how this document serves to integrate the University Campus with its campus environs either in Minneapolis (E/W Banks) or in St Paul. The university campus cannot be treated as an island, but should be considered a unique neighborhood within an urban regional setting to draw on neighborhood assets, and impacts.	CPED - Planning
6	Role of the Master Plan	Suggested addition	While the Master Plan addresses the University's position amongst a variety of stakeholders - this reality is not mentioned as a role that the document plays. Consideration of the U's position within the greater community should be of great importance here in the description of the document.	CPED - Planning
7	Plan Elements & Guidelines: Community Connections (Pg 7 of draft report overview document)	Support shared interests between the University and adjacent neighborhoods	Consider mentioning community gardens as a use for University owned land (to be used by either students, staff, or leased by community residents). Community gardens can be used for campus and community food production as well as beautification of campus grounds and can help promote community building between students and community residents. This is supportive of the Mpls Plan for Sustainable Growth (Public Services & Facilities Chapter, Pg 8 and Open Space & Parks Chapter, Pg 6)	Department of Health & Family Support

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
7	Plan Elements & Guidelines: Community Connections (Pg 7 of draft report overview document)	Coordinate academic and physical resources to establish learning communities that extend beyond traditional teaching/learning spaces and classrooms.	Consider mentioning farmers markets as a way to productively use open spaces on University property to encourage interdisciplinary learning activities (for example, combining small business opportunities and education related to agricultural practices). This is supportive of the Mpls Plan for Sustainable Growth (Open Space & Parks Chapter, Pg 6)	Department of Health & Family Support
7	Drafting the Master Plan - Bullet #6	Steering Committee Composition	The City encourages the University to include stakeholders from outside of the University system on the Steering Committee during the next round of Master Planning - further collaboration early on in the process would be welcomed.	CPED - Planning
8	Plan Elements & Guidelines: Natural Features & Systems (Pg 8 of draft report overview document)	Use an integrative, multipurpose, and conservation approach to resource consumption decisions related to development, infrastructure, and operations practices on campus.	Consider mentioning composting systems as a way to reduce food waste on campus. Composting leads to a reduction in waste and creates a value-added product (enriched soil) that can be utilized on campus grounds.	Department of Health & Family Support
8	Plan Elements & Guidelines: Natural Features & Systems (Pg 8 of draft report overview document)	Protect the Mississippi River water quality from negative impacts of campus development and activities.	Consider the development of community gardens, rooftop gardens and additional rain gardens and swales to maximize energy efficiency of buildings and landscapes as well as to improve wastewater filtration and resource management (specifically of soil and water). This is supportive of the Mpls Plan for Sustainable Growth (Environment Chapter, Pg 5; Open Space & Parks Chapter, Pg 6)	Department of Health & Family Support
8	page 8, first plan element bullet and page 27	"published Regent's Boundary"	What are the boundaries? I couldn't find this information online or in the plan.	CPED - Planning
8	Guiding Principles	Lack of vision for accommodating auto use	Being that the University is a major trip generator for all modes of transportation - the acknowledgement of auto travel to and through the University area should play a more important role in this portion and other areas of the report.	CPED - Planning
8	Community Connections	Community Interaction and engagement	There are positive statements about enhancing the surrounding community and adjacent neighborhoods - understanding that these are value statements - there does not seem to be much detail in the plan on how to accomplish this. How does the University intend to meet these goals?	CPED - Planning

