

CEDAR RIVERSIDE SMALL AREA PLAN Steering Committee Meeting #1

Wednesday, October 11, 2006
Augsburg College
Old Main Building, Room #23
7:00 – 9:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

Steering committee members present: Dan Prozinski, Susannah Dodge (alternate), Eunice Eckerly, Ann Ellison, Dean Carlson, Jim Ruiz, Rosemary Knutson, Nigel Grigsby, Adrienne Dorn, Margot Imdieke Cross

Steering committee members absent: Fredda Scobey, Doris Wickstrom, Julie Brand, Hussein Samatar, Abib Musse, Hashi Abdi, Rhonda Eastlund, Erduon Akguc

City staff present: Beth Elliott, Haila Maze, Kristin Guild, Cam Gordon

Others present: Emma O'Brien, Andie Martinez, Barbara Raye

Welcome and Introductions

- Steering committee members introduced themselves. Each person was asked to share where they lived and/or worked in Cedar Riverside, and to describe what the like about the area
- Things people like: convenience, being able to bike or walk/run around the area, not having to drive a lot, ethnic food, neighbors, progressive atmosphere, music, egalitarianism, diversity, unconventional character, music and arts venues, theaters, activism/democracy, post office (now moved to West Bank?)

What is a Small Area Plan?

- Haila Maze gave an overview of the definition and purpose of a small area plan
- Handout covering this topic is attached

Overview of Project and Timeline

- Beth Elliott gave an overview of the project scope of work and the estimated timeline
- Handout covering these topics are attached
- It was clarified that no development moratorium is planned for the neighborhood during the planning process, although schedules of some city activities may be impacted

Roles and Responsibilities

- Haila Maze provided an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the steering committee, staff, and others involved in the process.
- Handout covering this topic is attached
- It was clarified that the steering committee's official role ends with the plan's adoption, although the organizations members represent may be involved in the implementation

Guidelines for Steering Committee

- Beth Elliott reviewed the need for guidelines regarding how the steering committee will conduct meetings and interact with one another
- The committee came up with a list of guidelines:
 - No cell phones
 - Be respectful
 - Be constructive
 - Allow people to be heard without interruption
 - No soapbox speeches
 - Be open to ideas
 - No baggage
 - Use first names

Community Engagement

- Beth Elliott asked steering committee members to provide input on stakeholders in the neighborhood, as well as strategies to reach them. The comments given are organized in the table below.

Stakeholder	Possible Strategies
Immigrant groups: East African (Somali, Eritrean, Oromo), Korean, Vietnamese, Latino; possibly others (Eastern European, Native American)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups for specific populations • Identify key leaders in community • Address language barriers • Address limited time availability • Contact Somali Students' Association
Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal "pizza and beer" get-togethers • Go through relevant classes • Talk to students, teachers, deans • Student associations
Youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Coyle programs • Church programs (homework help, etc.) • Activities at parks • Charter school in Riverside Plaza • "Image of the City" mapping exercise
Residents – owners and renters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renter, co-op, and homeowner association meetings, newsletters, etc. • Association and management companies • North Country Co-op and St. Martin's Table – community places • Mailings, flyers, email lists, websites • MPHA Cedars office for resident initiatives • Focus on what issues are important to them • Address problem: why should some bother making effort if won't be here long term?

Small and large businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRBA: meetings, mailing list, newsletter, website • Business-specific meetings regarding market study • Time crunch for small businesses • One-on-one contacts, face to face may be the best approach • Need to account for different perspectives of different cultures • Articulate “what’s in it for me” (short term) for them to understand process
Institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach as huge employers in area; possibility to strengthen live/work connection • Work with institutions to contact employees and customers • Hold institution-specific meetings • Potentially use surveys • Can get us information on employees that live in the neighborhood • Institutions can help set example for involvement of students/faculty/staff
Nonprofits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a disproportionate number of them in area, for various reasons • Can help us get the word out about upcoming meetings • Need to be respectful of limited staff capacities
Park users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target youth users • Talk to people who live near parks • Get information from citywide parks master plan
Cultural institutions and their patrons (e.g. theatre-goers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-on-one contact • Mailing lists (customers, patrons, etc.)
Customers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with businesses • Andie’s survey of businesses • Need to compile information on “who is asking what questions”
Commuters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have a short term vested interest, based on planned improvements • Info from past surveys (parking, LRT) • 3 bike shops in neighborhood • Businesses know their customers – talk to

	them about who (and what) is missing
Tourists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach like commuters • Link to culture/bohemianism – potential to be a little United Nations • Invest in interpreting history, making area appealing for tourists • Area is historically a destination • Capitalize on stadium-related visitors
Seniors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Korean Service Center • People’s Center • Brian Coyle Center

Next Steps

- Need to identify a good place to meet. Location should be accessible for both walkers and drivers, and safety should be a high priority. Staff will follow up on this. Ideas included:
 - Brian Coyle Center (convenient parking)
 - Fairview Hospital auditorium (need to figure out parking availability)
 - Humphrey Institute (students can check on availability)
- Need to determine good meeting time. 7-9 PM seems to work for people.
- Need to set regular date to meet monthly. Tuesdays and Wednesdays could work, but need to make sure they don’t conflict with other neighborhood group meetings. Staff will follow up on this. Members asked to send staff information on any conflicts.
- Group will meet prior to first planned community meeting, to be scheduled in December. Staff will send out information on next meeting soon.

