



PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC) MEETING Meeting Minutes

Date: September 14, 2006
Time: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Location: Room 319, City Hall
Attendees: See attached roster

Agenda

1. Housekeeping
 - a. Approval of minutes from last meeting
 - b. Status of Action Items
2. Report on Portland Streetcar Visit
3. Citywide Needs Analysis
4. Downtown Streets Strategy

Summary of Items Discussed

Housekeeping

Change to August 10, 2006 meeting minutes, Page 3 of 8:

- Was there discussion at the task force meeting on the ability to shift trips from auto to transit modes? ... *the impacts of congestion on downtown and are concerned that the proposed transit alternatives ~~do not~~ may have unintended consequences related to traffic flow and parking ramp access and egress.*

Minutes were approved with the above changes. Motion by Pat Scott, seconded by Kent Warden.

An update on upcoming meetings was provided to Steering Committee members:

- Downtown task force meeting - September 27th, 8:00 AM (Location TBD)
- Outreach meeting with Downtown Neighborhood Summit Meeting - September 28th, 6:00 to 8:00 PM

The PSC requested that interim actions/meetings that take place between PSC meetings be listed on the minutes. Meetings held since August PSC meeting included:

- Midtown Community Partnership (August 15)
- Meet Minneapolis (August 30)

Report on Portland Streetcar Visit

Charleen Zimmer provided a summary of the Portland Streetcar visit. The City of Portland streetcar system was built in 1986 and is currently celebrating its 20th anniversary. The streetcars have very good ridership in Portland. The stops are spaced every two to three blocks. Portland also provides a “no fare zone” in their downtown area. The streetcar has good land-use connection and Portland has experienced growth comparable to Minneapolis in both residential and commercial developments. Financing is provided through special assessments. The parking rates in Downtown Portland were increased and these additional funds were used for streetcar operations as well.

Streetcars in Portland are operated and maintained by Portland Streetcar, a non-profit organization, contracted to TriMET (Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon). No federal funding was used for construction; however, today they are requesting federal money for two new lines. The streetcar has provided a catalyst for the growth of new neighborhoods like the Pearl District near downtown Portland. The city has had a lot of success with the streetcar transforming neighborhoods. The city is continuing to expand its LRT system and is also increasing bus service.

Zimmer also visited Seattle. Seattle uses a combination of electric trolley buses, hybrid buses, and diesel buses. The electric trolley buses are, of course, extremely quiet. Hybrids are noticeably quieter than diesel buses but do generate noise. Both Portland and Seattle currently operate roughly 140 buses per hour in their double-width transit lanes. The buses in Portland stop more frequently in downtown than the buses in Seattle.

A written summary report of the streetcar visit will be provided to the Steering Committee. The PSC requested the list of people who went to the visit to be included in the summary report.

Citywide Needs Analysis

System Planning Framework

Charleen Zimmer provided an update to the System Planning Framework flowchart. The flowchart shows operation of streets based on all modes of transportation. So far, the modal priorities for the non-auto network have been identified through the PTN network, downtown transit alternatives, bicycle and pedestrian gap analysis. The street operations analysis focuses on roadway needs by segment. The roadway needs will then be tied into other modal priorities to arrive at short (2006-2007), mid (2008-2015), and long-term (2015-2030) action items (please refer to the System Planning Framework flowchart and report handout).

Street Operations Analysis

Praveena Pidaparathi provided a description of the street operations analysis. The analysis is used to identify the portions of the transportation network that currently experience operation difficulties, how the network will respond over time to projected changes in demand and how these conditions will be affected by proposed changes to the network (please refer to Street Operations Analysis handout).

V/C (Volume over Capacity) ratios were calculated for street segments in Minneapolis. Street capacities used were developed from Hennepin County's Franklin Avenue Corridor Study (see handout). The capacities for six-lane streets were derived from national sources and one-way streets were derived from an analysis of peak-hour conditions on Minneapolis streets. Growth in traffic volume between 2005 and 2015 and further to 2030 were calculated on the basis of annualized growth factors by sector of the city. These factors were derived from an analysis of streets by functional class in Minneapolis using forecast data from the Metropolitan Council's regional model.(see chart on handout).