**City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Plan Element</b>	<b>Content in Question</b>	<b>Staff Comment</b>	<b>Department</b>
8	page 8-9-10	The Guiding Principles/Core Values listed in the bottom center of page 8 describe 11 key themes.	I expected to see discussion of each of these 11 themes in the following pages, but did not. Currently, page 9 follows the Guiding principles, jumping to the 2nd one first - and describing community connections. On page 10, the next several core principles are skipped, addressing discussion of natural features, which is the 7th core value. The reader is led to believe these core values were agreed upon, then a few were determined important, and the others were skipped or passed over. I see these principles are later addressed in detail beginning on page 20. A reference to page 20 should appear on pages 8,9, and 10 - directing the reader to the details.	CPED - Planning
9	Plan Elements & Guidelines: Movement & Circulation (Pg 9 of draft report overview document)	Prioritize pedestrian movement over other modes of transportation whenever feasible.	The Health Department strongly supports the prioritization of pedestrian and non-motorized transportation options whenever feasible because of the numerous health benefits associated with physical activity such as walking and biking. Pedestrian improvements are easy to implement (e.g. countdown crossing signals, pavement striping, audio/visual cues, signage, etc). This is supportive of the Mpls Plan for Sustainable Growth (Open Space & Parks Chapter, Pg 6)	Department of Health & Family Support
9	Plan Elements & Guidelines: Movement & Circulation (Pg 9 of draft report overview document)	Provide a barrier-free, safe, and accessible experience of moving around on campus.	The Health Department also strongly supports compliance with ADA standards as a way to facilitate movement by all persons, regardless of physical ability. The Master Plan should expand on this guideline to ensure that the pedestrian environment is accessible to persons with disabilities.	Department of Health & Family Support
9	Plan Elements & Guidelines: Public Spaces & Buildings (Pg 9 of draft report overview document)	Utilize renewable materials and sustainable methods in campus buildings and landscapes.	Consider the development of community gardens, rooftop gardens and additional rain gardens and swales to maximize energy efficiency of buildings and landscapes as well as to improve wastewater filtration and soil and water management. This is supportive of the Mpls Plan for Sustainable Growth (Environment Chapter, Pg 5; Open Space & Parks Chapter, Pg 6)	Department of Health & Family Support
9	Plan Elements & Guidelines: Public Spaces & Buildings (Pg 9 of draft report overview document)	Plan and build new buildings located on the edges of campus to be sensitive to their impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.	The Health Department strongly supports the development of mixed use buildings on the edges of campus as a way to encourage non-motorized transportation.	Department of Health & Family Support

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
9	Natural Features and Systems	Most of Page 9	Many of these statements line up well with policies outlined in the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth - the City looks forward to implementing these elements of our plans together.	CPED - Planning
10	Movement and Circulation	Bullet #2	Sometimes barriers to movement are appropriate and enhance pedestrian safety - they can also serve to guide people to the destinations where activity is encouraged.	CPED - Planning
10	Movement and Circulation	Bullet #4	It will be key to include way-finding to destinations in the neighborhoods - and to note in key neighborhood locations how to get to the University.	CPED - Planning
10	Movement and Circulation	Bullet #5	Further work with City of Minneapolis is needed to identify where these infrastructure needs are, and how they can be developed.	CPED - Planning
10	Public Spaces and Buildings	Bullet #6	Removal of historic or potentially historic resources should involve consultation with CPED - Preservation and Design staff - and when necessary the Heritage Preservation Commission. Also, the greater Community should be listed as an element that could gain from an improved physical/design relationship.	CPED - Planning
10	Public Spaces and Buildings	Bullet #8	Who will decide what is context sensitive design? What process does the University envision for ensuring this outcome?	CPED - Planning
11	Page 11	Key Guidelines	Public Works applauds the University in its stated efforts to utilize renewable materials and sustainable methods in campus buildings and landscapes.	Public Works
11	Implementation Summary	Bullet #2	While this is a logical guideline to have, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that it is helpful considering the lack of community involvement in this planning process. In other words, what good is conformance with the Master Plan to the district as a whole if many stakeholders have had limited influence on the plan?	CPED - Planning
13	page 13, first line, 4th paragraph	Quote "A cluster of residence hall neighborhoods are found at a number of East Bank locations, along University Avenue"....	What is a residence hall neighborhood?	CPED - Planning
14	p 14, middle of description	A smaller campus residential neighborhood clustered around Middlebrook Hall sits on top of the river bluff	One building is not a neighborhood.	CPED - Planning
16	Page 16	Renovation of Key Historic Buildings	The renovation or reconstruction of many of the buildings on campus presents an opportunity to improve stormwater runoff and reduce stormwater capacity needs.	Public Works