CEDAR RIVERSIDE SMALL AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting #2

Tuesday, November 14, 2006
University of Minnesota
Humphrey Institute, Room 186
7:00 – 9:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

Steering committee members present: Adrienne Dorn, Ann Ellison, Dan Prozinski, Dean Carlson, Doris Wickstrom, Jim Ruiz, Margot Imdieke Cross, Nigel Grigsby, Rhonda Eastland, Rosemary Knutson, Xan Cassiel.

Steering committee members absent: Abib Musse, Christine Nelson, Erduan Akguc, Eunice Eckerly, Fredda Scobey, Hashi Abdi, Hussein Samatar, Julie Brand, Russ Williams, Susannah Dodge.

City staff present: Beth Elliott, Haila Maze, Judy Cedar

Others present: Hani Mohamud, Deven Nelson, Andie Martinez, Emma O'Brien.

Welcome and Introductions

- Steering committee members and other attendees introduced themselves.

Branding of Plan

- Beth Elliott stated that needed ideas for plan's name (besides "small area plan") and potentially a logo or graphic
- Anyone with ideas should send them to Beth
- It was stated that the word "small" should be replaced with something more descriptive

Community Engagement

- Beth Elliott gave an overview, and requested help with identification of ways to get the word out about the December public meeting
- Attendees volunteered a number of ideas, including:
 - Delta Education Collaborative – Pearl Savage
 - CRBA newsletter and email list
 - FOLC email list with social services and health related agencies
 - NRP has lengthy email list
 - Coyle Center's food shelf
 - Coyle Center's multicultural dinner event
 - Next CRBA meeting – next week
 - Put up posters at Middlebrook Hall
 - Next WBCC meeting – tomorrow
 - Work with Hashi Abdi on community outreach to Somalis
 - Charter school board meeting

- After school programs at Coyle and Trinity
- Get surveys to leave on counters at businesses
- Tuesday afternoon support group at Coyle/FOLC program – Somali women
- Go to monthly meetings of Vietnamese and Korean elders
- A sheet was circulated with some organizations/contacts. It is attached, with some information added from the meeting.
- Copies of a flyer were distributed at the meeting. The flyer will be updated, put on the website, and emailed out to steering committee members and other for distribution. Coyle Center staff will assist with translation.

Content of Community Meeting

- Meeting's purpose is to educate people and to get input for next phase of work
- Have lists of key principles for people to react to and rank
- Need to translate materials at meeting into other languages
- List of key principles attached, with some additions from meeting.
- Need to get information on unsafe areas, perhaps identify on map.
- Noted that since cameras have gone up on Cedar, crime may be shifting elsewhere, and new trouble spots may pop up. Need more cops on the street.
- Luther Kruger is the community policing staff. No more SAFE officer.
- Need to explain what principles will lead to (in terms of specific actions); tell that this relates mainly to the physical environment.
- Make these principles more concrete.
- Increased police presence as a principle on the list?
- Exercise and abstract timeline at meeting may be confusing.
- Provide examples from other neighborhoods for how stuff got done through plans.

Format of Community Meeting

- Children and Family Services at City has headsets for simultaneous translation; potentially use these at meeting?
- Park Board broke people into smaller groups at meetings; perhaps better than having stations; or perhaps have multiple stations.
- Next NRP meeting in January will use “open space technology” approach
- Have tape recorders at the meeting, also note takers.
- NRP: have good luck using surveys, but non well-educated whites don't write lengthy answers on them.
- Have big maps for people to draw in each group.
- Provide coffee and snacks.
- Child care? There is a temp group, Deven can provide information.
- Coyle has group activities for kids on Tuesdays with play and computer areas, could be used in this context.
- Talk to campus security at U of M and Augsburg about providing escorts for students from campus to the meeting.
- Coyle has used facilitator training materials; Rhonda can provide information.
- Flyer should mention snacks and child care.

- At Coyle, Augsburg's Campus Kitchen will be prepping food, which can possibly be used for this event.
- Talk to Starbucks about providing coffee or food.

