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AUGUST 2010
I. AFFECTED JURISDICTION REVIEW

As presented in the Grand Rounds Missing Link Development Study Report, dated May 8, 2008, it is not unusual for significant public infrastructure proposals to uncover conflicts in policy between governmental agencies or offices within large cities like Minneapolis.

BACKGROUND

The Grand Rounds system of parkways circumnavigates the entire City of Minneapolis—some 50 miles in length. For the most part, the route was established many years ago prior to the border to border development that populates the City today. The Missing Link in Southeast and Northeast Minneapolis is defined as approximately 3.5 miles in length traveling through residential, commercial, and industrial areas within the City. Several attempts have been made since the 1890’s to identify a route filling this gap but because of economic and several other reasons, it did not occur.

The process facilitated by the Citizens Advisory Committee in 2007 and 2008 was concluded on September 3, 2008 when their recommendations for designating the Missing Link segment and new park sites were approved by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB). All but 1.25 miles of the 3.5 mile new segment proposes to utilize existing or proposed public streets. The designation of these streets as Parkway has the support of Minneapolis Public Works (MPW) and Community Planning/Economic Development (CPED) as long as weight restrictions are not imposed in effort to eliminate truck traffic.

ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

It is the 1.25 mile section proposed for new alignment through the Mid City and Southeast Minneapolis Industrial Area (SEMI) employment District that has been identified as the predominant issue because it is in conflict with City policy regarding the preservation of industrial property. In addition, the proposed bridge crossing of the existing railyard (south of the Industrial area) is not located where planning for the SEMI area had previously recommended. In a joint letter (attached) dated July 30, 2008, signed by the MPW Director/City Engineer and the CPED Director, these concerns and others were raised in attempt to assist the MPRB to revise its proposal in conformance with Industrial planning and City policy relating to Industrial areas.

SUBMITTAL OF MASTER PLAN AND METROPOLITAN COUNCIL RESPONSE

On March 9, 2009, the Grand Rounds Missing Link Master Plan, as approved by the MPRB on September 3, 2008, was submitted the Metropolitan Council, Park and Open Space Committee, for their review and approval. In response, by letter dated April 8, 2008, Metropolitan Council staff has asked for clarification regarding several issues including cost estimates for land acquisition, construction costs for bicycle and pedestrian paths, use of City streets for...
parkway improvements, use of parkways for truck and bus travel and the potential conflict with City policy regarding the taking of Industrial properties. The letter goes on to request comments from CPED regarding the acquisition of Industrial properties and from MPW stating their approval for converting City streets to a parkway. Evidence of their responses are to be included in the Master Plan re-submittal for the Grand Round Missing Link.

LOOKING FOR A SOLUTION

Several meetings between MPRB staff, their consultants, and representatives from MPW and CPED were held for the purposes of resolving the identified issues. During these discussions, the difficulty in coordinating plans that represent competing purposes became evident to everyone. In addition, several plans pertaining to employment and Industrial development preceded the Missing Link Master Plan and plans for future phases of Granary Road and the bridge crossing have not been started and are dependent on the availability of future funding. As a result, the Grand Rounds Master Plan must attempt to respond to past planning and also must avoid being in conflict with planning that has not yet begun. In an effort to seek cooperation and move forward the MPRB has offered both a short-term and a longer-term solution that will respect City planning and policies while filling the gap in the Grand Rounds system as soon as is possible.

INTERIM PROPOSAL TO MPW & CPED--Affected Jurisdiction Review

In a letter dated December 29, 2009 (attached), the MPRB submitted a compromise proposal to both the MPW and CPED that suggests an interim acquisition and development plan while not abandoning the longer term concept as proposed in the Grand Rounds Missing Link Development Study Report and the Master Plan as submitted to the Council on March 9, 2009. In their letter the MPRB provided several clarifications and planning adjustments with the intention of enabling both MPW and CPED to move forward jointly with the MPRB to develop the Missing Link. Further stated was their agreement that retaining and increasing employment opportunities is a City goal wholeheartedly supported by the MPRB. To this end, the MPRB has suggested that the Missing Link segment will generate redevelopment opportunities for both commercial and Industrial purposes.