The street segments that have a V/C of 0.90 or above based on the existing street configuration were grouped into the three timeframes. Segments that are currently at a V/C of 0.90 or above have been placed in the short-term category. Segments that exceed the 0.90 threshold in Year 2015 were placed in the mid-term timeframe and the long-term category consists of segments that exceed a V/C of 0.90 in Year 2030. Maps showing potential need for corridor studies for Years 2005, 2015, 2030 (please refer to handout maps) were handed out. The maps show traffic congestion in the three timeframes. Segments with V/C values of 0.9 to 1.1 are shown as Slightly Congested (yellow), V/C of 1.1 to 1.3 are Moderately Congested (orange), and segments with V/C values greater than 1.3 are shown as Severely Congested (red). It should be noted that this analysis is a broad planning analysis tool and identifies the general location of congested areas. Comments from the PSC included the following:

- What was the rationale behind grouping the congested segments into the three categories – slightly, moderately, and severely congested? *In the city, congestion tends to be a factor of length of time of congestion rather than a true daily volume/capacity relationship. There is also a tremendous potential range of congestion that a simple daily volume/capacity analysis does not reflect. Theoretical capacity does not represent gridlock; rather, it is a mathematical threshold for the point at which congested conditions are likely to exist during at least one peak hour during the day. The ranges were used to give readers a better sense of relative congestion from one street to another. 90% of capacity to 10% over capacity was considered “slight” congestion. 10-30% over capacity was considered “moderate” congestion. 30% over capacity was considered “severe” congestion. Those streets that are slightly congested would most likely have congestion at some intersections during one peak hour a day. Those streets that are moderately congested might have congestion during one or both peak periods. Those streets that are severely congested might experience congestion over a longer distance or over a longer period of time during the day.*
- Are we taking into consideration growth due to land development? *Yes, the traffic forecast is based on the Metropolitan Council's Regional Model which takes land-use into consideration.*
- How reliable are the traffic forecasts? *The Metropolitan Council's model is based on growth in Traffic Assignment Zones (TAZs). It is difficult to predict 20 or 30 years out into the future. The number of auto trips has surpassed growth predictions. The average number of auto trips per person has increased from 2.7 in 1997 to 4.0 in 2000. The analysis also includes growth projections provided by CPED.*

Downtown Streets Strategy

The Downtown Streets Strategy was updated based on comments from the last PSC meeting. Charleen Zimmer provided updates to the Downtown Streets Strategy (please refer to the Downtown Streets Strategy handout):

- Hennepin Ave has buses in mixed flow traffic. Change is to remove contra-flow lane from 11th St S to 2nd St.
- Contra-flow transit lanes on Marquette Ave and 2nd Ave S expanded from one to two lanes
- Long-term strategy to relocate I-35W ramps at Washington Ave to 3rd and 4th Streets S
- Long-term strategy to relocate I-94 off ramp at 5th St S to 7th St S
- 8th St S has one bus lane in each direction between 2nd Ave N and Park Ave N
- Two-way operation on Portland and Park Avenues S would extend only to Franklin Avenue
- Short term strategy to change I-394 ramp at 10th St N from HOV-only to mixed traffic

Comments from the PSC on the Downtown Streets Strategy included the following:

- Not only parking, but other curbside uses like loading zones and valet parking, should be considered
- Curbside bike lanes should not be used because they compete with vehicular curbside activities
- Eliminating all metered and on-street parking in Downtown would help. *On-street parking on many streets in downtown is already restricted during peak hours.*
- Metered parking provides a significant amount of income for the city. This should be considered when removing metered parking. Private property owners pay the city for loading zones, valet parking zones, etc. Loss of these revenues should also be considered.
- Effects on bicycles and pedestrians on Hennepin Ave should be considered if they become two-way.
- Has the proposed ballpark been taken into consideration? *Yes, we are coordinating with the ballpark's proposal.*

Downtown Capacity Analyses

The purpose of the Downtown Capacity Analyses was to perform detailed analyses of vehicular traffic operation for a variety of scenarios. These scenarios include analyzing both existing and projected traffic demands, as well as current street configurations and proposed alternative configurations. Roger Plum described each of these alternatives and their components (please refer to the Downtown Streets Strategy handout). The analysis indicated that Hybrid C would operate system-wide at a level of congestion similar to today. Comments from the PSC on the capacity analysis included the following:

- How does the existing scenario in 2030 compare to the Hybrid analysis? *This is not an apples to apples comparison. The existing scenario was based on detailed quadrant by quadrant growth but did not include any redistribution of traffic or optimization of the*

signal system. The Hybrid scenario was based on quadrant growth factors, redistribution of trips to a new street configuration, and signal system optimization.

- Do two-way streets have less capacity than one-way streets? Not really. The capacity shown in the Cross Section Capacity Analysis Results tables is based on Couplet Capacity. A couplet of two two-way streets with two lanes in each have more capacity than one-way however, the two-way streets may have more intersection problems.

Charleen Zimmer mentioned that two issues are being studied in detail by the consultants. The first one is to study the effect of double-width transit lanes on the ingress/egress to parking ramps. A traffic simulation of Marquette Ave between 8th and 9th Streets with double-width transit lanes is underway. Parking data from the Midwest Ramp is being use in the simulation. The second issue is air quality analysis of two intersections on Hennepin Ave to study the effects on air quality if it is converted into a two-way configuration. Hennepin Ave was converted into one-way as part of the State Implementation Plan related to the Clean Air Act. Since then, auto emissions have changed and results of the analysis might be different.

