
Appendix C

Open House Summaries

Franklin Ave (CSAH 5) - East River Parkway Intersection Study February 19 Open House Comments and Study Team Acknowledgements

Type of Concern	Comment	Acknowledgement
Assumptions and Perceptions	Don't assume that peak hour traffic volumes must be accommodated.	We understand. Our goal is: Develop an intersection solution that will serve user demands over the next 20+years. Study objectives relate to reducing delay, providing for safe movements and a less confusing design.
	Peak hour Level of Service shouldn't necessarily be your objective.	
	Perceptions are as important as actual reality.	We intend that any re-design be more intuitive for users.
	MTC wants to get rid of Route #8	Metro Transit staff has been invited to participate in the planning for the intersection and has not currently expressed plans to eliminate Route 8.
	Midtown Greenway will/will not cross River?	It is our understanding that the National Park Service does not support a river crossing at this time.
	Need to look at traffic projections for 2014 when LRT in Central Corridor is in place.	We are using the Central Corridor LRT traffic projections.
	Enough funds need to be available for the solution; this will be expensive.	Funding availability is always an issue. The amount needed will be identified as part of this study.
Current Conditions	The tolerance for more traffic in neighborhood is very low.	Understood
	There is a 1995-98 study that deals with intersections redesign recommendations.	Past ideas and new ideas will be considered
	Intersection is confusing: it is difficult to know which road is which.	It is hoped that the selected design will resolve confusion making the intersection more "legible" for users. This should allow users to better anticipate the actions of others.
	For runners, the intersection is very confusing.	
	Signal lights are confusing; drivers don't know which one is theirs.	
	27th Ave is very unfriendly for pedestrians.	Pedestrian issues along 27th Avenue near the intersection will be considered.
	Long delays during rush hour.	Agreed - especially in the afternoon. If no action is taken, the morning operation will also deteriorate over time.
	Problems on west side of bridge too; could this be included in study too?	The west side of the bridge is outside of the scope of this study.
	Park Police never enforce 25 mph parkway speed limit; speeds up to 40 mph are routine.	Comment will be referred to Park Police
	Most of time, driving over bridge is no problem; except heading east over bridge.	Eastbound delays approaching the 27th/ East River Parkway intersection are long especially in the afternoon. The Parkway also suffers long delays approaching Franklin.
Runners cross anytime, don't wait for light.	The study team has observed this behavior as well. This is evidence that the intersection operation doesn't satisfy the expectations of users.	

Type of Concern	Comment	Acknowledgement
Current Conditions	Walkers wait for light, esp. if in high traffic.	The delay can sometimes be as long as 4 minutes until the next pedestrian phase occurs.
	Too much traffic in right lane (on Franklin Bridge).	A design that improves the clarity of lane use to, and through the intersection is desirable
	Worst traffic movements are break out left-turn, and straight and right turns.	
Safety	Safety concerns are high for all users.	The actual crash history is remarkably good.
	Safety for pedestrians is biggest concern; they should have enough time to cross.	Despite that, long delays cause user behavior that is not safe and does create unexpected conflicts leaving pedestrians and bicycles especially vulnerable.
	This intersection is used by residents to cross over to East River Road. Consider safety of walkers.	
Impacts: traffic and construction	Will construction of intersection solution take more land?	Unknown at this point in time.
	What about increased traffic during construction?	Construction related traffic will be considered when a solution is identified and plans for implementation are developed.
Suggested Solutions	Don't re-route River Road down Yale Ave.	This idea was considered (but not selected) as an alternative to replacement of the Bridal Veil Bridge on the River Road. It is preferred to have the collector and arterial streets serve trips that do not have destinations in the immediate neighborhood.
	Do not use Yale as a diversion for River Road traffic.	
	Plan your redesign for all four seasons.	Bike and pedestrian demands fluctuate but are persistent throughout the winter.
	Consider peak and non-peak solutions; they may not be the same solution.	One solution that safely serves peak and off-peak periods is intended.
	Segregate users; consider both short-term solutions for more car use now, and longer-term solution for when we will use cars less.	Segregation will be considered where possible and most effective. For instance, can trail users be grade seperated from the intersection?
	Make bus use more desirable; work with Metro Transit on operational changes.	Metro Transit will have input into the development of a solution.
	Consider both 4-legged and 5-legged redesign options for the intersection.	5 legged intersections are far more complex than those with 4 legs. Opportunities to reduce complexity will be considered.
	"Ped Scramble" stoplight phase should be better known and signed.	If retaining the pedestrian scramble phase is part of a long term solution, better information to users could be considered.
	Restore I-94 to its Sept 07-Sept 08 design.	This idea lies outside of this study team's direct influence.
Consider reworking and resurfacing the Bridge itself as part of this project.	Hennepin County does anticipate the need for some sort of deck repair in the next 10 years. If the selected intersection solution depends upon or is highly complimented by bridge rehabilitation, the potential exists to combine or at least coordinate the projects.	