The MPRB further offered that, because the redevelopment of the SEMI and other areas along the Missing Link route will take time, it was prepared to modify the route south of Hennepin Avenue, as an interim measure, leaving the existing industries and commercial businesses unaffected. In their letter the MPRB did, however, re-affirm its long term goal which is to provide a high quality and unique parkway experience east of 29th Avenue between Hennepin and Weeks Avenues by placing the parkway on new location and acquiring nearly 80 acres of new parkland identified as an Eco-business park. In addition, the interim plan for this short segment will involve the re-design of 29th Avenue with parkway amenities and then designating this segment a part of the Grand Rounds system.
From I-35W south to Hennepin Avenue the proposal stipulated that Industrial Blvd. would be utilized as previously planned and that the intersection at Hennepin Avenue be moved to the west directly opposite 29th Avenue. This change would provide a direct and much safer intersection for traffic crossing Hennepin Avenue and continuing south on the parkway. At least one business would be acquired as a result of relocating the intersection. The current width of 29th Avenue is not adequate to support the parkway even on an interim basis. Therefore, footage on one or both sides will need to be acquired in order to provide sufficient space for traffic lanes, bike and pedestrian paths, signage and the necessary vegetation and landscaping. The MPRB does not believe that widening 29th Avenue will have a negative effect on the current usage of the adjoining properties.

**MPW AND CPED APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL FOR SHORT AND LONG TERM IMPLEMENTATION**

In response to the Park Board’s proposed compromise, a joint letter (attached) was received from MPW and CPED dated April 19, 2010. The letter re-affirmed their support for the Grand Rounds as a “world-class facility and one of the City’s most outstanding assets.” The Missing Link was identified as an important addition and amenity for the Neighborhoods of Northeast and Southeast Minneapolis. The letter also expressed appreciation and concurrence with the compromise offering a phased approach to implementation. Recognition was given to the compromise filling the gap in the Grand Rounds on an interim basis without the displacement of existing businesses and other uses while maintaining the more ambitious long term vision as property becomes available and re-development occurs. The City’s response also stated a vision for this area that included a Missing Link segment that safely accommodated a range of users from bicyclists and pedestrians to freight trucks. Also acknowledged was that a long term partnership between the City, MPRB and other Stakeholders would be needed to achieve this goal. The letter also explained that the City will address the bridge crossing issue as a part of planning for the phasing of Granary Road and the timing of this work will depend on securing the necessary finding. And finally, the City’s letter expressed a desire to stay involved as planning for completing the Missing Link continues.

**PROPOSED MASTER PLAN ADDENDUM**

As a result of this proposed and accepted compromise, the MPRB, by way of this addendum, is proposing the above described interim and long range plan as a modification to the previously submitted Master Plan. It is the Board’s belief that this two step approach represents the most prudent path to follow given the difficulty in obtaining the property required for the long term plan without support from MPW and CPED. Eventually, the MPRB intends to implement the long term approach but with the cooperation and support of the City Council and each of its departments.
April 8, 2009

Nick Eoloff
Project Manager
Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
2117 West River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55411

RE: Grand Rounds “Missing Link” Master Plan
Metropolitan Council Review No. 20523-1

Dear Mr. Eoloff:

Thank you for submitting the Grand Rounds Missing Link Master Plan. The master plan proposes developing a parkway and associated trails through northeast and southeast Minneapolis, which would connect St. Anthony Parkway to East River Parkway. The master plan also includes a series of parks, including the Southeast Como Community Park.

The 2030 Regional Parks Policy Plan ("Parks Policy Plan") identifies a regional trail search corridor for completion of the Grand Rounds trail system, but does not identify a regional park search area in Minneapolis. The Metropolitan Council does not have sufficient information to review the plan for the regional trail corridor. Therefore, based on the requirements outlined in the Parks Policy Plan, this master plan is incomplete for review.

Issues of Incompleteness

Affected Jurisdiction Review: The Parks Policy Plan states that the park implementing agency “shall present the master plan and planned amendments to affected local units of government... and address their concerns prior to submitting the plan to the Metropolitan Council. The master plan submitted to the Council shall include a summary of comments received that identifies issues raised.”

