TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, June 2, 2015
9 – 11 a.m.
Room 319 City Hall

Meeting Notes

Committee members present: Kathleen Boe, Hilary Dvorak, Tom Evers, Jessica Galatz, Michael Hagen, Cyndi Harper, Jeff Johnson, Chris Linde, Nick Ngo, Heidi Ritchie, Patrick Sadler, Ben Shardlow, Sarah Stewart, Julia Tabbut
[Please see website for Technical Advisory Committee Member affiliations]

Committee members excused: Brenda Bell-Brown, Leonard Bonacci, Sean Broom, Jenifer Hager, Dan Kenney, Tom Loftus, Bob Loken, Peter MacDonagh, Jesse Osendorf, Abdi Salah, Susan Segal, Rory Stierler, Alene Tchourumoff, Melvin Tennant

Guests: Adam Arvidson, David Knoll sitting in for Melvin Tennant, Lizzie Nelson sitting in for Leonard Bonacci

Staff/consultants present: Rachel Kerber, Lydia Major, Kjersti Monson, Jennifer Ringold, Rattana Sengsoulichanh, Lacy Shelby, Craig Taylor, Peter Truax, Marsha Wagner, Sarah Weeks

1. **Welcome/Introductions of New Participants**
   Meeting 6 of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 9:04 a.m. by Kjersti Monson, Director, Long Range Planning, City of Minneapolis Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED). Kjersti introduced herself and Lacy Shelby, Principal Urban Designer, Minneapolis CPED, then introduced Park Board staff and consultants: Jennifer Ringold, Deputy Superintendent, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB); Colleen O'Dell, Project Planner, for the MPRB; Lydia Major from LHB. She invited any new or substitute TAC members to introduce themselves: Ann Calvert filling in for Cathy Polasky, who has retired; Julia Tabbut sitting in for Bob Loken, Minneapolis Pedestrian Advisory Committee; Lizzie Nelson sitting in for Leonard Bonacci, Minnesota Sports Facility Authority.

2. **Project Identity and Coordination – Vision**
   Reviewing the agenda, Kjersti said that Minneapolis is reviewing the initial draft of a physical framework developed in the committees, and will be talking about the City's and MPRB's engagement strategies based on the two separate deliverables. MPRB is doing its Downtown Service Area Master Plan, which is about the design and programming of downtown parks and trails. The city focus is on streets and plazas, the right-of-way and the public space of the urban core.

   Kjersti and Jennifer jointly announced that a logo, as evidenced on signs and meeting materials, has been chosen to represent this initiative: "Pathways to Places – Shaping Downtown Together." The name "Pathways to Places" is significant because it is a landscape architect-rich term which means "a whole place," not islands of places with nothing in between. It also implies a roadmap, i.e. how this vision will be implemented. "Shaping Downtown Together" is also significant, particularly on the city side; this is a partnership with the private sector and nonprofits, and with MPRB.

3. **Downtown Public Realm Framework Plan (Streets and Plazas)**
   Kjersti said the city's plan is about streets and plazas. An enormous amount of work has been done with the committees (SC and TAC), and Lacy has been working with city staff to look at existing

adopted policy, small area plans that cover downtown, and created an aggregated map that shows the interests and policies at the local level. [PPT Page 5] The City will reference the small area plan work, along with what TAC members have provided about future interests, to surface a higher network of connectivity downtown-wide and how it connects with interests at a local and neighborhood scale.

Kjersti invited Lacy to present on the Small Area Plans (SAP) for specific neighborhoods downtown. Lacy said that what was crucial for the city's process was to understand what has been adopted by the City Council, what has been vetted by the community, review where we are, where we have delivered, and where we should continue to focus efforts. [PPT Pages 6-10] Lacy briefly highlighted some key points and priorities:

- Loring Park: A lot of constituents and interest around the park, especially near Loring Park itself; streets that serve the community, i.e. Harmon Place as a street or connector to be focused on and enhanced
- Downtown West: Fifth Street as a transit connected corridor, connecting to stadiums
- North Loop: Character of the North Loop as related to street design; capital projects in the pipeline, i.e. new way to enhance cobblestone streets
- Downtown East: Emerging neighborhood and destination; massive concentrations of people on event days will have impact on streetscape
- Elliot Park: Elliot Park itself and how it is serving the community; how better link this site to the river

Lacy said that the Protected Bikeways Plan [Map, PPT Page 11] will significantly impact the experience of the street; they are not just painted lines on the roadway but have physical elements that separate the roadway and the travel lane from the bikeway. Lacy referenced Access Minneapolis [Map, PPT Page 12], and described it as the foundation of the work that will evolve through the Public Realm planning process and will inform how the city can reinforce priorities that public works identified through that process.