Type of Concern	Comment	Acknowledgement
Suggested Solutions	Prospect Park will not support any redesign that results in increased traffic through the neighborhood.	The sentiment is understood.
	Open I-94 Railroad Bridge to bikes and pedestrians, perhaps even cars.	This idea lies outside of this study team's direct influence.
	Consider a "bike box" at the intersection.	Bike boxes, or other features, to serve bikes can be evaluated for use if the solution includes a traffic signal.
	Consider diverting traffic away from this intersection before it gets there.	Parallel arterial corridors need to be simultaneously planned for improvements to carry their respective traffic demands. The limited number of the river crossing opportunities available makes physical diversion seem unrealistic.
	Europe has lots of roundabouts with lights, with bike paths and walkways underground.	The study team will consider solutions that have been proven successful. A modern roundabout, a trail grade separation, and/or other pedestrian crossing treatments could be considered.
	Roundabouts can be confusing.	
	Roundabout could work here.	
	Single-lane roundabout should be preferred option.	
	Roundabout would be great, but consider traffic light for pedestrians and bikers.	
	Consider roundabouts like in Germany: send the River Rd-27th Ave traffic underground and put in a surface roundabout.	Grade separation of vehicular movements to the extent feasible (based upon benefits, impacts and costs) has not been ruled out.
	Connect 4th Street SE and Territorial as a bypass to University.	This idea lies outside of this study team's direct influence.
	Three-lane with middle turn lane, bike lanes on both sides.	May be a plausible operational scheme for the Franklin River bridge.
	Consider bike signal phase prior to car phase.	Interesting idea if the selected solution includes a traffic signal.
	Better signage would help a lot.	Information to users, provided through improved signing or through a more legible design is desired.
	Specific suggestions related to drawing submitted, with alternatives.	Sketch ideas submitted will be considered by the study team
Crosswalks need to be near intersection or else they won't be used.	Intersections are also the location where drivers typically expect to yield to pedestrians and where pedestrians can best benefit from intersection traffic control	
Consider overhead or underground solution for bikers and pedestrians.	A grade separation for the major trail crossing appears to have merit to be evaluated for its benefit to users and for its design feasibility.	

Type of Concern	Comment	Acknowledgement
Franklin Concerns	Close last block of Franklin Ave; make it a neighborhood street with focus on bikes and pedestrians.	Franklin Ave. functions as a neighborhood connector serving over 6000 vehicles per day. Closure to through traffic would create a displacement of demands to other collector and arterial streets but would also impact demands on other local neighborhood streets in the area.
	Add traffic-calming methods too, to stop cars from using this as a freeway short-cut.	
	Consider directing major portion of traffic from Bridge to 27th Ave, and downgrading Franklin so it is not an arterial anymore.	
	Make 27th Ave/County Rd 5 the main route to University; allow Franklin to be ped-friendly neighborhood street.	
	What about traffic impacts, and increased bike use on Franklin Ave? Won't this make it more difficult for residents to back out of their driveways?	
Study Process	Meeting place should have a microphone for the presenters and a roaming microphone for the audience questions. Everyone needs to hear the interaction.	Suggestion will be considered for future meetings
	Presenters were excellent and well-prepared.	Thank you. The subject is deserving of this effort.
	The University of Minnesota should be involved in this study.	U of M Transportation staff are active on the Technical Advisory Committee for the study.

Profile of Comment Card Respondents (17 total)

Who?

Residents: 14
 Business: 3
 Commuter/Visitor: 0
 in Prospect Park ERR: 10
 in Seward: 0
 at U of Minnesota: 1
 other location: 1 (DT)

Intersection Use?