As stated in the master plan, there are a number of planning initiatives that affect the area through which the parkway will travel, including the City of Minneapolis’ Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) AUAR and Master Plan as well as the Industrial Land Use Study and Employment Policy Plan. In addition to these plans, the City of Minneapolis approved the University Avenue and 29th Avenue Development Objectives and Design Guidelines Plan and is currently updating its comprehensive plan. Therefore, the master plan should be submitted to the Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) Department for review. Any concerns expressed from CPED should be addressed and a summary of their comments included in the master plan submitted to the Council.
The master plan proposes converting Industrial Boulevard, the planned Granary Road, and 27th Avenue to parkways. These streets are under the jurisdiction of the City of Minneapolis and are classified as Major Collectors in the City’s comprehensive plan. Since much of the regional trail is proposed to be developed within the right-of-way of these streets, the master plan needs to be submitted to the City of Minneapolis Public Works Department for review. Evidence of the City’s approval for the conversion of these streets to parkways must be submitted to the Metropolitan Council with the master plan.

**Boundaries and Acquisition Costs:** The master plan needs to include sufficient information regarding the boundaries and acquisition costs related to the regional trail corridor and associated green space so a determination of what is eligible for regional parks funding can be made.

The master plan indicates that land acquisition costs are estimated to be $36 million, with $23.5 million for right-of-way acquisition and $12.5 million for park and open space acquisition. The master plan should clarify how these estimates were determined and specify the proportion of acreage needed for the parkway, the regional trail corridor, and the signature park in relation to the parcels identified for acquisition.

**Development Concept:** The master plan indicates that the parkway route is approximately three miles. The preliminary cost estimate for the bicycle and pedestrian pathways is $6 million. Additional detail on how the preliminary cost estimate for the pathways was determined should be added to the master plan.

**Conflicts:** This section of the master plan should address the conflict between the Park Board’s policies prohibiting freight vehicles and transit buses on parkways. Because of the industrial nature of the area, there are significant freight movement needs on Industrial Boulevard. An existing bus route (#61) also uses Industrial Boulevard. This route must be maintained in order to continue to provide service for employees working in the northeast Minneapolis industrial area.

Once constructed, Granary Road will provide a critical relief route to Washington Avenue through the University of Minnesota campus, which will be converted to a transit mall for the Central Corridor LRT route. This new reliever route must be accessible to all general traffic, including trucks and buses to be effective. This should be addressed in the master plan.

In addition to incomplete items, there are also some issues that should be clarified in the master plan.

**Issues of Clarification**

- The master plan states that an 80 acre signature park is proposed, which is comprised of Parcels 1-20 as shown on page 19. Parcel data indicates that these parcels total approximately 58 acres. The park acreage should be clarified.
- The description of the Industrial Boulevard segment of the parkway states that the alignment would link to St. Anthony Parkway, but not to I-35W. Currently there is an interchange at I-35W for Industrial Boulevard. This information should be corrected in the master plan.

Metropolitan Council staff recognizes the complexity and challenges of creating a master plan to complete the Grand Rounds through a developed urban area and understands the significance of this project to the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, the City of Minneapolis and the metropolitan region. Therefore, the Council feels that it is important to work cooperatively with the affected jurisdictions and address concerns and conflicts prior to approval of the master plan and commitment of regional parks funding.

Please contact me if you have any questions. Council staff looks forward to working with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board through further refinement of the master plan.

Sincerely,

Jan Youngquist
Senior Planner—Parks

cc: Ann Beckman, Regional Growth Strategy Manager
Phyllis Hanson, Local Planning Assistance Manager
Denise Engen, Sector Representative
July 30, 2008

Mr. Jon Gurban, Executive Director
Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
2117 West River Road
Minneapolis MN 55411-2227-1400

Subject: Completing the Grand Rounds “Missing Link”

Dear Mr. Gurban:

The purpose of this letter is to express the support of the City of Minneapolis Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) and Public Works (PW) Departments for the completion of the Grand Rounds National Scenic Byway and general endorsement of the recommendations of the Citizen Advisory Committee’s (CAC) Missing Link report. The comments which follow are intended to provide clarification on specific issues, such as the City’s comprehensive planning policies as related to the CAC plan and in that light to express concerns with some aspects of the proposed alignment.