Other Comments

- Some questions regarding parking study – done in summer, so may not account for students; also day/night differences
- Concerns about poorly designed intersections that are unsafe to walk across, and also to drive through.
- Traffic lights are poorly timed for cars, and pedestrian signals don't give people adequate time to cross the street
- Construction in neighborhood is making it less safe and taking away other lighting.
- Neighborhood should make it a goal to be a model for a pedestrian friendly place, particularly with prospect of two LRT lines.
- There are lots of buses, but bus stops are not marked with the routes serving them.
- Bus stops are often overflowing with people, need to be redesigned.
- Buses all meet up around Cedar and potential LRT stop area, but nothing brings them together in a coordinated way. Stops not well placed.

CEDAR RIVERSIDE SMALL AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting #3

Tuesday, February 13, 2007
University of Minnesota
Humphrey Institute, Room 186
7:00 – 9:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

Steering committee members present: Dan Prozinski, Susannah Dodge, Eunice Eckerly, Dean Carlson, Jim Ruiz, Doris Wickstrom, Rosemary Knutson, Xan Cassiel, Adrienne Dorn, Margot Indieke Cross

Steering committee members absent: Russ Williams, Ann Ellison, Fredda Scobey, Nigel Grigsby, Christine Nelson, Hussein Samatar, Abib Musse, Hashi Abdi, Rhonda Eastlund, Erduon Akguc

City staff present: Beth Elliott, Haila Maze, Joe Bernard, Steve Hay, Judy Cedar

Others present: Tim Mungavan, Andie Martinez, Natalie Wright

Welcome and Introductions

- Steering committee members and other attendees introduced themselves.

Results of Community Engagement Process - Overview

- Haila Maze gave an overview of the community engagement process to date
- Summary from December 2006 community meeting distributed (copy available online)
- About 70 people attended the community meeting, with good participation including a number of new faces
- Attendees ranked a 20+ list of guiding principles by what was most important, the results are compiled in the meeting summary
- Attendees also identified what areas in the neighborhood made them feel uncomfortable; this will be covered later in the meeting
- Attendees – and subsequently, other members of the public – completed a survey as well; results are still preliminary, and will be released soon; nearly 200 people participated
- Since the main meeting, there have been a number of follow-up meetings held throughout the neighborhood, including:
 - Riverview Tower
 - Riverside Plaza
 - The Cedars (2 meetings)
 - Korean Service Center
- Around 100 people attended the follow-up meetings; the input received largely agreed with that collected at the meeting
- Comments from process are currently being compiled and organized; results will be available soon

Results of Community Engagement Process – Guiding Principles

- Beth Elliott presented a list of 10 guiding principles which summarized what has been identified as most important thus far in the process
- Steering committee members went through the list and made comments; amended version of the list is attached; additional comments listed below
- #1: Need more cops; however, should also look at alternatives to this: what is being done elsewhere in other cities that's innovative in response to public safety concerns?
- #2: Look especially at local needs but area has historically been a destination and want to keep it that way; mixed feeling regarding chain stores – is there a way to address this?
- #3: May not be able to regulate chains out of area, but should look at options available; support existing businesses and make sure improvements don't make area too expensive for them to stay
- #4: Need to address information sharing and have sites in the neighborhood to provide for this (may fit better under another principle); make sure historic preservation doesn't stand in the way of accessibility for residents; would like more information on historic properties in the neighborhood (note: sent to Steering Committee, and added to website under "Frequently Asked Questions")
- #5: Add references to affordability and accessibility, and how we do these
- #6: Need more focus on multimodal transportation system, not just parking; address need for transit connections
- #7: Make this statement broader to include other types of practices related to environmental sustainability
- #8: Make sure to include public agencies to list of major institutions
- #9: Clarify who maintains which streets, e.g. in front of Ted Mann

Transportation Presentation

- Steve Hay gave a presentation on some major transportation issues impacting Cedar Riverside right now (copy of presentation available on website)
- Major issues: Central Corridor, Access Minneapolis, and MNDOT freeway study
- Central Corridor: update on planning, including schedule, funding, cost, and station location decisions
- Access Minneapolis: ten-year action plan, which focuses on creating streets not just for cars, implementing comprehensive plan policies, primary transit network being established to focus transit service, reviewed transit/bike/pedestrian networks and how they will fit together
- Freeway study: many improvements needed for interstate system around downtown so need master plan for the area, listed some potential projects, including interchange improvements, bridge replacement, and new ramp/street connectivity
- Identified some opportunities for Cedar Riverside area, including bike/pedestrian improvements, connectivity improvements, Central Corridor, and funding sources
- Some questions raised regarding conflicting transportation improvements: need to balance, e.g. transit-friendly vs. capacity improvements