Kjersti reviewed the findings that resulted from SC, TAC and focus group meetings with constituencies. She began by explaining that a hierarchy of city priorities will be identified nested within the existing local initiatives prescribed by Small Area Plans. Some of the tools will enable both interests to advance. For example, the Portland Avenue "residential corridor" is a local scale initiative; they are looking for tools to enhance that street for resident use.

In previous constituency exercises with the SC and TAC, three categories of users: residents, visitors and workers, and developed priorities for each group. [Maps, PPT Pages 14-16] (The yellow corridors shown are common to all three maps, with specific priorities for each group color-coded and layered on top.) When all three maps are overlaid they show "consensus priorities" that all three constituencies identified and agreed upon. City and MPRB staff added contextual elements – landmarks, event and development opportunities – then started to think about proposed connections in the first iteration of the framework plan. [Maps, PPT Pages 17-19] The City has begun reaching out to city council offices and others to hear feedback and reactions to what has been identified as connectivity corridors

Looking at adopted policy, three basic corridor types were identified: green streets, streets of desired connectivity, and circulation. [Maps, PPT Pages 20-22] (Yellow stripes on these maps identify adopted policy.) On adopted guidance for green streets, it is evident that more work needs to be done across the river from downtown and near Franklin Steele Square. On adopted guidance for circulation, the city will not be doing all of this; they will compare and contrast to determine if they

are getting the big network. Desired connectivity adopted guidance demonstrates a need to jump across the river into the Marcy Holmes neighborhood.

Kjersti shared key observations:

- We've taken an important step to round out our baseline by analyzing and aggregating all of the adopted SAP priorities into a unified underlying detailed framework
- From this tighter network of local priorities, we will begin to surface a higher level major network
- We've observed that there are pieces missing in the underlying neighborhood level policy (more purposeful attention to connectivity is needed on to the north and west, around Royalston and Van White, and to the east, around Cedar Riverside and the West Bank)
- Growth has expanded the sense of where downtown's "edges" are, and the framework should reflect that

In the public realm framework, six policy areas have been identified [PPT Pages 24-32]:

- Physical Framework Plan
- Development Guidelines
- Enhancement Toolkit
- Event Programming Guide
- Integrated Modes Guidelines
- Implementation Guide

Of these, the top three will receive the most attention and detail. The bottom three will describe principles and values. Iteration 1 of the physical framework will continue to evolve. Development guidelines will look at how the development community can contribute to creating these enhanced corridors. The enhancement toolkit will enable more people to give feedback. Event programming, integrated modes and implementation guides are being advanced by several different groups downtown; the City will support and provide information and values.

Kjersti said that in terms of the enhancement toolkit, they are looking at a number of different strategies for funding, operations and maintenance:

- Operating entities: special districts or special purpose entities
- Dedicated revenues: fee for service, lease or sublease revenue, event revenue, tax increment or value capture, assessment
- Enabling strategies: permits and programs
- Zoning or regulatory strategies: overlays and development contributions

City staff have done the inventory of programmable spaces downtown and will be working with other partners to create the event programming guide. Wayfinding principles are key to the integrated modes guideline; others will lead on developing this and the city will contribute. The implementation guide will consist of a series of recommendations.

4. Downtown Service Area Master Plan (Parks and Trails)

Jennifer introduced a new member to their team: Bruce Chamberlain, Parks Fellow with the Minneapolis Parks Foundation. She said MPRB has reached a critical point in its project where they will be opening the doors wide, trying to get as many community members engaged as possible. MPRB's final product is to create master plans for each park within the downtown area as well as a clear delineation of where parks should be, or want to be, and what type of activities, programs or infrastructure should be in them.

Jennifer provided an update on MPRB work to date, stating that TAC and SC members provided a tremendous amount of information about user groups, stakeholders, individuals that should be included in this process. At subsequent meetings a lot of time was spent identifying where gaps are, from an infrastructure standpoint, as parks or corridors. Next was to determine, in those gap areas, what specific programs, infrastructure, etc. should MPRB be looking at. They developed two different grids, one that identifies existing activities within the system and where they are by park. The other one will take the new ideas and identify how those fit into a grid across the gap areas.

Looking forward, MPRB will be working with communities on individual park planning starting in September or October. They recently completed several stakeholder interviews and focus groups, have developed a Mapita tool and a calendar of intercept meetings, and created a workshop toolkit. These will be applied through August, and in September they will be conducting workshops and charrettes with communities to do the master planning for their parks. That information will be brought back to TAC and SC members in October-November. At this point they are focusing on a December-January finish for the deliverables.