Schedule Update

The next PSC meeting will be on Thursday, October 12, 2006. The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Action Items

MMA	Traffic simulation of Marquette Ave with double-width transit lanes
SEH	Air quality analysis for Hennepin Avenue
MMA	Updates to Downtown Street Strategy Report

**PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE
RECORD OF ATTENDANCE**

Meeting Date/Time: September 14, 2006, 4:00-6:00 pm

Location: Room 319, City Hall

OFFICIAL MEMBER	NAME	ORGANIZATION	PRESENT
X	Akre, John	Northeast Sub-Area	X
X	Anderson, Richard	Mpls Bicycle Advisory Committee	X
X	Brown, Tim	Mpls Parks	
X	Davis, Douglas	Mpls Senior Citizens Adv Commission	X
X	Dewar, Caren	Southwest Sub-Area	X
X	DeWitt, John	East Sub-Area	X
X	Eikaas, Gary	Minnesota Freight Advisory Comm	
X	Gerber, Darrell	Southwest Sub-Area	X
X	Greenberg, Bob	Downtown Sub-Area Business Rep	X
X	Grube, Jim	Hennepin County Alternate	
X	Harrington, Adam	Metro Transit – Service Development	X
X	Indieke Cross, Margot	Mpls Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities	X
X	Johnson, William	Transit Rider Representative	X
X	Keysser, Janet	Transit Rider Representative	
X	Kjonaas, Rick	Mn/DOT – SALT	
X	Kotke, Steve	Minneapolis Public Works	X
X	Kozlak, Connie	Metropolitan Council	
X	Larson, Mike	Minneapolis CPED	
X	McLaughlin, Mike	Downtown Council	X
X	Miner, Pam	Minneapolis CPED	
X	Moe, Susan	FHWA	
X	Morlock, Jan	University of Minnesota	
X	O'Keefe, Tom	Mn/DOT – Metro	
X	Pearce Ruch, Kerri	Northwest Sub-Area	X
X	Qvale, Pat	Opt-Out Transit Representative	
X	Scallen, Maureen	Meet Minneapolis	
X	Schuster, Lea	Southeast Sub-Area	
X	Scott, Pat	Mpls TMO	X
X	Thorstenson, Tom	Metro Transit – Eng and Facilities	
X	VanHeel, John	Downtown Sub-Area Resident Rep	X
X	Walker, Katie	Hennepin Community Works	
X	Walter, Doug	Southeast Sub-Area	
X	Warden, Kent	BOMA Minneapolis	X
Mailing	Byers, Jack	Minneapolis CPED	
Mailing	Caddock, Andrew	Close Landscape Architects	

OFFICIAL MEMBER	NAME	ORGANIZATION	PRESENT
Mailing	Fey, David	Minneapolis CPED	
Mailing	Martens, Michael		
Mailing	Schmidt, Stacy	Mpls Senior Citizens Adv Comm	
Mailing	Sheehy, Lee	Minneapolis CPED	
Mailing	Sporlein, Barbara	Minneapolis CPED	
Mailing	Wagenius, Peter	Mayor's Office	
Mailing	Wernecke, Teresa	Minneapolis TMO	
Mailing	Willlette, Pierre	Minneapolis	
PMT	Abegg, Michael	Minnesota Valley Transit	
PMT	Rae, Rhonda	Minneapolis Public Works	X
PMT	Wertjes, Jon	Minneapolis Public Works	X
Alternate/PMT	Byers, Bob	Hennepin County Transportation	
Alternate/PMT	Gieseke, Mark	Mn/DOT – Metro State Aid	
Alternate/PMT	Stine, Paul	Mn/DOT- SALT	
Alternate/PMT	Elliott, Beth	Minneapolis CPED	
Alternate/PMT	Griffith, John	Hennepin County Transportation	
Alternate/PMT	Johnson, Tom	Hennepin County Transportation	
Alternate/PMT	Mahowald, Steve	Metro Transit – Service Development	
Alternate	Olson, Glenn	Mpls TMO Alternate	X
Alternate	Opatz, Mike	Op-Out Provider Alternate	
Project Mgr	Zimmer, Charleen	Mpls Public Works (Zan Associates)	X
Staff	Flintoft, Anna	Minneapolis Public Works	X
Consultant	Buss, Jaimie	Richardson Richter	
Consultant	Dock, Fred	Meyer Mohaddes	
Consultant	Gondringer, Linda	Richardson Richter	
Consultant	Kost, Bob	SEH	
Consultant	Messner, Gina	Meyer Mohaddes	X
Consultant	Plum, Roger	SEH	X
Consultant	Pidaparathi, Praveena	Meyer Mohaddes	X
Consultant	Richter, Trudy	Richardson Richter	
Consultant	Thompsen, Will	Meyer Mohaddes	
Consultant	Tumlin, Jeff	Nelson Nygaard	
Consultant	Walker, Jarrett	Nelson Nygaard	
	Green, Tiffany	Council Ward 6	X