Discussion on Transit

- Beth Elliott said city staff will be meeting with Metro Transit, and asked for input on what are main problems with transit right now that need to be addressed
- Bus stop used to be at Cedar and Riverside across from bank, moved down to in front of Midwest Mountaineering to accommodate cars; but means bus riders (including elderly) have to walk another block; bench still there, with “not a stop” sign
- Location of Central Corridor station on the West Bank – want it moved closer to Cedar Avenue (not just 19th, as city said in statement)
- All bus stops need proper signage to show which bus stops where; many pass through the neighborhood and it can be confusing
- Unattractive stop location along Washington ramp
- LRT station location lacks connection to bus lines
- Need signage at LRT indicating where to catch buses
- Needs signage to guide people to the LRT station – wayfinding
- There is no stop at Hard Times anymore
- Cuts to #20 were very inconvenient for people, used particularly by those needing to travel to downtown public housing office
- Need better connections between the bus routes
- Look into potential for circulator in neighborhood
- Noted that Central Corridor location will be addressed during the planning process, and city staff will check to make sure deadlines for city input on station location are met

Public Realm

- Joe Bernard gave a presentation on research into public realm problems and potential solutions in the neighborhood (copy of presentation available on website)
- Reviewed work to date and what will be done regarding analysis of public realm and recommendations for it
- Working on determining strengths and weaknesses of the public realm and develop best practices to inform future development
- Major issues identified by the public: 6th Street unsafe, Riverside Ave lacks identity, intersections that are unsafe for all modes, LRT placement concerns, 15th Ave and Riverside Plaza blighted
- There are upkeep concerns along problem corridors
- In some locations, private space is acting as public space – and resulting in criminal activity there
- Reviewed next steps, final product, and steering committee’s role in the process
- Steering committee requested written documentation of what’s been done to date, with more specifics than what was in presentation; city staff will provide
- Need to schedule improvements for Cedar and Riverside, getting a place in the CIP for these projects
- Need to check if there are any storm/sanitary sewer separation issues here
- Need funding to upgrade Cedar Avenue sidewalks; an old special service district was established back in the 1970’s – ran out of money and is now obsolete, but could be redone and used again, with same properties/businesses assessed as before
- Need plan to upgrade Cedar streetscape – very dated; should lead to recommendations

Update on Schedule

- Need to add one more steering committee meeting in April, moving next community meeting back one month to May; all agreed this was necessary to provide adequate time to cover detailed materials and analysis
- Next community meeting: look at opportunity sites and guidelines for future development and improvements to neighborhood
- March meeting will be second Tuesday of the month (3/13/07); April meeting will be second Tuesday of month (4/10/07) as well
- Questions regarding when draft plan will be available for review – much later in process, will get plenty of notice
- Lots of concerns regarding where the station will be located; will have a more detailed conversation on this next month
- Get information regarding the meeting out prior to the meeting so people have a chance to review it
- Address Central Corridor deadline issues ASAP

CEDAR RIVERSIDE SMALL AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting #4

Tuesday, March 13, 2007
University of Minnesota
Humphrey Institute, Room 186
7:00 – 9:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

Steering committee members present: Dean Carlson, Doris Wickstrom, Rosemary Knutson, Adrienne Dorn

Steering committee members absent: Russ Williams, Ann Ellison, Fredda Scobey, Nigel Grigsby, Christine Nelson, Hussein Samatar, Abib Musse, Hashi Abdi, Rhonda Eastlund, Erduon Akguc, Dan Prozinski, Susannah Dodge, Eunice Eckerly, Jim Ruiz, Xan Cassiel, Margot Indieke Cross

City staff present: Beth Elliott, Haila Maze, Judy Cedar, Kristin Guild, Cara Letofsky

Others present: Tim Mungavan, Janna King

Welcome and Introductions

- Steering committee members and other attendees introduced themselves.

Transportation Follow-Up

- Beth Elliott gave an update on discussions on transportation that had transpired since the last meeting.
- Planning staff met with Metro Transit regarding concerns in the neighborhood. Some highlights from this meeting:
 - They are very open to working with neighborhood on operational issues
 - Will work with neighborhood on identifying bus stop location and signage issues and possible improvements
 - Discussed possibilities for improvements around Hiawatha LRT – routing buses to station not likely, but signage and wayfinding improvements are possible
 - Discussed relative advantages of proposed locations for the Central Corridor LRT
- City staff working on the Central Corridor LRT project met together to compare notes:
 - Met Council is in process of hiring a consultant to work on preliminary engineering phase of project. The consultant should be selected by June and done with first phase of work by the end of 2007.
 - This small area plan process will have an opportunity during this time frame to have input on the station location decision. We will also be hiring a consultant to work on an analysis of both potential locations – one near the U of M, one closer to Cedar Avenue. This analysis will include a look at pedestrian access, cost estimates, and conceptual illustrations of the stations.

- Heidi Hamilton, the city's Deputy Director of Public Works, has been informed of the neighborhood's and city's interests and concerns and will represent them during the selection and managing of the Met Council's consultant.

