Process notes
The attached concepts are working drafts and were presented to the Community Members’ Working Group on August 24. Ongoing work will be presented to the general public at open houses to be held on September 14 and 15. Feedback from both of these groups will be used to modify and refine the concepts. An additional group of plans resulting from this feedback/modification cycle will be presented at the final Community Members’ Working Group and public open houses, currently scheduled for November 2010.

To provide comments or additional feedback on the concepts, please plan to attend an upcoming open house:

Tuesday, September 14, 2010
Harrison Recreation Center
503 Irving Avenue North

Wednesday, September 15, 2010
Jones Harrison Residence
3700 Cedar Lake Avenue

Please feel free to contact:

Adele Hall, Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority
612.543.1094 Adele.Hall@co.hennepin.mn.us

Amanda Arnold, City of Minneapolis Planning
612.673.3242 Amanda.Arnold@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

with additional questions or comments.
**Corridor Notes**

In order to understand the context and potential of each station, the design team first looked at how the group of stations within the study area would work together. A successful transit corridor is one in which stations complement, rather than compete with, each other.

Land use is the single biggest determinant of station character and function. The Minneapolis station roles are anticipated to be as follows:

- **Royalston:** transitional mixed use station, critical multi-modal transfer and reverse commute
- **Van White:** transitional mixed use station emphasizing a classic urban mix of residential, commercial, office, light industrial
- **Penn:** walk-up, low profile station emphasizing neighborhood and recreational use
- **21st Avenue:** walk-up, low profile station emphasizing neighborhood use
- **West Lake:** mixed-use ‘urban village’, with a retail core and high-density residential; potential for joint-use and shared parking
Station Context: Penn

Top Issues
• difficult to access, all modes
• ped/bike access across freight rail

Principles
• provide safe crossing of freight & LRT
• minimize visual impact of any new development
• minimize traffic impact of any new development

Points for Discussion
Ped/Bike Bridge
• moves bike/ped across freight rail
• minimal neighborhood impact
• bridge could serve as neighborhood icon
• extremely high cost
  • approx. 420’ long (Hennepin Ave bridge: 380’)
  • need to be covered, heated
• minimal return on transit investment
• long walk for peds
  • visual / environmental experience?

Mixed-Use Building
• some development to offset cost of ped/bike circulation
• development would likely need subsidy
• difficult tenanting
• ped/bike distance still long
**All statements below represent individual comments from meeting attendees and represent the views or understanding of the individual speaker. The factual accuracy of these statements has not been verified.**

Penn
- Could become a sense of place for the neighborhood—future neighborhood node?
- Bus service?
- Would there be improvements to the way the existing ped/bike switchback adjacent to I-394 functions? Connectivity/wayfinding?
- Bike hub? Bike ramp?
- Escalators?
- There might be more development potential than shown, particularly by 2050.
- Having residential development on this site has been discussed before. The concern was building height.
- Coordination with Metro transit: will bus route changes be known before this study is complete?
- Look at improving existing switchback
- Could you come talk to KIAA?
- When will things be online?
- More artful bridge? Sabo?
- If there could be development on the south side of the station it would improve access.