

# North Minneapolis Greenway Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, 10/30/12

Sumner Library, 4-5:30 PM

**Attendees:** Jim Voll (Community Planning and Economic Development), Neal Baxter (Pedestrian Advisory Committee), Matthew Hendricks (Twin Cities Greenways), Georgianna Yantos (Bicycle Advisory Committee), Jim Skoog (Ward 4), Donna Hemp (Pedestrian Advisory Committee), Jennifer Ringold (Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board), Rose Ryan (Hennepin County Housing, Community Works, and Transit Development), Sarah Stewart (Minneapolis Department of Health and Family Support)

## Next steps/action items:

- **Steering committee members** are asked to provide additional feedback on two topics that were not covered at the meeting (please send feedback by 11/7/12):
  - Topic 1: A combination of the three treatment options (full linear park greenway, half and half, and bike boulevard) will likely be used on the greenway; however, we'd like to avoid having the greenway treatment change too frequently so that we don't confuse users and we make a user-friendly system. Here's my question – how long (e.g. in blocks, miles) do you think we so go with one treatment before switching to a different treatment?
  - Topic 2: Do you have suggestions for the best way to conduct outreach, both to cultural groups and to people who live along the proposed route (given that I have a very limited budget)? Second, in your opinion, do you think it would be better to more fully develop our plans (including providing preferred treatments for different greenway segments) prior to conducting engagement along the route so that people have something to react to? Or do you think it would be best to conduct more engagement along the route first to learn more about which treatment is most desirable before developing more detailed plans? (Or do you have a different suggestion?) In any case, we will hold a second community meeting to share the route plans sometime in early 2013.

## Minutes:

### I. Review open house and online survey results (4:05-4:25)

Sarah Stewart presented results from the community engagement work conducted up to this point. Steering committee members are asked to not share the result from the meeting, as they are incomplete and do not include the most recently completed online surveys. See the separate PowerPoint document that was presented at the meeting (summary of fall 2012 community engagement efforts.pptx). The results and steering committee conversation are summarized below:

- As of 11/30 at 11:30am, 86 people completed surveys at the open house and 336 had completed surveys online, with a total of 422 surveys completed
- The majority of open house participants (more than 80%) and about ½ of online survey participants live on or near a proposed greenway route
- Greenway design preferences:
  - At the open house, about 60% of participants ranked the full greenway and the bike boulevard as a 4 or a 5 (with 1 being 'strongly dislike' and 5 being 'strongly like'). Participants seemed to have the most divided opinions of the full greenway, with more than 45% strongly liking this option, and about 30% strongly disliking this option, whereas the half and half option received fewer strongly positive or strongly negative

rankings. The bike boulevard option was the least popular option presented. Participants also preferred the one-way traffic and parking half and half design over the 2-way traffic and no parking design. It was noted that since the half and half was not as controversial, this option could be implemented first, with long-term phasing in of a linear park greenway.

- Online survey respondents strongly preferred the full greenway, with 70% selecting this as their preferred option.
- Majorities of people living on most greenway routes still supported the linear park greenway design, but support was not as strong as the overall survey results would indicate. Jennifer asked if there was enough data to really have a sense of design preference along each route, and Sarah said that no, she did not think we had enough responses to make a conclusion.
- Likelihood of use for each design: Both open house respondents and online survey respondents indicated that they would be most likely to actually use a linear park greenway. Many also indicated that they would be likely to use a half and half greenway, while many respondents were not likely to use a bike boulevard.
- Route preferences: only the online survey respondents were asked which route they preferred, and just over half preferred route A, with fewer than 15% preferring either of the remaining routes. This is consistent with some feedback received at the open house about preferences for a more direct route (since route A was the most direct route of the three proposed).
- Conclusions:
  - The general design preference is for a linear park greenway, but some are strongly opposed to this. There is also support for a half and half greenway. Respondents were least enthusiastic about a bike boulevard.
  - Route Option A was favored, mostly because it was the most direct route.
  - Some segments of the population have not yet been adequately engaged, including communities of color and young people.
- A report summarizing all responses and including an appendix with all comments will likely be available on November 16.

## II. Review traffic study results (4:25-4:40)

- Sarah shared the results of a traffic study completed by SRF Consulting. Copies of the report will be included as a separate attachment in the email with these minutes. Results of the traffic study and committee discussion about it are included below:
  - Traffic volumes: SRF counted and analyzed traffic volumes at several points along the greenway routes. All potential routes had low traffic volumes (most under 500 cars per day). SRF concluded that traffic volumes could be absorbed on parallel streets for most of the route if full closures were implemented.
  - SRF also observed parking at peak hours and calculated parking density. Density was at 25% or below for all streets. Assuming that parallel streets have similar parking densities and given that east-west streets have lower parking densities, SRF concluded that the parking along the greenway route could be absorbed on parallel and adjacent streets. Jennifer noted that the conclusion should be qualified with a statement that parallel streets were not studied – if these streets have a different parking character, then parking might not be as easy to accommodate. Jim V. noted resident perceptions may differ from the city's opinion. What SRF or the city considers to be easy-to-absorb low-

density parking may not seem the same to residents.

- SRF also conducted a diversion analysis to determine which intersections could be closed along the routes. See the report for a summary of the streets. SRF concluded that many of the intersections could be closed, with some intersections on busier east-west streets remaining open. A few streets will require further study to determine whether they could be closed.