The Minneapolis Plan (TMP) of 2000 is the City’s comprehensive plan. It was adopted by the City Council in 2000 and addresses all facets of the city’s growth and development: land use, transportation, public services and facilities and economic development as well as open space and parks. The TMP provides an overall vision for all city policy, programs, and resource allocation decisions. It also provides a framework for all other city plans, including the Capital improvement program, as well as additional specific plans that have been adopted by the City, including the 2001 Southeast Minneapolis Industrial/Bridal Veil Refined Master Plan and the 2006 Industrial Land Use and Employment Policy Plan – both of which apply to segments of the proposed Missing Link route.

As you know, our staff worked together with MPRB staff over the past year through the updates to the MPRB Comprehensive Plan and the City’s comprehensive plan, The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth. Close attention has been paid to ensuring that the policies in both comprehensive plans are complementary with one another and present a unified vision for parks and open space in the city.
In general, there is strong support for the Missing Link plan concepts through the City's comprehensive plan and other plans and policies. The City's plans support the growth, connectivity, and maintenance of a superior parks and open space system. However, there are a few key areas where these differ, as described below:

- The Missing Link report recommends a route for Grand Rounds completion that includes parks and roadways in the Mid City and the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial Area (SEMI) Employment Districts. Minneapolis Industrial Policy identifies these areas for preservation of industrial property and growth of industrial jobs.

- An extensive roadway and stormwater management plan has been approved for the SEMI/University Research Park area. The plan includes parkway like roadways and open space in association with stormwater management facilities which are not fully acknowledged and utilized in the Missing Link proposal.

- Both the SEMI Master Plan and Missing Link recommendations conclude that a bridge crossing the rail yards in SEMI is needed. The proposed locations of the bridges differ. We believe that one crossing can be designed that serves the needs of both of these plans.

We are concerned that the CAC's recommended route for the Missing Link does not fully address these conflicts, and therefore is in conflict with City policy direction. Given these policies and comments CPED and PVW provide the following recommendations for the Missing Link report:

- The Missing Link should incorporate, as much as possible, the infrastructure planned for SEMI in order to strengthen the feasibility and funding of both the SEMI and Missing Link systems. For instance, using Kasota Avenue as part of the parkway near the northern border of SEMI would both reduce the taking of industrial lands and promote efficient sharing of infrastructure.

- The width of the parkway right-of-way should be minimized between Industrial Boulevard (Hennepin Avenue East) and SEMI in order to reduce the impacts and costs associated with the taking of industrial and residential properties, particularly in the areas around the proposed landmark park south of East Hennepin Avenue.

- The currently proposed bridge crossing is not adequate to meet the needs of both parkway and industry. City and MPRB staff should work together to identify a bridge crossing that both serves the industry in SEMI by providing direct access to the major arterial roadways in SEMI (Grainary Road and Kasota Avenue) and meets the needs of the proposed parkway.

- Truck traffic should be maintained on 27th Avenue between the Mississippi River and Grainary Road, Grainary Road to the adequately located bridge over the railroad property, and Industrial Boulevard to Interstate 35W.

- The Missing Link report needs to more specifically address feasibility issues related to cost and phasing. The cost estimates for land acquisition, now estimated at $150 million, seem low and likely don't include "going concern" values of business as defined by condemnation law. It should be noted that the recommendations above may help reduce project costs and therefore increase its feasibility.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the report and believe that incorporation of our concerns into a recommended Missing Link Plan will enhance the viability of the project. We also look forward to a response or the opportunity to further discuss the CPED
and PW comments and to working with you to achieve our common vision for the City of Minneapolis.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Christenson
Director, CPED

Steven Kotke
Director/City Engineer
Public Works Department

Cc: Mayor R. T. Rybak
Tom Nordyke, President, MPRB
Judd Rietkerk, Director of Planning, MPRB
Minneapolis City Council President Johnson
Minneapolis City Council Members
Barbara Sporlein, Director of Planning
Don Elwood, Director of Transportation Planning and Engineering
March 9, 2009