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
16	Growth in Faculty and Staff based on Academic Plan	Second Paragraph	This seems to be an opportunity to collaborate with surrounding communities to increase owner occupied housing options in the University District.	CPED - Planning
16	Wide Use of Resources in Facilities and Operational Practices	Third Paragraph	Creating a new power generation plant to serve the needs of the University needs to be explored in detail with area service providers, area stakeholders, and various government agencies. Engaging the City of Minneapolis in this process as soon as possible is recommended.	CPED - Planning
16	p 16 , 3rd paragraph	By 2000 there were two buildings devoted to this work located in the neighborhood. A new wave of development between 2005 and 2013 will result in an additional three biomedical buildings in the district.	The authors need to clarify where the various "neighborhoods" and "districts" referred to thus far by the plan actually are. A simple map preceding the existing page 11 could build on the discussion of the core values/guiding principles and help the reader identify specific places where such implementation is to be carried out. For instance, it may be that "the University will work to maintain the historic character of the Old Knoll "district" of the East Bank Campus as a set of traditional building styles set within the early landscape of this part of the campus. It seems there is an attempt to identify certain districts (residential housing districts as being distinct from neighborhoods (such as the biomedical sciences area now developing in the east gateway) but the question is what makes a district unique from a neighborhood, or are they intended to be the same thing?	CPED - Planning
17	p 17 fourth bullet	Stable on-campus housing neighborhoods	Is there any consideration of off campus housing issues in the plan? This is would be a great opporunity for the university to engage its neighbors.	CPED - Planning
20	p20 - discussion of guiding principles.	I would like to see a page worth of discussion devoted to each of the guiding principles.	This will emphasize the importance of each, rather than deemphasizing them some by putting multiple principles on each page.	CPED - Planning
20	p20-22	11 core principles	Each of the core principles are very well done. I do think they would have a more lasting impact if they each had individual pages, or perhaps if each of the common themes had their own pages...move guiding principle 3 on page 20 to p 21 where it can be properly associated with the others intended to implement the theme of "Creating a Model Campus"	CPED - Planning
21	Guiding Principle #4	Suggested addition	The University should include a comment about how the built environment will interact with the surrounding community in this statement.	CPED - Planning

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
23	Guiding Principle #10	General Consideration	When thinking about sustainability in the plan, the University should consider the balance between removal of buildings deemed "obsolete" if those buildings will not be replaced on site. While the need for meaningful and programmable open space is important, the efficient use of land should also be a balancing consideration throughout the document - especially when the University is considering outward expansion in the coming years. Inward expansion is a sustainability element that does not seem detailed enough in the document.	CPED - Planning
26	Page 26	Open Space Framework map	Map is detailed but would benefit from identification of boundary streets.	CPED - Business Development
26	Page 26	A site for a new energy plant east of campus	This facility will have a significant impact on neighboring communities. Its location should result from a community wide planning effort.	CPED - Business Development
26	Page 26	A site for a new energy plant east of campus.	If a new plant is to be constructed it should be designed to allow for the existing steam plant to be closed and east river parkway extended.	Public Works
26	Pp. 26 and 27	Campus Lands map on p. 26 and Areas of Influence map on p. 27	The St. Anthony Falls Lab site is not shown as under University ownership, although we thought it was.	CPED - Business Development
26	Text re: Boundaries on p. 26	There's a reference to a potential future acquisition within the next ten years of a site for a new energy plant east of campus.	This raises the question of whether this new plant would supplement or replace the existing plant along the river. If the latter, that would allow some exciting riverfront opportunities to be explored. In either case, the siting of a new plant would need extensive study. It would be helpful to have more information as to what is meant by "east of campus" (even if a specific site cannot yet be identified) and how large a site would be needed.	CPED - Business Development
26	page 26, map	extension of campus to Huron Blvd	The future land use map in the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth designates land east of Oak Street as urban neighborhood. The University should apply to amend the plan if they proceed to expand as shown.	CPED - Planning
26	page 26, map	Ontario between Essex and Fulton is not shown	Is this proposed to be vacated? If so, this is in direct conflict with the following policy of Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth: Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments. 10.15.1 Consider street vacations as a last resort to preserve the network of city streets and arterials.	CPED - Planning
26	page 26, map	properties identified as owned by the University	According to Hennepin County records, the U of M is not the owner of all of the properties that have been identified as being under their ownership. Unless recent acquisitions have occurred, the block bound by Essex, Ontario, Fulton, and Oak is an example where only half of the properties are under University ownership.	CPED - Planning