Driver/Passenger: 11
 Pedestrian: 11
 Bicyclist: 10
 Transit Rider: 3
 Other: 2 (wheelchair;
 roller blades)

Franklin Avenue (CSAH 5) – East River Parkway Intersection Study Open House #2 – Study Update/Progress Report

**St. Frances Cabrini Catholic Church
1500 Franklin Avenue, Minneapolis
6:30 to 8:30 pm
June 9, 2009**

Agenda

1. Open House
2. Presentation (and Q and A)
3. Continuation of Open House

Attendance: Approx. 80 persons

Meeting Summary

From 6:30 to 7:15, meeting attendees gathered at nine “stations” which contained boards describing:

1. Study Goals and Objectives; Study Process and Schedule
2. Existing and Future Conditions – No Build
3. Modified 5-Leg Signal Intersection – Traffic Management Concept
4. 4-Leg Signalized Intersection
5. Pedestrian Routes and Bike Routing Options
6. Roundabout: Single Lane
7. Roundabout: Multiple Lanes
8. Roundabout: Hybrid
9. Grade Separated Trail (Bridge and Tunnel Options)

Staff from Hennepin County and SEH consulting firm were at each station to explain the information and graphics and to respond to questions and comments.

At approximately 7:15, Hennepin County Director of Transportation Jim Grube opened the meeting with a welcome to all participants and introduced Hennepin County

Commissioner Peter McLaughlin who made a few remarks about the need for intersection improvements. Mr. Grube also recognized State Representative Phyllis Kahn, Peter Wagenius, senior policy aide from Mayor Rybak's office, and Annie Welch from Minneapolis City Council member Cam Gordon's office.

Mr. Grube proceeded to outline the Agenda, the purpose of the study and the issues. He emphasized that the intersection improvement project is intended to serve long term user demands. He pointed out that the study was based on 20-year vehicular traffic projections provided by the Central Corridor LRT planning team, and that, in the absence of definitive pedestrian and bicyclist projections, the Hennepin County consultant team presumed a 'doubling' of pedestrian and bicyclist demands. Mr. Grube concluded by quoting the goal of the study to "Develop an intersection solution that will serve user demands over the next 20+ years," and listing the following study objectives:

1. Improve pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle safety.
2. Reduce delay for all users.
3. Improve intersection design and clarity to satisfy user expectations.

Consultant city planner Dan Cornejo presented several details on each of the study objectives that amplified the types of impacts and/or attributes that pertained to safety, delay, or design clarity. He then addressed several slides that summarized "What have we heard so far?" He discussed the following:

- Pedestrian and bicyclist safety is a HUGE concern for all of you, and us.
- Fear that intersection improvements will actually work, and therefore attract even more traffic.
- Intersection is very confusing and frustrating: the lack of proper signage, confusing lane markings, and signal cycle length tests the patience of all users.
- Runners and Type-A bicyclists demonstrate particularly low levels of patience.
- Older people and people with disabilities have high degree of vulnerability – and desire more time to cross safely
- Intersection seems to work OK (not great, but acceptably) most of day.
- Greatest need is to satisfy a.m. and p.m. peak vehicle users without detracting from pedestrian and bikes

- How certain are we that vehicle traffic will actually increase as much as projected?
- All efforts should be made to consider and use intelligent technology to its fullest before going to a solution that would involve a physical reconstruction of the intersection.

Consultant Mike Kotila described each of the four categories of concept solutions that were being considered:

1. Modify 5-Leg Signal and Lane Configurations (applying technology)
2. 4-Leg Conventional Signal
3. Roundabouts (varying types considered)
4. Grade-Separated Pedestrian-Bicyclist Trail Options.

Jim Grube concluded the presentation by outlining the “next steps” in the study process:

- Continue to examine these concept alternatives with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) , an interagency work group, and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC), which is a work group comprised of neighborhood representatives as well as representation from bicycle advisory committees and Transit for Livable Communities.
- 3rd Open House / Public Meeting in August to present recommended intersection solution.
- Presentation to Minneapolis City Council and Hennepin County Board in September/October.

Public Comment and Feedback at the Meeting

Following the presentation, the participants and study engineers and planners engaged in a dialogue regarding the concepts and study process:

- There appears to be a bias towards routing traffic to Franklin Avenue; we should be doing “traffic calming” in that corridor.
- What about the impact of money? Who pays for all this? Have you considered the cost implications of the four options? Response: The 5-Leg intersection (design, build, and observe its performance) would cost around \$500,000. All of the other options would cost \$3-5 million dollars. A tunnel or bridge would cost about \$2 million. There are no funds allocated, nor has a funding source been

identified. What we are doing is attempting to find a workable and acceptable solution, then we will seek funds to implement it.