Arne Stefferud  
Park Planner  
Metropolitan Council  
Parks and Open Space Committee  
123321 Downtown Somewhere  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55

Dear Arne:

We are pleased to provide you with the Grand Rounds Missing Link Master Plan. This plan recommends a route and adjacent amenities to complete the three-mile missing link in the Minneapolis Grand Rounds parkway system. The plan culminates a one-year process involving several public open houses, monthly Community Advisory Committee meetings, and informational tours. We received extensive public input. Staff and the consultants gave significant time and effort to this project.

Completing the original intent of the Grand Rounds, put forth by Horrace W. S. Cleveland, of connecting and circumnavigating the city with a series of parkways is a top priority for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. The Missing Link is not only part of our Comprehensive Plan, but it has also been incorporated into the City of Minneapolis’ Comprehensive Plan. To further assist us in our efforts, we have the support of many agencies, organizations and individuals who are willing to help carry this project forward.

Please review the enclosed Grand Rounds Missing Link Master Plan. It contains the necessary information that the Metropolitan Council seeks in their review. We ask that it be placed on the May agenda of the Park and Open Space Committee for their adoption. Once the Master Plan is approved we will seek to secure resources to begin the design, acquisition and construction of the project.

If you have any questions or seek additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thanks, and we look forward to working with you in this regard.

Sincerely,

Jon Gurban
Superintendent

Nick Eoloff
Project Manager

closure
December 29, 2009

Steve Kotke
Director of Public Works
350 South Fifth Street 203, 55415
Room 203
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Mike Christensen
Director of CPED
105 Fifth Avenue South
Room 200
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Subject: Completing the Grand Rounds “Missing Link”

Dear Steve and Mike:

This letter is in response to your letter dated July 30, 2008 regarding support of the City of Minneapolis for the Grand Rounds “Missing Link” project. Park Board staff has been meeting over the past several months with staff from Public Works and CPED. The proposal that follows is intended to provide clarification and planning adjustments regarding the “Missing Link” Master Plan. We feel they should enable both the Public Works Department and CPED to jointly move forward with the Park Board working to develop the Missing Link.

The Minneapolis Plan of 2000, the City’s comprehensive plan along with the 2001 Southeast Minneapolis Industrial/Bridal Veil Refined Master Plan and the 2006 Industrial Land Use and Employment Policy Plan apply to segments of the proposed Missing Link route. We understand that the City is working toward retaining and increasing employment opportunities. We share this goal and feel that the Missing Link parkway segment will generate enthusiastic redevelopment opportunities for both commercial and industry.

Understanding that the redevelopment of SEMI and areas along the Missing Link route will take time, the Park Board is prepared to modify its route south of Hennepin Avenue, as an interim measure, leaving the existing industries and commercial businesses unaffected. The long-term goal, however, is to provide a unique parkway experience east of 29th Avenue between Hennepin and Weeks Avenues by acquiring nearly 80 acres of new park land identified as an Eco-business Park.

The interim plan for this segment involves a redesign 29th Avenue with parkway amenities and then designating this short segment as a part of the Grand Rounds system. From I-35W south to Hennepin Avenue we continue to propose utilizing Industrial Blvd as previously planned, however, we strongly feel there is a need to move its intersection with Hennepin Avenue to the west directly opposite 29th Avenue. This would provide a direct and much safer intersection for traffic crossing Hennepin and continuing south on the parkway. This change will necessitate the acquisition of at least one business.
While we feel the existing right-of-way width of Industrial Blvd is probably adequate for a parkway, redeveloping 29th Avenue will require a widening of its right-of-way by purchasing footage on one or both sides of the existing street. We do not expect that acquiring right-of-way strips will negatively affect the current use of these adjoining properties. We also expect that these improvements will be appreciated in this area of the City as we ‘green up’ the street and improve connections between the northern business area and SEMI.

Understanding the City’s concern to maintain arterial routes, we can accept the current level of service, including truck traffic along Industrial Blvd and 29th Ave SE. While truck traffic is not allowed on the existing parkways, the Missing Link has been identified as a future ‘business parkway’, combining business and commercial use with a ‘parkway-like’ look and experience.