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
26	p26	the map	It is hard to discern from the image where the location of the university services properties are. It would be helpful to identify some of the streets on this map for reference since they are used in the paragraphs. For instance, 25th avenue is referenced - and even a person with a vast familiarity with the U of M area geography had a hard time seeing these features in this image.	CPED - Planning
27	Page 27	Area of influence map	Map is detailed but would benefit from identification of boundary streets.	CPED - Business Development
27	Page 27	Area of influence map	Area # 6 should be identified both as Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) Area and as University Research Park (URP)	CPED - Business Development
27	Text on p. 27	There are several bullets that list exceptions under which the University may do additional land acquisition outside the "boundary."	These bullets are broad enough that they could largely negate the concept of a "boundary."	CPED - Business Development
27	Areas of Influence Map - Twin Cities Campus	General Consideration	It is unclear whether or not these are boundaries at all. Furthermore, the text does not indicate that the boundaries have real meaning considering that further expansion may be considered during the life of the plan. What will the University process be for amending the so-called "boundaries" on this map?	CPED - Planning
27	p27	the map	Again, a few additional landmarks might help with identification of features on this map. More streets identified, or possibly community identifiers like parks or Municipal boundaries would provide helpful information. Overall, this is a good base illustration for the associated text.	CPED - Planning
28	Shared Geography and Areas of Influence	Fourth and Fifth Paragraphs	These statements are key to cultivating a positive working relationship between the University, the Community, and the City of Minneapolis. CPED hopes to be a major participant in these efforts on into the future. However, there again is a lack of foresight into what kind of real commitment this will take - what kinds of steps will the University take to make this a reality?	CPED - Planning
28	Guidelines	Bullet #1	Again, how will this be accomplished? What kind of commitment can the University make to ensure this outcome?	CPED - Planning
28	p28, first paragraph	Shared Geography and Areas of Influence Figure Y, Areas of Influence illustrates the University's area of influence on adjacent neighborhoods.	This reference to Figure Y must imply the image on the preceding page, but the images are not labeled according to a letter or number format, so its not clear if this is the case or not....	CPED - Planning

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
28	p 28, 4th paragraph, last sentence?	Whenever possible, these activities will be informed by a collaborative planning process with area stakeholders.	Is the university committed to the same public approval process on a voluntary basis as that which applies to private development. How is "whenever possible" going to be determined? When would it be impossible for the University to collaborate with neighbors/stakeholders?	CPED - Planning
28	p 28,5th paragraph	Discussion about peripheral developments	Three guidelines are identified. The first deals with the image and physical characteristics of development at the edge. Does this means property the university owns, or private land on the opposite side of the street? Is this plan supposed to apply similarly to both, and what is the procedural instrument that will make it happen? It sounds a little like the U is interested in design of private property, and if so, what is the nature of that interest - does it have a monetary backing? or simply advisory? the 2nd bullet describes improvements along access routes. Again, many of these are public infrastructure, or private properties, and some are university owned. To what degree, and how will the university invest in these partnerships?	CPED - Planning
29	Land Use Plan map on p. 29	Map is not included	Cannot evaluate this topic without the map	CPED - Business Development
29	First Guidelines	Bullet #1	Again, how will this be accomplished? What kind of commitment can the University make to ensure this outcome? What is the measurement of success?	CPED - Planning
29	First Guidelines	Bullet #2	Defining the "University Community" may be a helpful exercise. What stakeholders is the University describing here?	CPED - Planning
29	p 29	use of the term campus	Livability Issues : It can be interpreted in this paragraph that campus means both the university campus, and the campus and surrounding community. It would be useful to differentiate how campus is used throughout the document for this reason. Perhaps use "Campus" to describe the core university properties on the E/W banks and in St Paul, and the "Greater Campus Community" to describe the area represented by the university alliance.	CPED - Planning
32	Open Space Framework Map - Minneapolis Campus on page 32, Guidelines Bullet #7 on page 33	New Public Space near the Knoll	Careful consideration should be taken to ensure that demolition of structures is the best way to create a new public space. Efficient use of land and reprogramming of existing buildings should be considered when weighing the impacts of development on Natural Features and Systems.	CPED - Planning
32	Guidelines	Bullet #14	What are the natural conditions?	CPED - Planning