Market Analysis To Date

- Janna King, a consultant for this project, gave an overview of progress to date on the market analysis for Cedar Riverside
- There is an overall theme of a lack of connectivity in the neighborhood – physical and social; reconnecting the area will be a major consideration in recommendations
- Dick Paik, another consultant, has done a couple dozen interviews with business owners, developers, and other stakeholders. Regarding housing, he has identified a short-term opportunity for market rate rental housing targeted to students. Long term opportunities, to be identified, will likely be more varied and numerous.
- The construction of the Central Corridor LRT can serve as a catalyst, and real time of opportunity for the neighborhood. It will be good to have a vision in place before then.
- Theater and entertainment is a major business cluster in this neighborhood. In a meeting with this group, a number of strengths and challenges of this neighborhood were identified, along with recommendations of how to improve the area for this group.
- In response to a question regarding the Fine Associates proposal: it appears that their approach will be to do what is possible in the short term, then hold the property until the market improves – a “patient investor” approach, which may well be what is needed here.
- A question was raised about streetscaping Cedar Avenue, and there was reference to a walkability analysis done around three years ago that recommended improvements; it was discussed that further analysis will be done to both Cedar and Riverside to see what improvements would be desirable and feasible.
- It was suggested that public safety must be addressed to improve the business climate, and that the recently installed lights might not be helping as much as planned.
- Regarding business mix, it was noted that there are not a lot of businesses that create daily traffic to the neighborhood.
- Storefronts need upgrading, and often do not reveal the value of what is behind them. The market study will have short term fixes to this (e.g. façade renovations), as well as longer term strategies.
- Parking problems may be more related to management than supply. Will be recommending strategies for making parking more understandable and accessible, and in general making the area more welcoming to visitors.

Land Use Decision Making

- Haila Maze reviewed existing land use conditions and outlined decisions to be made
- The future land use map will be a central component of the small area plan.
- However, due to the current land use pattern and ownership structure, it is unlikely that there will be a lot of changes in land use designations in the neighborhood.
- An initial analysis of land to building value ratios does not immediately suggest a lot of areas that are ripe for redevelopment, particularly since much of land is tax exempt or does not have a building on it.

- Currently, Cedar and Riverside are designated as community corridors in the city’s comprehensive plan (see handout for description of this and other land use features). However, all of these are being reviewed and these potentially could be shifted to be commercial corridors.
- Additionally, the area around the intersection of Cedar and Riverside is designated as an activity center. The comprehensive plan update now underway is an opportunity to more clearly define the extent of this area and its supporting policy.
- It was noted that city economic development programs have funding available to assist businesses along commercial corridors, as well as near transit stations.
- There were concerns about how you balance activity center status with neighborhood livability. That will have to be considered in the plan.
- Since the land use features can be confusing, it was suggested that the small area plan focus first on what types of land uses the neighborhood wants, and then see which land use features fit the best with that decision.

Criteria for Opportunity Sites

- Beth Elliott gave an overview of how opportunity sites will be identified in the neighborhood
- Opportunity sites are those that are ripe for redevelopment. In the context of the plan, these will be identified, and then certain ones will be selected as “case studies.” No site will be chosen without the permission of the property owner.
- The land/building ratio is sometimes used to identify these properties. However, since the data for this neighborhood is so limited on this metric, other criteria need to be used. These include: vacant or underutilized properties, potential catalysts for future development, need for upgrade to the existing building, and establishing an important connection.
- The group was asked to identify some potential sites. These included:
 - City-owned properties, including some parking lots
 - Brian Coyle Center, since they are considering an expansion
 - Theatre in the Round, which has potential for expansion
 - Lucky Dragon/Viking Bar and adjacent properties
 - Former Dania Hall site
 - Fine Associates properties
 - Open land on Cedars public housing property, fronting Cedar
 - Both east and west sides of Cedar from Riverside to 6th
 - Parking lots owned by institutions, if they agree to participate
 - Area around proposed Children’s Hospital site
- It was noted that city staff will be meeting with commercial property owners soon, and this may provide an opportunity to find willing participants for a case study

Preparation for April Meeting

- The next meeting will be held in April, and will focus on preparation for the May community meeting
- The May community meeting will focus on case study sites. It will most likely be held on a Saturday morning early in the month.

CEDAR RIVERSIDE SMALL AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting #5

Tuesday, April 10, 2007
University of Minnesota
Humphrey Institute, Room 186
7:00 – 9:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

Steering committee members present: Dean Carlson, Doris Wickstrom, Rosemary Knutson, Adrienne Dorn, Jean Lawrence Caron, Xan Cassiel, Susannah Dodge, Dan Prozinski, Margot Indieke Cross, Eunice Eckerly

Steering committee members absent: Russ Williams, Ann Ellison, Fredda Scobey, Nigel Grigsby, Christine Nelson, Hussein Samatar, Abib Musse, Hashi Abdi, Rhonda Eastlund, Erduon Akguc, Jim Ruiz

City staff present: Beth Elliott, Haila Maze

Others present: Tim Mungavan, Andie Martinez, Barbara Raye

Welcome and Introductions

- Steering committee members and other attendees introduced themselves. Jean Lawrence Caron, a new member representing WBCC, was in attendance.