As the Missing Link route moves south into the SEMI area, discussion has focused on the location of the proposed rail-yard bridge that would connect Kasota with Granary Road. While we each have a preference for its location, we agree that the cost of a new bridge will dictate that only one can be provided. The Park Board will work with the City on an acceptable crossing location understanding that the University of Minnesota also has a stake in this important decision.

We suggest that a planning program be initiated by the City involving the Park Board, the U of M and Neighborhood groups to determine the most acceptable location. Currently, Park Board staff anticipates that if the bridge is located near the University of Minnesota campus, as has been the preference of Public Works and CPED, the Missing Link segment could be realigned to the west to meet the new bridge at that location.

Throughout the Park Board’s planning process we have kept the interests of the neighboring residents in mind and have worked very hard to avoid solutions that would adversely affect where they live and work. We will continue to discourage decision-making that is not consistent with this objective. We understand that the Missing Link is a bold vision and a challenge and will require commitment from all interested participants and stakeholders.

We accept the challenge and are committed to working with the City to successfully finish the Grand Rounds Scenic Byway system.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jon Gurban
Superintendent

cc: Nick Ealoff
April 19, 2010

Mr. Jon Gurban, Executive Director
Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
2117 West River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55411

Subject: Completing the Grand Rounds “Missing Link”

Dear Mr. Gurban:

This is in response to your letter dated December 29, 2009, regarding the implementation of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board's plan for the Grand Rounds Scenic Byway "missing link" project.

The City of Minneapolis strongly supports this project. The Grand Rounds is a world-class facility and one of the city's most outstanding assets. Completing this final link will enhance the overall network and provide an important amenity for the neighborhoods of Northeast and Southeast Minneapolis.

As recognized in your recent letter, this is also a complicated project, evidenced by the fact that it has taken many years to complete the final segment. There are many competing interests for the land and right-of-way in this area, and any major project such as this requires careful planning and implementation.

We appreciate and concur with the direction in your letter regarding a phased approach to implementation. This will allow the connection to be made without significant displacement of existing businesses and other uses, while maintaining a more ambitious long term vision as property becomes available and redevelopment occurs.

The City envisions this area as an amenity-rich parkway coexisting with well-maintained, low impact industrial and institutional uses as well as residential neighborhoods. Our vision includes roadways that safely accommodate a wide range of users, from bicyclists and pedestrians to freight trucks. Achieving this vision requires a long term partnership between the City, the MPRB and other stakeholders.

The proposed location of the rail yard bridge between Granary Road and Kasota is one of the more challenging components of this project.
The City will address this issue as part of planning for future phases of Granary Road, with the exact time frame dependent on the availability of funding for the project. Key stakeholders, including the MPRB and University of Minnesota, will certainly be brought into this conversation at the appropriate time to ensure the design and location serve all needs. Identifying additional funding for this important but resource-intensive connection would further this goal.

As you move forward with planning for both the interim and final versions of the Missing Link, we would appreciate being kept in the loop regarding your approach and progress. In particular, we would like to be involved in the decision about the potential realignment of Industrial Boulevard at Hennepin Avenue. This may be a challenging piece to implement, particularly with the location of the nearby rail crossing.

We are committed to working with MPRB and the community to successfully finish the Grand Rounds Scenic Byway system.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Christenson
Director, CPED

Steven Kotke
Director/City Engineer
Public Works Department

cc: Mayor R. T. Rybak
John Erwin, President, MPRB
Judd Rietkerk, Planning Director, MPRB
Minneapolis City Council President
Minneapolis City Council Members
Barbara Sporlein, Director of Planning
Don Elwood, Director Transportation Planning/Engineering
II. USE OF CITY STREETS AS PARKWAYS

Among the comments provided in the Metropolitan Council letter of April 8, 2009 was a concern expressed regarding the proposal to convert Industrial Boulevard, the planned Granary Road, and 27th Avenue to parkways. The letter also pointed out that these streets are under the jurisdiction of the City of Minneapolis and are classified as Major Collectors in the City’s comprehensive plan. Evidence of the City’s approval for the conversion was requested and submitted to the Metropolitan Council as a part of the Master Plan.