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
33	p 33, bulleted guideline at top of middle column	creation of multipurpose utility corridors, boulevards, parks and streets as a way to preserve public views of the river corridor	I would like to see a more specific comment about completing the connection from E River Road to Main Street/St Anthony via the area currently occupied by the Steam Plant. Especially since the discussion of a new power facility appears elsewhere in this document, this is the #1 way views of the river can be ensured, created, and preserved.	CPED - Planning
33	p 33, bulleted guideline at bottom of right column	this bullet describes controlling storm surface runoff	It is interesting to ponder the implementation steps for those vast areas of the campus that are urban plazas, especially on the West Bank. It could certainly lead to a number of positive changes.	CPED - Planning
37	Figure	32% Auto Trips	While the University is certainly a multi-modal destination - the high volume of cars that make up that 32% of trips to and from the University are generally not given enough attention in the plan. How will the University accommodate auto traffic into the future considering the major constraints being put on the road system with Central Corridor?	CPED - Planning
38	Pages 38-40	Pedestrian Priority	The plan does address multi-modal opportunities to include new transit hubs, better pedestrian and bicycling way-finding signage, and the goal to reduce conflicts between the modes. The University should consider a policy of modal balance instead of modal priority to address modal conflicts.	Public Works
39	Page 39	Map	Any improvements on 25th Ave SE from University Avenue to Huron Blvd need to be coordinated with the City of Minneapolis. Currently this project has not been identified as part of the cities 5-year capital program.	Public Works
39	Route to Parking map on p. 39 and Pedestrian Framework map on p. 40	Both maps show a dotted line indicating the future route of the "River Road Ext." (a.k.a. the Main Street to East River Parkway extension	We support the inclusion of the River Road Ext. and recommend inclusion of a guideline bullet about working with other partners to develop key pedestrian connections to the campus, such as the River Road Ext.	CPED - Business Development
39	Route to Parking & Vehicle Free Zones Map - Minneapolis Campus	Vehicle Free Zone	What does this mean exactly? Cars are not allowed on the interior of blocks where there are no roads? Clarification on the meaning and value of this designation would be helpful.	CPED - Planning

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
39	P 39 - all	Vehicle free zones?	what will be the impact of the vehicle free zones be? Will it lead to cars continuing to be left at the campus fringe for the day? The whole idea of this is interesting, but extremely confusing and not very well developed. More emphasis on the who, what, how and \$ regarding this subject will prove clarifying. Also, most of the identified Vehicle free zones are plazas and walkways between buildings - given this is the case it is hard to discern what the actual potential impact of these zones could be.	CPED - Planning
40	page 40, map	"pedestrian gap"	What is meant by pedestrian gap? Most of the identified locations have sidewalks.	CPED - Planning
40	Maps on P 40-41	the image in the map and its suggestions	The maps are not very well annotated. The mpl's map shows some very obvious places where ped routes are blocked. However, I see no discussion here about improvements. Further, the map identifies a series of distinct areas (IE 1,2,3 at either end of the bridge) as conflict areas, but there is no discussion or elaboration on the issues that make these areas "zones of conflict" for pedestrians	CPED - Planning
41	Safe and Accessible Movement on Campus	Guidelines	Many of these guidelines are in line with the City's Site Plan Review chapter in the Zoning Ordinance - CPED encourages further collaboration with the University on these elements.	CPED - Planning
42	Pages 42-47	Bike Network/Transit Network	The modal hub near the new stadium is an exciting opportunity to improve transit and bicycle use. It is good to see in the plan that the Campus Circulator will continue to operate along Washington Avenue, as there will not be enough capacity on the Central Corridor trains to allow for transitway bus users to get off and transfer to a LRT train. However, bicycle routes to the new hub need to be planned to allow for better connections.	Public Works
42	Pages 42-43	Map	The bicycle plan has omitted a number of city bicycle routes including a planned trail between Bridge 9 and 2nd Street underneath I-35W. The city will work with the U of M to identify all of the planned city bicycle routes on its map.	Public Works
42	Bike Network map on p. 42	This map shows a future route between the Stone Arch Bridge and the bike trail in the Dinkytown rail trench that follows a different route than the planned River Road Ext.	It isn't clear whether the difference between the ped and bike routes is intentional or simply that the maps' detailing needs to be cleaned up. We recommend that the route location be agreed upon and reflected in the maps (and think they were both to use the same route). We are glad to see the bullet on p. 43 about working with other partners to develop key bike connections to the campus.	CPED - Business Development
42	Guidelines	Bullet #2	How does the University intend to accomplish this?	CPED - Planning