### III. Discuss/recommend preferred greenway route (4:40-5:00)

- Sarah shared the following feedback gathered mostly from online surveys but also partly from the open house:
  - Keep it as direct as possible – even consider staying on one street the whole way
  - Provide better connections to the south (downtown, Cedar Lake Trail, warehouse district)
  - Option A: either stay on Humboldt or cut over to Irving earlier (differences of opinion about whether to cut through Folwell); connect it to Webber park; concern about narrowness of Humboldt north of Dowling. Online survey – several people who lived on this route expressed interest in this route
  - Option B: Further from Emerson/Fremont bike infrastructure, which is an advantage; recreational riders tend to prefer this route. At community meeting, several residents who lived on this route expressed desire for this route
  - Option C: too steep – Webber parkway to 43<sup>rd</sup>; 25<sup>th</sup> and Broadway
  - Use some combination of A and C
  - Start with B and use A/C after that
  - Matthew added that a couple that came to the open house had biked all of the routes and had found that route B was the least hilly through the Tangletown area.
- The committee discussed the greenway routes by segment (north, middle, and south) and made the following comments and recommendations.
- North segment: Option A seems like the best starting point, maybe connecting up to the Humboldt greenway. Webber Park would be very easy to access from Option A using the Grand Rounds Trail. Option B is not as appealing to bikers because it jogs off of a direct route, and the intersection near the park is rather complicated (the Parks are working to put a roundabout there). If Humboldt Ave from 44<sup>th</sup> to Dowling is already constricted, we might as well use it as a bike way. Traffic would then be diverted to streets that have more capacity. For Option C, a ne on-street connection is already planned for Webber Park. **Recommendation: Follow Route A from the north end of the greenway to Dowling.**
- Middle segment: Best to avoid bringing bikes through Folwell Park. In Loring Park, the bike trails don't work very well, and there are a lot of bike/ped conflicts. It would make sense to follow option A south along the park and turn west either at Folwell or at Jordan Park instead of at 33<sup>rd</sup>. Turning south at James is one option, but cyclists heading north towards Fowlell might be tempted to cut through the trails in the park. They would end up at the other end of the park on Dowling, but west of the greenway. Irving seems like a better option for heading south, and would take users directly through the trail between Jordan Park and the school. Sarah noted that she had presented the greenway options at an MPS Safe Routes to School meeting, and the transportation planners at the meeting did not see a problem with having the greenway go past a school. Another option would be to follow Girard instead, which would take users closer to the library. Humboldt would take users within two blocks of the library and would make it easier to

take advantage of the existing path next to Jordan. The crossing at Lowry will need to be well-designed since this is a rather busy street. Rose suggested that a hawk signal be considered at this intersection (and at others along the route). She saw them on a recent trip to Portland and through they were especially useful for cyclists during busy traffic times. **Recommendation: Follow Option A south along Folwell Park, turn east at 36<sup>th</sup> Ave, and go south along Irving. Continue to follow Option A from 33<sup>rd</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup>.**

- **South segment (26<sup>th</sup> to W. Broadway):** Following Option A south, it might be a good idea to move the route from the west side to the east side of Glen Gale Park. The park, the Boys and Girls Club, and the school all work collaboratively together and might appreciate a greenway, which could help create a campus feel. There are some houses along this section of Irving, but it appears that they have a very large alleyway in the back. The MPS school headquarters is on the map in the space marked 'Broadway Arts and Technology'. It was suggested that it would be good to run the greenway close to the HQ, which is a large employer (although it would also be good to draw MPS employees out and away from the HQ a bit so they are more apt to explore the area). Within the Tangletown area, there are two criteria that could be considered – the directness or the hilliness of the route – in this case, only one or the other could be adequately addressed. The group decided that directness was a higher priority, given the community comments. One option would be to follow A all the way south; another would be to connect Glen Gale and Cottage Parks by following Route C from Glen Gale to Cottage Park, and then route B south after Cottage Park and maybe cutting south from James through what is now not a road to connect with Knox south of Broadway (not sure if this is feasible). **Recommendation: option 1) follow option A, except bring this route to the east side of Glen Gale park. Option 2) follow A south to Glen Gale Park, then follow C south to Cottage Park, and then follow B south passed W Broadway.**
- **South segment (W. Broadway to southern terminus):** depending on what route is selected to go through Tangletown, either route A or route B should be followed past North Commons Park. Route A south of North High School is not the best option because it would force users to take a left on Plymouth. There appears to be some sort of roadway/path through the North High school campus that could potentially be used – this should be looked into. East/south of North High school, either route B or C makes sense, and people could make use of the existing bike infrastructure on Emerson and Fremont. **Recommendation: Depending on which route is chosen north of W. Broadway, follow A or B south to North High School, then follow either B or C east to Emerson/Fremont and use these to connect to the southern trail terminus. Look into making use of the path/road through the North High campus.**

**IV. Discuss minimum length for a given treatment option (5:00-5:05)**

- This agenda item was not addressed due to lack of time. Sarah will email steering committee members to get their feedback on this item. Feedback received via email will be attached to these minutes.

**V. Discuss next steps and ideas for community engagement (5:05-5:20)**

- This agenda item was not addressed due to lack of time. Sarah will email steering committee members to get their feedback on this item. Feedback received via email will be attached to these minutes.

**VI. Discuss ideas for addressing security concerns (5:20-5:25)**

- This agenda item was not addressed due to lack of time. This item will be addressed at a future steering committee meeting.

**VII. Meeting reflection and wrap up (5:25-5:30)**

Our next meeting will be February 26, 2013 from 4-5:30 PM, location TBD.