Several statements made in the joint MPW and CPED letters of July 30, 2008 and April 19, 2010 offer evidence that their departments are in support of a “joint use” of these roadways:

July 30, 2008 letter, second page

• The Missing Link should incorporate, as much as possible, the infrastructure planned for SEMI in order to strengthen the feasibility and funding for both the SEMI and Missing Link systems.

• The width of the parkway right-of-way should be minimized between Industrial Boulevard (Hennepin Ave. East) and SEMI in order to reduce the impacts and costs associated with the taking of industrial and residential properties, particularly in the areas around the proposed landmark park south of East Hennepin Avenue.

• Truck traffic should be maintained on 27th Avenue between the Mississippi River and Granary Road and from Granary Road over the railroad property, and Industrial Boulevard to I-35W.

• City and MPRB staff should work together to identify a bridge crossing that both serves the industry in SEMI by providing direct access to the major arterial roadways in SEMI (Granary Road and Kasota Ave) and meets the needs of the proposed parkway.

April 19, 2010 letter, first page

• The City envisions this area as an amenity-rich parkway coexisting with well-maintained, low impact industrial and institutional uses as well as residential neighborhoods. Our vision includes roadways that safely accommodate a wide range over users, from bicyclists and pedestrians to freight trucks. Achieving this vision requires a long-term partnership between the City, the MPRB and other stakeholders.

CONCLUSION: It is very apparent that the City desires a long-term working relationship with the MPRB resulting in the construction and designation of roadways and bridges that serve the needs of the City, MPRB and the travelling public. Specifically, the City and the MPRB have stated a vision for this part of the City that produces multi-modal and multi-functional roadways.
III. BOUNDARIES & ACQUISITION COSTS

The April 8, 2008 letter from the Metropolitan Council requests information regarding boundaries and acquisition costs related to the regional trail corridor and associated green space so a determination of what is eligible for regional parks funding can be made.

The attached parcel map depicts the properties needed for phase 1 (the interim plan) and in the future to implement the long-term program that includes the parkway’s permanent route and the signature park.

Phase 1 acquisition only: 24.78 acres at a total cost of $14,171,700

Future (long-term) phase: 41.23 acres at a total cost of $19,780,000

TOTALS 66.01 acres at a total cost of $33,951,700*

* 2010 Estimated Market Value, City of Minneapolis
* Does not include three parcels necessary for the preferred route designated in the Master Plan but now pending a final decision on the railyard bridge. Their combined acreage is 18.16 at an estimated value of $5,761,000. Adding their acreage and cost back in would then bring total acreage to 84.17 and cost to $39,712,700.
* Does include parcels 1 and 2 containing 2.90 acres at a cost of $3,000,000 found later to be necessary.
PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