Progress Report

- Beth Elliott gave a progress report on the original scope and what has been accomplished to date (copy of report attached).
- A background narrative for the plan has been drafted; let staff know if you would like to see this document.
- Have produced ten guiding principles based on community input.
- Market study is now underway; more details will be provided soon.
- Analysis of transportation facilities, including parking analysis as part of market study, is now underway
- Public realm analysis underway, including CPTED, wayfinding, and landscaping. Need to coordinate with NRP regarding study of community space needs.
- Question: what is the committee's role in identifying infrastructure improvements? Steering committee is more about process than content; will have role in deciding what options are feasible and what should be presented to the public.
- Will be sending out periodic updates of the progress report to the steering committee as various items on list are accomplished.

Transportation Scope

- Haila Maze reviewed a draft scope developed for the transportation consultant (copy of scope attached).

- Have decided to go with SRF as the consultant, since they have already done extensive work for U of M on design for station locations and we can build on this.
- SRF has already done preliminary work on three station locations on the West Bank.
- The study will incorporate elements done in transit station area studies for Hiawatha line stations; no need to do separate study here if we can add them to the small area plan.
- We will use the work SRF has already done. On top of this, we will have them do preliminary cost estimates for the three locations as well as providing a detailed analysis of pedestrian connections to each of the locations from both the campus and neighborhood.
- Scope will also include a traffic study of Riverside Avenue, which has a lot of potential for redevelopment.
- A number of concerns were expressed regarding choosing the same consultant as the U of M, due to fear of conflict of interest. Will insist on clear and detailed analysis in process.
- Questions regarding how the station location at Anderson Hall (now in EIS) was chosen, and what the city can do to influence and change this decision; April 13 forum on the subject, sponsored by the CDC, was mentioned.
- Opinion was expressed that this is one of the most important parts of the plan

April 18 Business Meeting

- Beth and Haila gave updates on the planned business meeting on April 18, 3-5 PM at the Lucky Dragon.
- The meeting will feature a presentation by consultants on the findings of the market study thus far.
- For those who are unable to attend, meeting notes and other information will be distributed afterwards. Steering committees are encouraged to attend, though it is not high priority.

May Community Meeting

- Beth Elliott gave an overview of what will be covered at the May community meeting. Flyers for the meeting were distributed (and attached).
- The meeting will last from 10 AM – 2 PM, but no need to stay longer than you like; will be open house format for people to come and go as they please
- What ways can we get the word out about this meeting?
 - This Friday 4/13 LRT event – talk to CDC
 - This Saturday 4/14 women’s night out – talk to Hani
 - CRBA meeting, 3rd Thursday
 - WBCC meeting 3rd Wednesday
 - KFAI radio announcement
 - Distribute flyers: Hard Times, North Country Co-op, Bank, May Day Books, West bank grocery store, apartments, etc.
 - Put flyer on website, and send to steering committee members
 - NRP Steering Committee 4/16 6-8 PM – Hani
 - Neighborhood Relations Committee 4/16 6-8 PM – Hani
 - Human Opportunities work group 4/17 and 5/15 6-8 PM – Hani
 - Saturday 4/21 9 AM to noon Bluff Street cleanup project for Earth Day – Rosemary

- Safety Committee meeting 5/1, 7 PM - Hani
- NRP Economic Development meeting 5/2 6-8 PM – Hani
- There will be four rooms at the community meeting:
 - Overview – background information, orientation
 - Transportation – Riverside Avenue, Central LRT, Hiawatha, bicycling, wayfinding
 - Land use – zoning, existing land use, market information (what do we need), streetscaping/landscaping, public realm
 - Case study sites – three sites are chosen, with three different focuses:
 - Market feasibility – Dania Hall
 - Urban design – U of M parking lot along Riverside
 - Public realm and connectivity – whole neighborhood, but especially Cedar
- Other issues for community meeting: need to look at filling in the gaps, need to discuss adding back alleys to the neighborhood; can address in public realm topic
- How do we incorporate green in all of this? Highlight in urban design focus – need educational element to this
- Provide examples of good lighting for neighborhood, e.g. MCTC, Hennepin County service center
- Use preference survey to get at what people like (subjective choices)
- Historic character: should new buildings be clearly modern, or resemble older buildings? General support for the latter.
- Urban design discussion can lead potentially to neighborhood design guidelines
- Start with principles of development rather than specific examples (too limiting)
- Ask if people want owner-occupied versus renter-occupied housing; noted that this may be long term, rather than short term, due to market realities.