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
42	Guidelines	Bullet #3	What areas have been identified as opportunities? Further work with City staff is required.	CPED - Planning
43	Page 43	Right Of Way cross sections	Dimensions for the cross sections should be provided.	CPED - Business Development
43	Regional Trail Network map on p. 43	Map doesn't indicate whether this is intended to show the existing network or the existing and planned future network.	If the map shows the existing network, then there aren't yet continuous connections on both sides of the River in the Upper River area. If the map shows the future network, then it would be preferable to not show a break that will be filled by the River Road Ext. (although that may not yet technically be included in the regional park plan).	CPED - Business Development
43	Bicycle Support Facilities	Paragraph #1	Appendix H is referenced - what are the University's Construction Standards?	CPED - Planning
44	page 44, first paragraph and first guideline	"Improvements are planned to mitigate the adverse effects of rerouted vehicular traffic." and "Pursue traffic mitigation on campus streets to minimize negative impacts on campus buildings"	What improvements? Most of the impacted streets are city streets.	CPED - Planning
44	Light Rail Transit	Paragraph #1 - "closing a portion of the Washington Avenue"	Should note that Washington Avenue is closing to auto traffic only	CPED - Planning
44	Light Rail Transit	Paragraph #2	The City requests review of any studies the University has done to support the claim that pedestrian and bicycle traffic will increase substantially due to the absence of automobiles. The claim seems logical, but also could stand to be substantiated by some research.	CPED - Planning
44	Light Rail Transit	Paragraph #2	The City is aware of planned projects at two of the LRT stations (West Bank and Stadium Village) that do not seem in keeping with the last sentence of this paragraph. How can large parking ramps located immediately at transit stations be considered part of a "Pedestrian-focused environment?"	CPED - Planning
44	Light Rail Transit Guidelines	Bullet #1	How will the University help to mitigate traffic impacts on surrounding communities that are related to University generated traffic? - not just on campus streets.	CPED - Planning

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
47	Pages 47-48	Signature Streets	Many of the outlined signature streets (i.e. Riverside Avenue, University, 4th St, Oak Street, Fulton Street) are along City of Minneapolis or Hennepin County right-of-way. Any needed improvements along these corridors should be coordinated with the appropriate jurisdiction. There is currently no city or county funding programmed streetscape elements on any of these routes and it will be the responsibility of the U of M to identify funding for signature streets, capital improvements, and maintenance.	Public Works
47	Page 47	Map	The plan should show Granary Road on all maps east of 23rd Ave SE.	Public Works
47	Vehicle Framework map on p. 47	Map shows River Road Ext. as a future street, but makes it appear that Washington will remain open through campus (when it won't due to LRT)	We support the inclusion of the River Road Ext. Given the major impact of closing part of Washington to vehicles, we recommend that much more attention be given to how this can be accommodated/mitigated (or at least text added to acknowledge this need). It also is important to try to assure that mitigation does not negatively impact the routes along the river that have been primarily recreational and/or low volume (e.g., East River Parkway).	CPED - Business Development
47	Vehicle Framework Map - Minneapolis Campus	Church Street as Signature Street	Does this indicate that Church will be reopened to regular auto traffic? The signature street description would lead one to believe that this is the case.	CPED - Planning
49	Page 49	Encourage appropriate agencies to construct bypass routes to reduce congestion resulting from non-university destined trips.	Much of the congestion in the area is the result of trips to and from the U of M campus. The U of M may be asked to financially participate in a bypass route.	Public Works
49	Traffic Management Guidelines	Bullet #1	The University generates much of the traffic in this area, and would directly benefit from any constructed bypass or method aimed at alleviating congestion - the University should be a major partner in the implementation of such a project.	CPED - Planning
49	Parking Guidelines	Bullet #1	Will this be done by the University or Metro Transit, where will these areas be located?	CPED - Planning
53	Identity and Symbolism	Suggested addition	Under "Guidelines" a bullet should be added to stress the importance of negotiating how University buildings interact with neighbors that are not part of the University itself.	CPED - Planning
54	Definition and Borders	General Comment	Discussion of how buildings interact with pedestrians and with open space and view corridors is a welcomed consideration.	CPED - Planning
55	Unity	General Comment	Again, working with other agencies and the surrounding community to create this district identity will be important.	CPED - Planning