- It appears that with the 5-Leg intersection that the relatively new Bridal Veil Creek Bridge would be torn out. Response: Yes, a portion would be reconstructed, but it would not be the bridge itself, but rather it would involve the at-grade portion; this would be widened. Much of the railing and other features could be reused. We must remember that these are concepts; if selected, the details would have to be worked out. We would respect how this looks now, and try to do the changes up to the same quality level.
- This intersection is, has been, and will always be “nasty.” People have no idea how the “walk” signals work. Why not create a shorter walk, by tweaking the timing of the signals (and not spending millions of dollars).
- The “no left turn” idea with the 5-Leg intersection option won’t work, and it would have a negative impact on residents who live on Yale.
- Do the Traffic Management approach first. Improve the signal operations and lane configurations, watch how it works until LRT starts up, and then make your next decision.
- I have heard that the Franklin Avenue Bridge will be re-made in five years. Why not wait until then and do everything, including intersection improvements, all at once? Response: The Franklin Avenue Bridge is solid and safe. We would not replace it. What we would do would be similar to what was done with the Ford Bridge a few years ago, namely a widening of the surface to create expanded sidewalks, a shoulder for bikes, and replacement of the vehicle lanes, but a bit narrower. So, should we wait until we fix the top? Not necessarily.
- Your traffic projections are really guesses. How do you really know? If you do the 5-Leg Traffic Management option, then you have time, after LRT is completed and in operation, to follow up with intersection reconstruction if you need to.
- Do your traffic projections take into account that some people will be switching to LRT? Response: The traffic projections are based on traffic behavior elsewhere with similar situations.
- Seward will be impacted by the 25 percent increase in traffic, if the intersection is allowed to get even more congested, because traffic will back up even more and cause some drivers to forgo the Bridge and cut through our neighborhood.

- Intersection reconstruction seems too expensive if (it can be demonstrated that) signal and lane changes would work through 2030.
- The idea of a transit mall (such as the one proposed for the U of M on Washington Avenue) is outmoded. Why do we have to accept the U of M position and its effects on our neighborhoods? Response: Regional population and traffic growth, the U of M football stadium, LRT success and new high-density development in the University Avenue corridor – all of these changes will affect us. Do we “dive in” or do we “wade in?”
- “Don’t use a hatchet when a razor blade will do.” We should be going slowly, doing small changes, and monitoring those changes.
- We should just wade in, be conservative. But we in doing so, we must also acknowledge that we could spend \$500,000 now, and then if this doesn’t work, or works only for a few years, then we could still be spending an additional \$3-5 million. Or, possibly, we might find a better and cheaper solution.
- I recall when I-394 was opened in 1992. The reduction in delays lasted only a very short time. I am convinced that any reduction in delays (if we do major improvements to this intersection) will be only temporary. More traffic will come.
- I am very dubious of traffic circles. They are unknown here, and will only lead to more accidents.
- What about trying no traffic signals at all? Except for a sign telling you that you are approaching an uncontrolled intersection?
- Council Member Cam Gordon had the final word: he encouraged all to send in your comments. We need to hear from you and learn what you think about this study and the information provided.

Jim Grube thanked everyone for coming and participating. He reminded everyone that the next Open House – Public Meeting would take place in August.

