

SW LRT CAC Meeting NOTES

18 November 2010

MPRB Board Room, 6:30-8:30 p.m.

Agenda Item	Person
1. Welcome and introduction	Scott Neiman
a. Chair welcome and thank you b. Goals of Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue identifying issues and outcomes.• Identify additional information needs.• Review and make decision on staff proposal to gather additional community input, based on CAC objectives from 11/04/10 meeting.	10 min 6:30-6:40
c. Review agenda d. Park Board welcome and charge <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prepare recommendations to the Board on the contents of a formal Comment Letter in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Southwest Light Rail Transit Alternative 3A. The recommendations of the CAC shall focus on desired outcomes relative to historical, cultural, visual, recreational, social, environmental, and safety issues as they relate to lands owned or managed by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board.	
e. Housekeeping <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CAC work in accordance with the International Association for Public Participation Core Values• Reminder: notes previous CAC meetings are posted on the project website.• Video: Scott Reed's presentation from 9/23/10, Corridor tour, and video linked to a corridor map are on project website. f. Updates from staff on CAC information requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Definition of Grand Rounds Corridor boundaries: see PPT• Cedar Lake Parkway/Grand Rounds crossing the corridor: staff reviewed information on property data (see attached); appears that the MPRB has a permit for an at-grade crossing of the corridor (by the parkway)• CAC member Brian Willett reported out on a charrette (intense brainstorming about design) that he and others attended; hosted by the Cedar Lake Park Association. Jennifer Ringold made a presentation at the beginning about the CAC's work and the Park Board perspective on various issues. Kathy Doty was also there representing Commissioner Dorfman. They met for about an hour with people from the neighborhoods about issues and challenges related to Bryn Mawr Park and the proposed Penn Street station, LRT corridor, trails, etc. (Commissioner Tabb also attended part of it). A total of 13 professional designers volunteered their time in association with a leading transportation planner/designer the hosts hired (Steve Durant, who was the designer of Cedar Lake Park, etc., so he was thus very familiar with parks, light rail, trails, etc.). Also one of the volunteer designers was	Neiman/ MPRB Staff/Carroll

<p>involved in the original Grand Rounds design. The design team walked the corridor then spent the rest of the afternoon developing sketches. Goal was to enhance the park as much as possible in consideration of the light rail coming through; they did not have the design parameters/constraints the larger County CAC is working with. Steve Durant reminded everyone that parks are among the most protected under federal law, so there are some serious opportunities for MPRB to really make a difference here. They have begun the process of converting these sketches to electronic format, and if the CAC would find it helpful, could present those to the CAC, perhaps with the support of one of the volunteer designers to explain it. CAC members noted that good ideas, presented well, have an impact. Communities are important, MPRB is important, and the city is important in all this decision making. Good design is much more cost-effective than poor design. We need to get the “vocabulary” (both words and images) out there about good design and what’s really important for this corridor.</p>	
<p>2. Issues and Outcome based discussion for corridor locations</p>	<p>Neiman/ Carroll Ringold</p>
<p>a. This discussion is geared to identify the impacts or potential issues in various locations of the SW LRT Corridor and follow with preferred outcomes at each site. The discussion will follow that of the tour and video going from south to north and encompass each tour stop in addition to the corridor as a whole. (This list comprises the whole of the CAC’s work through the end of the DEIS comment period. Those discussed at the October 14 meeting are noted. We will complete discussions on the remaining items at this meeting.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes document introduction • Trail access at Abbott Avenue S. (10/14/10) • Park Siding Park (10/14/10) • Intersection of Cedar Lake Parkway and Corridor (10/14/10, 11/04/10, and 11/18/10) • Kenilworth Channel under the Corridor (11/18/10) • Intersection of 21st St and the Corridor • Intersection of Cedar Lake Trail, Kenilworth Trail and Corridor • Bryn Mawr Meadows Park • Connection to Spring Lake, Kenwood Parkway, Parade 	<p>80 min 6:40-8:00</p>
<p>3. Opportunities for additional community input</p>	<p>Neiman</p>
<p>a. Current Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public comment for 10 minutes at the end of each CAC meeting • Online place for people to advise the CAC on park-specific issues and concerns: http://www.minneapolisparcs.org/default.asp?PageID=1247 <p>b. Discussion and direction: Per CAC objectives from 11/04/10, review and make decisions on staff proposal to gather stakeholder input on the CAC’s draft issues and outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff/consultant proposal: The CAC had a very thoughtful discussion at the last meeting about authentic involvement per the IAP2 core values under which this CAC is working, their roles as community representatives, the multiple organizations and groups providing input and advice on the entire SW LRT process, and their explicit responsibilities per their charge. Within 	<p>20 min 8:00-8:20</p>

<p>that context, there was concern that there would be limited value to a community session that would gather general input to this process. At the same time, there was interest in finding a way to gather specific input on the preliminary issues and outcomes that the CAC is developing along the corridor. In response to that sentiment, we are proposing a very specific online survey where community stakeholders can provide comments on any or all issues and outcomes that CAC is drafting. Respondents would have access to the same issues and outcomes material the CAC is working with each meeting, and would have their choice of contributing on one or all issues or outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAC advised staff/consultant to proceed with the survey and gather online input on the CAC’s draft issues and outcomes as they evolve 	
<p>4. Housekeeping and next steps</p>	<p>Neiman</p>
<p>a. Anticipated CAC meeting schedule: This schedule assumes a DEIS release in mid-December, but that is determined by the Federal Transit Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 2 • Possible: December 9 • Possible: December 16 • <Once the DEIS is released the 45-day countdown begins, so CAC may need to increase meeting frequency and/or duration> 	
<p>b. Documentation, communications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting information and agenda will be posted on the website in advance • Meeting notes will be the combination of the agenda, materials, and flipcharted record of discussion • Meeting notes will be posted on the website as soon as possible following each CAC meeting • Member names and appointers, along with the chair’s contact information will be on the website • Information requests to staff must be made by the full CAC, relate to the charge, and be relevant to CAC decisions 	
<p>5. Public comment: 10 minutes</p>	<p>Neiman</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to congestion at Cedar Lake Parkway: the neighborhood organization has done some traffic counts on other stops near the lakes. Their results show there will be serious backup problems for both Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles – traffic could be sitting there all the way back to Penn Avenue based on the count of cars and estimates. This is a critical factor in determining how widespread the effect could be if the LRT were at grade. This must be studied before things get farther along; this will have a significant impact on the park system. In addition, an overpass would be visible on the other side of Lake of the Isles. A tunnel would prevent the congestion problem but would also preserve both the parkway and the lakes (speaker will provide the results of this informal neighborhood study to staff). 	<p>8:20-8:30</p>
<p>6. Adjourn</p>	