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
57	Optimization	General Comment	This line of thought is highly recommended, and should be thoroughly put to application when considering demolition of buildings in the Knoll area	CPED - Planning
58	Cultural Resources Map - Minneapolis Campus	General Comment	We strongly encourage consultation with City of Minneapolis Preservation and Design Staff when considering demolition or designation of potential historic resources.	CPED - Planning
58	Page 58	Washington Ave Bridge may be eligible for NHRP Listing	Adding this bridge to a historic listing may inhibit the ability to repair or replace the bridge in the future.	Public Works
58	P. 58 (second one)	Development Framework map	The potential demolition of structures along East River Road would (assuming none are historically significant and thus should be saved) allow opportunities to greatly enhance the planned River Road Ext. that would connect Main Street SE to East River Parkway. It also would provide additional space to potentially address erosion problems in this segment of the gorge.	CPED - Business Development
59	Development Framework Map	Paragraph #5	We would like to discuss what these joint planning efforts might entail, and any detailed timeline that the University may have identified.	CPED - Planning
59	Guidelines	Bullet #2	We encourage the University to reconsider demolition of buildings if their programmatic elements require construction of new buildings at the periphery of campus.	CPED - Planning
59	p. 59 (first one)	Text re: preservation and adaptive reuse	We encourage the University to also formulate a plan to interpret its history. This could be done with signage on/in buildings, an expanded self-guided walking tour, public art that is informed by the history of the institution or specific buildings/districts, and printed or web brochures, etc.	CPED - Business Development
63	Recommendations	Bullet #4	It is unclear where the two new academic buildings will be, and which buildings that they are slated to replace.	CPED - Planning
63	Knoll and Mall District text on p. 63	There is a bullet under Recommendations about LRT on Washington, but no bullets that respond to the River-related goals on pp. 9, 22 and 33 (other than a reference to a River view from the Norris Hall site).	The LRT bullet is a statement of fact that (because it's under "Recommendations") makes it sound like increased traffic on the listed streets is recommended. It seems like the recommendation should be that these increases should be evaluated, avoided if possible, and mitigated if unavoidable. And, it would be great to see how the River goals would inform activities in this district. There is no recommendation about the River Road Ext. creating an additional multi-modal access point into campus.	CPED - Business Development

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
65	Recommendations	Bullet #4	It should be acknowledged that the closing of Washington to auto traffic, not LRT itself will result in increased traffic on side streets. Additionally, any University expansion into this area will likely result in increased traffic as well.	CPED - Planning
65	Residence Halls and Health Center District text on p. 65	There is a bullet under Recommendations about LRT on Washington, but no bullets that respond to the River-related goals on pp. 9, 22 and 33.	As above, the LRT bullet is a statement of fact that makes it sound like increased traffic on the listed streets is recommended. It seems like the recommendation should be that these increases should be evaluated, avoided if possible, and mitigated if unavoidable. And, it would be great to see how the River goals would inform activities in this district (in addition to stormwater management in the Health Center area).	CPED - Business Development
65	page 65, 2nd and 4th recommendation	extension of campus to Huron Blvd and increased traffic on E River Rd, Harvard St and Fulton St	Expanding the campus east of Oak St for a clinic will result in increased traffic on minor arterial streets. Stating that traffic will increase as a result of the Washington LRT stop isn't a recommendation. Where parking can be accommodated should be recommended and it should not include surface parking as discouraged by the following policy: 1.13.3 Discourage uses that diminish the transit and pedestrian character of areas around transit stations, such as automobile services, surface parking lots, and drive-through facilities. They should also recommend that they will work with the City to address the adverse effects of the new LRT stop and any campus expansion plans to be consistent with our policies of traffic management around the University: 2.2.7 Coordinate with the University of Minnesota, institutions and other largescale users, as well as regional transportation agencies to manage transportation needs and manage transportation and parking impacts on nearby residential areas.	CPED - Planning
67	Recommendations	Bullet #4	Granary Road will also provide a direct connection to planned University development in the area, benefitting a wide variety of stakeholders.	CPED - Planning
69	West Bank District text on p. 69	There is a bullet about improved stormwater management in plaza areas.	It is good to see the recommendation about stormwater management improvements related to plaza areas; are there other ways that the River goals would inform activities in this district? Also, there are no recommendations that respond to the changes that will result from the elimination of vehicular traffic from "the trench."	CPED - Business Development
71	Recommendations	Bullet #2	This work will need to be done in collaboration with County, City, and local area stakeholders.	CPED - Planning