#####

Type	Theme	Comment	Study Team Acknowledgement
Assumptions and Perceptions	Pedestrians and Bikers	There seems to be a focus on the roundabouts. I think that pedestrians and bikers are getting the short straw on this. We are in a time when gas prices are going up, environmentalism is gaining steam, and people will be finding other modes of transportation OTHER than cars. We need to focus on ways to move walkers, busses and bikers SAFELY. This is the Grand Rounds! People love this stretch of river. We need to make this intersection good for the people who use it responsibly.	The study is considering four categories of improvement: 1) Traffic Management Solutions, 2) 4 Leg Signalized Concepts, 3) Roundabout Concepts, and 4) Trail Grade Separations. Roundabouts have received a significant amount of review and discussion due to the level of interest and need to understand how they would serve intersection users. The needs of pedestrian and bicycles are being considered in each of the options.
	Gateway	The Gateway concept is also important to me. Lets make it both special and beautiful as well as functional and safe.	The desire to create a "Gateway" has been expressed and continues to be topic of consideration
	Traffic Patterns and Delays	Don't forget that people want to cross the bridge and go onto 27th Ave. Not everyone goes on Franklin Ave.	Recognition of movements made by all users is part of this analysis.
		Your PM westbound maximum queue on Franklin vastly understates the queue, which is frequently backed up beyond I-94.	Field studies and local reports have identified queues on westbound Franklin to be an issue. The queue lengths are reported to vary greatly dependent upon how well the freeway is flowing. Longer queues such as those you describe are supported by anecdotal information received.
		I am feeling like something needs to be done, because when you are going north on E. River Pkwy, and you are at a red light at this intersection (when you are trying to make a left turn onto Franklin Ave) you sit for 5 minutes every time. It's ridiculous! Thanks for your time and thanks for the ideas!	Our data and analysis indicates long waits and queues similar to the conditions you describe.
Make 27th Ave better and easier to relieve Franklin Ave of cars.	Some vehicular traffic on Franklin Ave may choose to use 27th Avenue dependent upon their origin or destination. Some trips would be difficult to redirect route because it is they orientated in a direction that parallels Franklin Ave.		
Study Process	Schedule	Are we rushing too fast and causing a bigger mess than we have?	The process is fast paced, but also thorough. We are communicating through open house meetings as well as smaller groups of stakeholders to identify a solution that best serves all users. In addition, Prospect Park, Seward, Mpls. and Hennepin Co. Bike Advisory Committee, U of M, Mpls Park & Rec. Bd. and Transit for Livable Community staff members are participating in the study through our Project Advisory &/or Technical Advisory Committees.
	General	Very informative and well presented and well led. I will be back for the August meeting.	Thank you for recognizing the efforts of the study team.
Reaction to Concepts Presented	Modified 5-leg Traffic Management Plan	Modified 5-leg is ok if you don't tear down the railing that was just put up. Keep it looking nice.	After a concept is selected, the next level of design will acknowledge these types of concerns in greater detail. The intent is to restore or improve conditions aesthetically.
		The re-signalized option is not that much different in peak queue than now except for on E. River Pkwy	That is correct. Our studies indicate that improvements to the 5 leg signal will potentially better serve an increase in demand but will not effectively serve the 2030 forecast demand.
		If the modified 5-leg signal is selected, please retain the nice new bridge over Bridal Veil Falls (which was just redone recently and looks good).	The modified 5-legged concept would cause the north side parapet railing and sidewalk to be relocated but would not disrupt the more elaborate a structure along the south side.
		Problems with Modified 5-leg: 1) Centerline across intersection on E. River Parkway does not line up well. 2) Franklin Ave, East and West bound movements turn thru the intersection and the turn radius reduces upon leaving intersection.	The modified 5-legged intersection tries to address some of these concerns but while staying within the existing roadway as much as possible to minimize construction. Additional refinement will be explored if this option is pursued.
		I do question the narrowing of the bridge at the intersection, reducing the current three lanes to two. If you left it at 3 there could be a left turn lane for E River Parkway as there is now. That would work if there were a left turn arrow.	The existing outside right turn lane is quite short and while it does provide storage length for vehicles waiting at the signal, it does not allow smooth flow for a moving traffic lane. Eliminating it would allow the crosswalk to be shortened improving pedestrian safety. This trade off will be considered further as the concept is refined.
		Change to 3 lane coming off bridge	
		Modified 5 leg signal - If you prohibit a left turn from the bridge to River Road people will not go all the way to Fulton and will turn down Yale. This would be very bad for the people who live on Yale.	Thanks for pointing this out. Discouraging left turns at Yale may also need to be considered if this concept is pursued. The left turn ban, would likely not be implemented unless operation without the ban proved to be problematic.
		For routing onto 27th Ave and banning left turns at intersection I am concerned about the safety of neighborhood residents and campus people for the re-routing.	
		I favor the modified 5 leg signal concept. Let some time pass to illuminate all the future unknowns before any other major improvements.	Thank you for your feedback.
		Do the modified 5 leg signal as 1st stage to save money during current economy and governor. Plan for several 2nd stage options to be assessed after LRT is operating.	
		Fine tune the lights.	
		Maybe if you just made the lights reflect the real world of needs it would be fine.	Any signal concept will account for a re-timing of the signal.
		I strongly prefer maintain the existing configuration. Introducing the control technology to support a more balanced pedestrian/bike signal flow with a focus on aesthetics and safety.	This strategy has merit as a short term improvement but it also has shortcomings as far as its ability to serve long term needs.
		I prefer the modified 5 leg as a modest attempt to improve traffic and safety.	Balancing safety and efficiency for all users is a significant challenge with this project. The Modified 5 leg signal is significantly limited it its long term potential to meet the demands from both motorized and non-motorized users.
Do something that will last more than 5 years OR do the intelligent intersection solution and observe what happens when the light rail goes in.	Responsible use of resources is an important issue and a staged approach is an option that is being considered.		
Solutions for Modified 5-leg signal: 1) Align E. River Pkwy Centerline - extend centerline thru intersection (dashed?) (a sight line problem) 2) Modify/shorten & round off "nose" between Franklin and E. River Parkway (S.E. corner of intersection) 3) Provide "Straight shot" for eastbound bus turn out & stripe for Franklin E. Bound Traffic. 4) Lane Markings with turns through intersection opening down stream (as much as possible)	1) Centerline alignments and improvements to sight lines have been taken into account in the concept designs. 2) Modifying this radius may have negative vehicle turning radius issues. 3) This would result in a smaller pedestrian waiting area between Franklin Ave and E River Pkwy 4) All of the conceptual designs call for updated lane marking schematics.		