Upcoming Schedule

- Cunningham Group, who will be facilitating at the community meeting, wants to meet with steering committee members. Doris, Rosemary, and Susannah volunteered
- Probably will be meeting around noon on Friday, May 11.
- Beth will ask for other volunteers via email
- Original schedule for next steering committee meeting was August, but that seems too far away; need additional meeting before then.
- Will meet sometime after May community meeting for follow-up, review results of meeting and talk with Cunningham Group; Beth will check with CG to see if they can be read in time for a June meeting, around June 12.
- August meeting (August 14) will focus on preparing for September final community meeting

CEDAR RIVERSIDE SMALL AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting #6

Tuesday, July 10, 2007
University of Minnesota
Humphrey Institute, Room 186
7:00 – 9:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

Steering committee members present: Jim Ruiz, Doris Wickstrom, Adrienne Dorn, Dan Prozinski, Rosemary Knutson, Susannah Dodge

Steering committee members absent: Dean Carlson, Jean Lawrence Caron, Xan Cassiel, Margot Indieke Cross, Eunice Eckerly, Russ Williams, Ann Ellison, Fredda Scobey, Nigel Grigsby, Christine Nelson, Hussein Samatar, Abib Musse, Hashi Abdi, Rhonda Eastlund, Erduon Akguc

City staff present: Beth Elliott, Haila Maze, Judy Cedar

Others present: Tim Mungavan, Andie Martinez, Andrew Dresdner (Cunningham Group)

Welcome and Introductions

- Steering committee members and other attendees introduced themselves.

Land Use

- Haila Maze gave a summary of the land use exercise at the May community meeting; confirmed a generally commercial focus along both Cedar and Riverside; additional information available on website
- A draft future land use map was presented for review, as well as a supporting narrative (both attached)
- Issues raised with future land use map included:
 - Need to preserve small parking lots on southern end of Cedar
 - Need more clarification of buffer along Riverside
 - Possibly show existing/future LRT stations on map
 - Clarify stray right-of-way parcels
 - Show northernmost park-owned parcel as “park”, not high-density residential; this parcel has been an issue in the past, may need to consult legal staff
- No issues with showing all of Cedar and Riverside as Commercial Corridors; both currently Community Corridors
- No issues with showing Activity Center all along Washington/Cedar, as now indicated by C3A zoning
- Potentially extend Activity Center on MPHA property? Discuss potential collaboration on new development of street frontage with MPHA (possibly with structured parking for residents, public included); will be following up with MPHA on this idea
- Development of MPHA property would help form southern “gateway” into neighborhood where none currently exists

Transportation

- Beth Elliott gave a brief summary of transportation content from May public meeting, focusing on parking and Riverside Ave; more information available on website
- Not a lot of content on LRT was presented at the meeting, but more work has been done since then
- Will be working with URS instead of SRF; SRF and U of M uncomfortable with potential conflict of interest issues on plan
- Draft scope for URS was provided (attached)
- Will be analyzing station locations around Cedar Ave and 19th
- Question: how do we estimate ridership by location? Consultants say locations too close to be able to differentiate between them in terms of ridership draw
- Request to look at how to connect between two LRT stations
- Discussion regarding development of Cedar & 6th public art elements, and need for lighting/other improvements along 6th for LRT connection
- Might move community meeting back to October, to allow for more time for URS to do work; OK with those attending
- Discussion of traffic study underway for Riverside; no major issues noted, though comment that lights along Riverside too short for pedestrians to cross safely
- Question regarding potential traffic study for Cedar; response: due to high level of congestion along Cedar, fewer options are available; staff will check on this

Urban Design/Connectivity

- Andrew Dresdner of Cuningham Group gave a presentation on urban design and connectivity issues in the neighborhood; copy of presentation available on website
- Initial comment follow-up to transportation discussion: in urban area, congestion can be a good thing, which businesses prefer; should not aim for lightly traveled streets – some great places are level of service F
- Urban design: builds investor confidence, manages growth, and coordinates investments
- Presented a variety of urban design concepts; need to think about how they all fit together
- Neighborhood has many connections, but not all high quality – quality is more important than just having a sidewalk
- Need to think about how private systems of connections relate to public ones here, especially with large property owners
- Suggestions regarding focusing development along nodes, redoing connections between Cedar/Riverside/6th
- Brief summary of scenarios for Dania Hall site done at public meeting; note that these were for illustrative purposes only and none will be recommended in plan, or as part of RFP process; general lesson: more density = more chance of being able to retain local merchants (more reasonable rents for retail space)

Next Meeting

- Cuningham Group will produce technical memo for review
- Updates on Central Corridor LRT work
- Next steps on Riverside Avenue traffic analysis
- More information on market recommendations (see attached)
- Preparing for upcoming community meeting

CEDAR RIVERSIDE SMALL AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting #7

Tuesday, August 14, 2007
University of Minnesota
Humphrey Institute, Room 186
7:00 – 9:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

Steering committee members present: Doris Wickstrom, Susannah Dodge, Margot Imdieke Cross

Steering committee members absent: Adrienne Dorn, Dan Prozinski, Rosemary Knutson, Jim Ruiz, Dean Carlson, Jean Lawrence Caron, Xan Cassiel, Eunice Eckerly, Russ Williams, Ann Ellison, Fredda Scobey, Nigel Grigsby, Christine Nelson, Hussein Samatar, Abib Musse, Hashi Abdi, Rhonda Eastlund, Erduon Akguc

City staff present: Haila Maze, Judy Cedar, Kristin Guild, Robin Garwood

Others present: Tim Mungavan, Andie Martinez, Janna King (Economic Development Services), Mike Larson and Steve Malloy (URS Corp.)