Grand Rounds Missing Link
- Preferred Route
- Interim Route
- Phase 1 Acquisition
- Future Acquisition
- Parkway Route to be Determined after the City selects the Railyard Bridge Crossing
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- Como Ave SE
- Weeks Ave SE
- Proposed Granary Pkwy
- Proposed Central Corridor LRT Line
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## III. BOUNDARIES & ACQUISITION COSTS, CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>2010 Est. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>300 INDUSTRIAL BLVD</td>
<td>FRANCIS FAMILY LTD PTNSHP</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2905 HENNEPIN AVE E</td>
<td>MANN BROS REAL ESTATE L L C</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2900 HENNEPIN AVE E</td>
<td>NEWGATE EDUCATION &amp; RESEARCH</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2901 TALMAGE AVE S E</td>
<td>UNIV OF MINN</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>$2,730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2920 TALMAGE AVE S E</td>
<td>A CAMACHO &amp; G CAMACHO</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2917 COMO AVE S E</td>
<td>A CAMACHO &amp; G CAMACHO</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$266,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2911 COMO AVE S E</td>
<td>SB SPECIALTY METALS HLDGLLC</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2904 FAIRMOUNT ST S E</td>
<td>REGENTS OF THE U OF MINN</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase 1 Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,171,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>2010 Est. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>501 29TH AVE S E</td>
<td>JJN-L LLC</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>$874,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2635 4TH ST S E</td>
<td>DANIEL C &amp; RUTH M PARTEN</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3100 HENNEPIN AVE E</td>
<td>HAWKINS CHEMICAL INC</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3101 TALMAGE AVE S E</td>
<td>HAWKINS CHEMICAL INC</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3130 TALMAGE AVE S E</td>
<td>CRE 8 IT REALTY LLC</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3260 TALMAGE AVE S E</td>
<td>BOLGER FAMILY LTD PTNRSHP</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1047 33RD AVE S E</td>
<td>SOUTHEAST INC</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>$168,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2919 COMO AVE S E</td>
<td>S M ANDERSEN/A T NGUYEN TRS</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2921 COMO AVE S E</td>
<td>RUSSELL E BELK</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3011 COMO AVE S E</td>
<td>REGENTS U OF M</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3101 COMO AVE S E</td>
<td>VIKING MATERIALS INC</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1025 33RD AVE S E</td>
<td>RAVE PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3000 TALMAGE AVE S E</td>
<td>SOUTHEAST INC</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3225 COMO AVE S E</td>
<td>VIKING MATERIALS INC</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$3,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3200 COMO AVE S E</td>
<td>3200 COMO ASSOC LLC</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>$2,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2951 WEEKS AVE S E</td>
<td>ASPEN WASTE SYSTEMS INC</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>$1,825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Future Phase Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,780,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Phase 1 + Future Phase Totals</strong></th>
<th><strong>Area (Acres)</strong></th>
<th><strong>2010 Est. Value</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.01</td>
<td><strong>$33,951,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

Additional detail has been requested explaining the development costs for bicycle and pedestrian paths. In providing this information, we have broken the pathways down into the following segments:

1) Stinson Boulevard to I-35W, 1.33 miles:
   - Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathways only (including signage and landscaping) $250,000
   - on Industrial Blvd.

2) I-35W to Hennepin Avenue, 1 mile:
   - Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathways only (including signage and landscaping) $450,000

3) Hennepin Avenue to Weeks Avenue, 1/2 mile:
   - Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths $250,000
   - $14,171,700
   - $15,121,700
V. MPRB ACCEPTANCE OF PARKWAY USEAGE BY TRUCKS AND REQUEST FOR CITY TO SELECT BRIDGE LOCATION

The MPRB also agreed to accept the current level of service, including truck traffic along Industrial Blvd. and 29th Avenue. Trucks are not normally allowed on parkways but the Missing Link has been identified as a future “business parkway”, combining business and commercial use with a “parkway like” look and experience. An important additional element involves the railyard bridge crossing further south. The MPRB indicated their understanding of the interest on the part of MPW and CPED to have the new bridge connect Kasota and Granary Road. Although the Board continues to prefers the crossing be located near the City’s east border, they acknowledge that cost will dictate that only one crossing can be provided. As a result, the Board has offered to work with the City and the University of Minnesota to find a location acceptable to all parties. The Board further acknowledged that south of Weeks Avenue the parkway route will need to be re-aligned to meet the new bridge. A combination of City streets and acquired property will likely be utilized in making this connection.

VI. SIZE OF THE SIGNATURE PARK

Another issue in the letter requiring clarification is the size of the proposed signature park. A discrepancy was found between the size identified in the text of the Master Plan (80.00 acres) and the table containing the parcel data (58.00 acres). One of the reasons for the difference is that the estimate of 80.00 acres incorrectly included five parcels located to the south of the signature park needed for the proposed parkway but not attached to the park. They totalled 22.67 acres. In the development of the parkway they would be fully landscaped and of sufficient size for “pull offs” functioning as rest areas along the route. The actual size of the signature park, including the parkway route traveling through the signature park, totals 58.60 acres. Adding these two numbers together then totals 81.17 acres which was described as 80.00 acres in the text of the Master Plan.

** Did not include parcels 1 and 2 that contain 2.9 acres that was determined later to be necessary. Adding them confirms the above number of 84.17 acres