Type	Theme	Comment	Study Team Acknowledgement
Reaction to Concepts Presented	Modified 5-leg Traffic Management Plan	Please try tweaking traffic lights now so people can make right turns at all intersections at some points (right arrows green), also reduce time for ped/bike crossing so there is less time when no one is going anywhere.	Currently there is only one lane that is only for right turns (E. River Road from the University). The current intersection configuration does not allow for the opportunity to permit a protected left turn for those vehicles during other points of the cycle. The ped/bike crossing time is based on standard minimum times to allow for safe crossing, which is especially important with the disabled users that live so close to the intersection.
	Four leg signal	The four leg plan looks troublesome as it would back traffic up even further on Franklin Ave.	The four leg intersection plan does call for a new traffic signal at Thornton and vehicles eastbound on Franklin Ave would have to wait at this light when it is red. Overall, the four legged signal operation does provide for more efficient movements for all users through the intersection.
		If you route traffic up Thornton cars will not go up to 27th Ave as far as Fulton. They will cut down Yale Ave.	Your concern is understood. None of the concepts intentionally route traffic on Thornton north of Franklin Ave.
		For "Type A" riders have bike friendly sensors to activate the traffic signal. I like bike boxes.	Bike boxes, or other features that serve bikes will be evaluated for use if the group decides that the final concept includes a traffic signal.
	Roundabouts - General	Realizing this is a study in its infancy its difficult to perceive the 3 dimensional impacts of the roundabout, particularly when elevations must rise to make it work. This could be a problem west of the intersection where the road surface seems to rise above elevations of existing residential property (vehicles could end up in the yards). Even though I'm not a business owner I have a concern regarding the effects of the construction and loss of land on the small business owners.	To the extent possible in this preliminary stage, we have realistically identified property needs associated with each concept so that potential impacts are clear. Minimizing impacts will continue to be a priority as the design process continues. Addressing the influence of grade differentials will be part of this effort.
		I don't support roundabouts at this time.	While we acknowledge that you do not support roundabouts right now, we appreciate that you are keeping an open mind to further discussion.
		Roundabouts are not good for pedestrians.	Roundabouts can be designed to accommodate all users. Experience with other roundabouts has been positive for pedestrians.
		Roundabouts only seem to accommodate cars. Seems like it would be dangerous to walkers.	
		As a bicyclist who travels through this intersection twice each weekday throughout the years I am worried about the notion of a roundabout in this area. This would be confusing to bicyclists, pedestrians (especially the disabled) and automotive users alike. Confusion leads to frustration, and frustrated drivers of multi-ton vehicles leads to snap judgments, faster driving, and more danger for all involved. Sight lines must exist for a predictable environment.	The current intersection can also be confusing to all users, mainly those that are unfamiliar with the intersection. Whatever the final concept decided on, focus on clarity and intuitive driver reaction is important to minimize driver confusion.
		I like the idea of a roundabout, but I worry about the volume of vehicles being too high, and also people who don't know how to do it and are hazardous to the rest of us. There are multiple near-accidents at this intersection because of the people seeing the other people's traffic signal say green, so they enter into the intersection and almost get hit by oncoming traffic, so something needs to be done with this intersection please!	Properly designed roundabouts can handle similar traffic volumes as signals (sometimes even more). The learning curve for any new intersection configuration will take some time as users adjust. Roundabouts have a benefit over signals in that there are fewer conflict points within the intersection and the existing confusing traffic signals would not exist.