Welcome and Introductions

- Steering committee members and other attendees introduced themselves.

Future Land Use

- Haila Maze gave an update on the future land use map (attached), which has been updated slightly based on conversations at last month's meeting
- Attendees were fine with the map as shown

Riverside Avenue

- Haila Maze gave a brief summary of the Riverside Avenue Traffic Analysis (available online). The study showed that the road could accommodate bike lanes on both sides while still maintaining a good traffic flow.
- It was stated that the city has obtained some funding which can be used to construct a bike lane on Riverside Avenue, and this study could help move along the project by providing needed information.
- The alignment of the various lanes is somewhat tight at intersections, and the bike lane and travel lanes may need to be narrowed or temporarily combined to ensure adequate space for on-street parking and turn lanes.
- The study also indicated there may be a need for improving signal timing along the road, which could be a recommendation of the plan.

Cedar Avenue

- While Riverside Avenue is being identified for potential bicycle improvements, Cedar Avenue is targeted for pedestrian improvements
- There was a discussion of a potential project involving upgrading the mid-block crossing over Cedar at vacated 5th Street, combined with a new sidewalk and an easement along a private lane to complete the connection to Riverside. There is the possibility that this could be included in a grant application to the non-motorized transportation funding available to the city.
- It was stated that the crossing should be as clear and understandable as possible, and that public education may be needed to help people see the need for pedestrian safety. The signal itself may need to be upgraded as well.
- Bollards or another type of barrier were suggested to discourage people from crossing the street not at signals.
- Other improvements could include addressing the various “cow paths” in the area, and ensuring safe and convenient crossings, particularly for seniors who live in the area.
- The sidewalk on Cedar is in bad shape, and there is some confusion regarding whose responsibility it is to improve it; will need to check with Public Works on this; there may be some ADA compliance issues.
- Improvements should also take into account safe and direct ways to access the existing LRT station from the major institutions.

Central Corridor

- Mike Larson and Steve Malloy from URS Group presented some draft concepts for a Central Corridor station.
- Major questions, considerations, major issues with connections, and design challenges were described for the project, which were summarized in a handout (attached).
- Two alternatives were presented: one between 19th and the U of M skyway with a sloping sidewalk to Cedar, and one located between 19th and Cedar (available online).
- There was a discussion of access issues with the U of M, which has relatively few connections to Washington Avenue.
- Attendees favored the alternative located between 19th and Cedar as the one most beneficial to the neighborhood as a whole. Concerns were expressed regarding how the long walkway from Cedar would function, and whether it would be safe.
- The consultants agreed to provide more details on additional options, such as a reconfiguration of the Washington Avenue ramps which could open up land for development.
- Idea of presenting a main project concept, along with a series of options that could be added, all with cost estimates.

Market Analysis

- Janna King presented a draft economic development strategy for the neighborhood (available online).
- The neighborhood is divided into several market niches, including Seven Corners, Cedar Riverside, South Cedar, and Riverside Avenue. Each has its unique strengths and focus.

- The Riverside Avenue area was highlighted in particular as an opportunity to draw more buying power out of the staff, visitors, students, and patients at the major institutions. Since the resident population has limited buying power, this provides a growth opportunity – as well as a chance to bring more activity to Riverside Avenue. The key will be to present options which are appealing to those in the institutions.
- Recommendations for an organizational structure to implement the economic development strategy were also presented. In response to questions, it was stated that – although this envisions an independent nonprofit entity being created with a board of directors including leaders from the area’s institutions and other community representatives – the city would remain an important partner.
- A series of opportunity sites were also identified in the neighborhood, as was a detailed implementation strategy.
- A plan for accommodating new development and public parking on Lot A was discussed briefly. The main idea was that development opportunities are currently somewhat limited for this location and may need subsidy to happen, particularly when considering how to include public parking in addition to parking needed by the new development.

Next Steps

- A public meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, September 25, from 7-9 PM at the Brian Coyle Center.
- The meeting will include the main topics discussed here, including updates on Central Corridor planning, the market analysis and recommendations, and the future land use map. Additional materials and recommendations will also be included.
- The public input, at this point, will be less about choosing between major options, and more about reacting to draft recommendations.
- Draft materials for the meeting can be sent to steering committee members in advance of the meeting date.