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
71	Page 71	Conflict areas for pedestrians and bicycle crossings will be mitigated at established pedestrian crossings on the minor arterials through changes to signal design or other operational changes.	This is a presupposed assumption that changes to signal design or operational changes will improve conditions for bicycles and pedestrians. This may not be the case.	Public Works
83	Implementing the Master Plan	General Comment	As noted in previous comments, this portion of the plan lacks detailed direction on who the University considers to be a stakeholder, and how those stakeholders will be engaged in the process of growing the University into the future. We encourage collaboration with the City of Minneapolis on all fronts in this respect.	CPED - Planning
83	Page 83 last paragraph	Definition of University community	How is the University community defined. I may have missed it and I hope that it is defined as the communities surrounding and being impacted by the University.	CPED - Business Development
Various	Page 26, 27, 32, 39, 40, 42, 45, 47, 58 (#2)	Depictions of University East Bank property	The maps depict property that appears to be owned by the university. Properties owned by others are included (e.g. north side of 4th Street between 25th Ave SE and 27th Ave SE). Plans for acquisition by the University of these and any other properties should be a part of the plan.	CPED - Business Development
Various	Page 39, 40, 42, 45, 47, 58 (#2)	Depictions of Granary Road	The role of Granary road should be described more thoroughly than is the case.	CPED - Business Development
Various	Entire plan	-	The Master Plan is well organized and the guiding principles are solid. Generally the plan elements and guidelines support the guiding principles and the University's mission.	Public Works
Various	Multiple locations throughout plan	References throughout draft to importance of respecting and responding to University's location along the Mississippi River, e.g. p. 9, p. 22, p. 33.	We strongly support the University's desire to make its relationship to one of the world's great rivers a central part of its vision.	CPED - Business Development
Various	District Planning chapter	None of the district maps are shown.	We can't evaluate what isn't shown and the maps may assist in interpreting the related text.	CPED - Business Development

## City of Minneapolis Staff Comments on the University of Minnesota 2009 Master Plan - February 17, 2009

Page	Plan Element	Content in Question	Staff Comment	Department
Various	Historic Preservation	Knoll Area	Preservation & Design note the existence of all planned and existing historic districts and landmarks within the affected areas indicated in the U of M's proposed Master Plan, and request that the University respect these resources and the shared heritage that they communicate. We further recommend that the University of Minnesota not demolish properties designated or eligible for designation as historic properties on local, state, and national registers of historic properties. Planned demolitions and development on the Knoll are especially troubling. The City strongly recommends the University adhere to local and federal standards for the treatment of historic properties when planning new construction and modifications to existing buildings within this area.	CPED - Planning
Various	Plan Elements & Guidelines: Community Connections	Suggested addition	Suggest adding a guideline under "Community Connections" that emphasizes the need to connect students with resources in the surrounding community that promote active living, healthy eating (such as farmers markets and recreational trails).	Department of Health & Family Support
Various	Historic Preservation	Prospect Park	The plan itself uses a very broad brush, and does not appear to directly affect the proposed Prospect Park Historic District. Chapter 4 of the U of M's Master Plan includes maps of affected areas. No physical activities are proposed within the boundaries of the proposed Prospect Park Historic District, though the westernmost portions of the district are shaded as "sensitive edges." While there is no formal definition of what this means, the plan notes, "Sensitive edges are mapped to indicate real estate, environmental, research or activity impacts experienced by neighborhoods and the campus itself." It goes on to highlight the university's commitment to "...respecting the adjacent urban environment."	CPED - Planning