		Roundabout, I love it for the non-peak hours. For the peak hours I am concerned about the less busy directions getting into the queue. Also for Type A cyclists - great- once people learn it. But this is unusual and probably not intuitive to most. Also driver behavior towards non-driver users can be very aggressive (Using Minnehaha circle for example). Multi-lanes seem particularly confusing. E River Rd ends up with a lot of people who come to the U infrequently.	The learning curve for any new intersection configuration will take some time as users adjust but roundabouts have a benefit over signals in that there are fewer conflict points within the intersection.
		Roundabout!	Thank you for your feedback.
		I like traffic circles the best.	Thank you for your feedback.
		I definitely prefer a roundabout and perhaps with protection for pedestrians and cyclists via raised hump crosswalks that would slow traffic moving through the intersection. The hybrid design seems great! Thanks for your hard work.	A focus on slowing driver speeds is inherent to a roundabout. Special treatments or warning devices could be considered if the geometry of the roundabout alone is unable to slow speeds and inform drivers.
		No to traffic circle.	The strengths and weaknesses of all the concepts are being weighed as well as the viability of a staged approach.
		The roundabout concepts are not familiar to many folks and should be shown in more detail, especially showing approach signage, especially for bicyclists.	Roundabouts are still fairly new to Minnesota and there would be a learning curve for drivers. Further detailed plans will be developed once a final concept design is identified.
		Roundabout seem very car-centric. Type A cyclists would be fine. Type B and peds would likely have delays. Cars will have to (but probably wont) stop for ped/bike crossings.	Roundabouts have been found to safe and effective for all users in many areas in both the United States and throughout the World.
	Single Lane Roundabout	Single lane roundabout would be my preference.	Thank you for your feedback.
	Hybrid Roundabout	Of the roundabout options I prefer the one with the smaller inner space. Tighter turns around the circle will slow down traffic.	Tighter turns do slow traffic down. The ultimate design also needs to serve larger vehicles like transit buses. The resultant design can be refined to allow larger vehicles and minimize speeds.
	Trail Bridge/Tunnel	If there is a bike/ped bridge it should be more than a utilitarian structure, but also a destination ala the SABO bridge.	Any bridge concept will take into consideration the surrounding structures and character of the parkway. Functionality and visual appearance will be key components of any new structure.
		How hard would it be to build overpasses for bikes? Peds? It was said that this would be hard. Bummer.	It appears to be feasible to build a trail bridge. Visual impacts of the bridge are a concern within the river corridor.
		On the "Grade Separated Trail" option a tunnel would be much less visually intrusive than a ped/bike bridge.	That is correct.
		You have to protect pedestrians and bicyclists either with signals or grade separation in all directions (raised roundabout above the vehicular traffic). Cars do not respect pedestrian right of way in Minnesota (Proof: try walking across any intersection without a crosswalk, especially during rush hour - Examples Franklin at Bedford). If you opt for a roundabout, drivers will overlook pedestrians to their right as they look for traffic approaching from the left in the roundabout.	Safety for all users is an important issue that was identified early in the process. All efforts will be made to provide safe passage for everyone. Going to a grade separated configuration brings with it a set of issues revolving around safety and functionality.
	Tunnels are dangerous at night. Will they plow down there?	Accommodations for winter operations would be made to allow for year round use.	