Before turning the meeting over to Lacy and Lydia, Jennifer said that this is a time where both projects are doing engagement but in slightly different ways. While trying to do as much of it together as possible, the city is branching out to make sure they get policies and framework in place, and MPRB is trying to get a more detailed understanding of what the users want to do in the parks. They are on parallel paths but on two different roads, and will be coming back together in the Fall.

Kjersti added that in terms of what the city is trying to create, the design and master planning of parks work that MPRB is doing is different from what the city is doing regarding streets and plazas. The city's engagement will be different in terms of targeted work related to those generative policies that enable a multiplicity of factors to contribute to that systemic whole.

5. Report on Community Engagement Process

Downtown Public Realm Framework Engagement (Streets and Plazas)

Lacy said that the technical expertise of TAC members related to their experiences downtown, the work they do and their contributions to the public realm, has helped the city get to this point. TAC members are now being asked to work in small groups, joining one of three subcommittees that will dig into the details of policy, practices and implementation that are being explored by the project team:

- Development Guidelines – explore a range of issues including ground floor uses, street wall character and right-of-way improvements
- Physical Framework – examine and prioritize near, mid and long term opportunities
- Enhancement Too Kit – explore funding, operations and maintenance tools and evaluate feasibility for Minneapolis

An email will be sent to TAC members soliciting their participation in these technical subcommittees. These committees will be meeting on an interim basis between the scheduled TAC meetings.

The City has worked with small groups in the business/worker community and the tourist/visitor community, which has helped them better understand the different constituent groups. At a recent focus group with a small group of residents, they said they wanted to maintain the character of each of their neighborhoods, but wanted to feel a part of this larger whole of downtown. Some of them felt isolated, but they saw themselves as downtown residents. Meetings have been held with developers

one-on-one to better understand what some of their challenges have been for implementing enhancements in the past, what successes they have had, and where they would like to work with the city moving forward.

The city has engaged an artist and graphic designer, Stephanie Glaros. She will interview people on the street to collect stories and feedback through video, photography and audio on how they use public space and the public realm.

The city's community engagement process involves presenting at community advisory committee meetings, meeting with city council members to discuss specific policy ideas, meeting with neighborhood leaders, attending open streets events and engaging at different farmers markets. [PPT Page 43]

Downtown Service Area Master Plan Community Engagement (Parks and Trails)
Lydia Major, Landscape Architect, LHB, referenced the updated version of the Dashboard that was previously distributed, which is used by the MPRB to track the progress of community engagement against its original goals.

Focus groups and stakeholder interviews have been conducted by MPRB. [PPT Pages 45-46] Lydia highlighted a few specific things people indicated they want: more places to sit, a variety of seating options, and more public restrooms. There were also some general ideas about how parks and public spaces can create sense of community, opportunities for play, support families, making community happen even around underserved and challenged populations; more specifically around parks and how they can celebrate their historical and ecological context.

Lydia emphasized the importance of the Mapita tool, which will be used to capture individual information as well as big patterns of thinking. It asks questions about where people are using downtown places now, what their favorite places are, where the gaps and barriers might be. It allows people to show how they get from one place to another downtown, and where they would like to get. She asked TAC members to help spread the word about Mapita through their Facebook, Twitter, etc. accounts. [http://bit.ly/pathwaystoplaces]

Jennifer added that MPRB is looking forward to sharing the data that they are receiving from Mapita. There have been more than 250 inputs, and it is very rich data, including why they are there, what they are doing, what is working and not working. It will be beneficial to both projects, and the technical group in this room might find the data very interesting.

Lydia then referenced the Community Engagement Tool Kit which describes four different kinds of engagement opportunities for TAC members to use:

- One-on-one interviews with stakeholders
- Intercept events
- Small group discussions
- Short meeting presentations

The Community Engagement Tool Kit was distributed. MPRB will begin doing a number of intercept events and rolling out workshops. The toolkit will enable committee members and others to go to public events to gather information, and it also contains an easy way to deliver the data captured without spending a lot of time and effort.

As referenced previously, a calendar of events scheduled throughout the summer was also provided. Lydia said they welcome ideas for more events, and invited TAC members to send information about those events so they can be added to the calendar, which will be maintained by Colleen O'Dell. Jennifer added that this same information was provided to the SC, some of whom represent the same organizations as TAC members, so they might be receiving requests to be involved in those conversations by coworkers or associates.

Lydia invited Bruce Chamberlain to describe the project approach structure. Bruce talked about the difference between parks that are magical, that people want to visit, and those that are not. Although there are many reasons for that to happen, part of it is the translation between people who use it today or who are projected to use it in the future, and what is in the park (i.e. programs, physical landscape). With this process, which will be used as model for how MPRB is handling the rest of the service areas around the city and master planning the park system, we want to build in a deeper level of sophistication and understanding of who the users are and make the translation between that and the actual design of those places. The project approach structure is:

- Understanding who the downtown audience is, now and in the future
- Understanding what their habits and interests are for public space
- Understanding the programs and activities that they should support
- Understanding the landscape and typology, leading to development of systems, patterns/layout, implementation strategies/toolkit and design character/concept design

Referencing resident, visitor and worker user group maps that were developed from information provided by TAC and SC members [PPT Pages 53-55], Lydia introduced the preliminary set of personas [PPT Page 56] that was developed by capturing information about users who have different needs in our public realm and spaces:

- 7 Residents (including minority and underserved residents): teen residents (one boy, one girl), resident with a disability, working low-income resident with children, senior resident, parent resident, single adult resident, homeless resident
- 3 Visitors/Tourists: tourist, fly-in visitor, drive-in recreational day visitor
- 2 Downtown Workers: daytime worker, evening/shift worker

Lydia added that within these broad categories there are a lot of demographics, and the Planning Team understands that there are different numbers involved in each of the categories. Feedback on the categories at this meeting, and the questions included in the Engagement Toolkit, will help the project team to better understand the needs of these personas.

Jennifer added that more than thirty user profiles were condensed down to seven. The correct number is unknown; there are probably a few more personas that could be included. What they are looking at in identifying additional user personas is what makes them a distinctly different user, both current and prospective, because they would need different things in the downtown area, from parks, etc. She also said they are really cognizant of not wanting to make assumptions or to stereotype.

6. Large Group Discussion: Solving for "Who?"

Lydia introduced the large group discussion by asking for additional feedback on the following questions:

- Do the proposed user groups include most users we anticipate for downtown? Which are duplicative? Which are missing?
- What type of park user do you think is most often overlooked downtown?
- What approach would work best to reach these users?

- What habits and interests do you think would be different for these users?

A question was asked regarding fly-in visitors, whether they are flying-in for a sporting event, convention, or concert: do they have special needs, and is that captured? Jennifer answered that we would want to capture their needs; the fly-in visitor might be a day, three days, a week. She countered with a question about what their different needs, habits or interests would be depending on the length of stay. Proximity would be the biggest difference; if only here for a day you would want something near your hotel. With longer stays you would have opportunity to explore a little more.

Subsequent discussion introduced several user groups with different needs that may not be represented in these personas:

- Students: high school and college students having different needs, high school students have GoTo transit cards and transferring between routes often requires walking downtown so they have wayfinding needs
- Sports fans, and arts and theater patrons, who look at their visits downtown differently
- Hospitality workers
- Corporate employees
- People passing through downtown
- Communities on the edge of downtown
- Reoccurring visitor, coming in to work once or twice a month
- Groups of visitors/tourists, not just individuals
- Occasional worker, someone who works from home occasionally and/or shares work location
- Children in daycare, whose parents work downtown
- Financial situation, people who need something free or cheap

There was some discussion about the distinction between working low income resident with children and parent resident. There also isn't a persona for married couples with no children or empty nesters. Lydia said those categories require a little more thought.

In answer to the next question, "what type of park user do you think is most often overlooked downtown?" there were several suggestions:

- Pet owners: with the growing residential population downtown this will be a greater need
- Homeless adults and teens
- People participating in medical treatments: Mayo Clinic, University of Minnesota

Several suggestions were submitted on the approach that would work best to reach users: websites, pop-up surveys, using trusted advocates (people who are already familiar with or known to a specific group), weekly dinners at churches or other organizations where people are already congregating.

Engagement cards were distributed to TAC members to be used to indicate which activities they might be interested in participating, the date of the activity, which engagement tool(s) would be used, and what type of support they might need from the project team. This will also be sent to TAC members in an email so they can continue to be involved in community engagement with their constituencies.

7. Upcoming Activities/Adjourn

Jennifer said the next meetings will be held on July 7 (TAC) and July 16 (SC). From a park perspective, they will be attempting to complete the user group information and set some overarching goals, guidelines and principles for the neighborhood park master plans. In addition to thinking about

what the community needs around the park, determining how the park fits into the overall structure of downtown, and what might be some additional services or activities it needs to provide.

Kjersti said TAC members would be receiving an email about the technical subcommittees, specifically relating to the first three chapters: physical framework plan, development guidelines and enhancement toolkit.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 a.m.

This constitutes my understanding of items discussed and decisions reached.
If there are any omissions or discrepancies, please notify the author in writing.
Submitted by:
Marsha Wagner, CastleVisions
marsha@castlevisions.com