Type	Theme	Comment	Study Team Acknowledgement
Reaction to Concepts Presented	Trail Bridge/Tunnel	I think the tunnel is not a good idea. Vulnerable users are likely to simply not use it.	That concern has been identified.
		A tunnel for pedestrians would not feel safe for many walkers. Raised bridges would be better.	Safety for all users is an important issue that was identified early in the process. All efforts will be made to provide safe passage for everyone. Going to a bridge configuration brings with it a set of issues revolving around safety and functionality.
		I liked the raised bridges.	Thank you for your feedback.
		I don't like the tunnel idea.	Thank you for your feedback.
	Ped/Bike Bridge over Franklin Ave is enticing. I understand the concerns of national parks people. However, if it is built like SABO, then real potential to contribute to "gateway" concept.	The pedestrian bridge concept does have a lot of potential. But with the benefits does come challenges related to access for all non-motorized users and feasibility in the space.	
Right of Way and Parking Impacts	Any option that would reduce my parking lot's square footage (corner of E River Rd, Franklin and 27th Ave SE and corner of Thornton and Franklin) will be a concern as those lots provide parking for visitors and staff. This loss of parking space would need to be addressed and a workable solution developed. I am willing to entertain options that would enable us to recoup lost spots in other ways.	Right of way needs and the impact to the current use of adjacent sites, including off street parking, is an important consideration. Continued communication with local businesses will persist throughout this process.	
Other Suggested Solutions	Alternative 4 - Leg Configuration	Block off 27th. Route the NB 27th Ave traffic up Thornton and the SB Traffic on Yale to River Road. Traffic signals at River Rd and Franklin, Thornton and Franklin, and Yale and River Rd.	Closing 27th Ave would route county road traffic onto local streets. The completion of the Grand Rounds route runs down 27th Ave and maintaining this route for bicyclists is needed.
	Bike lanes on Franklin	Traffic increases on Franklin Ave. requires a calming modification. On E. River Pwky we marked the pavement to designate a parking lane/bike lane (no parking during rush hour). This could help on Franklin Ave.	we understand that the neighborhood is currently engaged in a study of configurations for Franklin Avenue which includes consideration of parking, bike lanes and other components. The intersection design would be adjusted where possible to be compatible with the plan that evolves for Franklin Ave.
	Elevated Ped and Bike Circle Ped Bridge/Tunnel	Consider an elevated traffic circle in the middle of the roundabout designs - relatively low cost ramps (bikes/peds). Could make it an architecturally pleasing. It would not block views to the river (from homes) and wouldn't be substantially visible from the river. Keep walkways and label with Yield to Ped signs. Even if fewer people use them (vs. Raised Route), they offer additional route for ADA compliance and winter travel.	Safety for all users is an important issue that was identified early in the process. All efforts will be made to provide safe passage for everyone. Going to a grade separated configuration brings with it a set of issues revolving around safety and functionality.
	Fulton Extension	As part of change, connect Fulton SE from 27th SE to Huron SE to relieve pressure on East River Rd.	Connection of Fulton lies outside of the scope of this study. Alternative routes would tend to lessen demands on Franklin and 27th.
	Grade Separate the River Road	One wonders if grade separation of East River Road below Franklin and 27th would help. Barring that, removing signal lights would be an intriguing option.	The idea of a grade separation of E. River Pkwy from Franklin has not been investigated due to anticipated issues with Bridal Veil Bridge, Natural features of the river bluff and historical significance of the existing parkway. This could only be pursued if less impactful solutions were proven to not be possible.
	Lane markings and signage	Improve lane markings and signage.	A short term benefit may be available through improving lane markings and signage. These would be part of a short term traffic management strategy. To serve long term needs, a more robust solution is thought to be needed.
	No Control	Look into the free zone intersection! When the lights are out, things work better? Wow.	Current concerns have been expressed by residents about driver's behavior near and in the intersection with the current control. Removing traffic control at the intersection may not achieve the desired results in terms of driver behavior. Removing traffic control may facilitate an environment where non-standard actions are more common and thus hazardous to everyone else. In addition to vehicular movement, pedestrian traffic also needs to be considered and a lack of control may create a hazardous situation for bike and pedestrian traffic, especially disabled users.
		Shared space. No Control roundabout. Use paint, markings, and sculpture to organize flow.	User safety is very important in this project. Efforts will be made to ensure that the final product visually conforms to the character of the area
	Stop Signs	A well-lit area without stop-lights or stop signs would force everyone to act and drive like adults.	Current concerns have been expressed by residents about driver's behavior near and in the intersection with the current control. Removing traffic control at the intersection may not achieve the desired results in terms of driver behavior. As always, it only takes one person to not follow normal operations and something can go wrong. Removing traffic control may facilitate an environment where non-standard actions are more common and thus hazardous to everyone else. In addition to vehicular movement, pedestrian traffic also needs to be considered and a lack of control may create a hazardous situation for bike and pedestrian traffic, especially disabled users.
		Just put stop signs at the intersection.	All way stop traffic control at the intersection may not achieve the desired results in terms of driver behavior and operation. In addition to vehicular movement, pedestrian traffic also needs to be considered and only stop control may create a hazardous situation for bike and pedestrian traffic, especially disabled users.
What about just stop signs?			
	Consider removing all traffic signals and replace with stop signs (this worked well several years ago during construction on the intersection and kept traffic moving)		
Safety	Bikers	Curb cutouts for bikers to go up to sidewalk is a bad idea for winter. Already, the sidewalk is not adequately groomed slush and ice are often pushed up onto that surface.	Winter maintenance is a clear issue that will need to be addressed in further detail once the group has made a collective decision about the desired concept.
	General	Thank you for your efforts to improve the safety of this intersection.	Thank you for recognizing our efforts.
	Pedestrians	Any Option adopted needs to take into consideration the 200+ disabled people (and their sometimes disabled visitors) who live at that intersection and enable them to move freely and safely through the intersection.	Safety for all users is an important issue that was identified early in the process. All efforts are being made to provide safe passage for everyone.

Franklin Avenue (CSAH 5) – East River Parkway Intersection Study Open House #3 – Recommended Approach

**St. Frances Cabrini Catholic Church
1500 Franklin Avenue, Minneapolis
6:30 to 8:30 pm
August 25, 2009**

Agenda

1. Open House
2. Presentation (and Q and A)
3. Continuation of Open House

Attendance: Approx. 85 persons

Meeting Summary

Open House

From 6:30 to 7:15, meeting attendees gathered at five “stations” which displayed boards describing:

Station #1: General Project and Process Information

- Project Advisory Committee/Technical Advisory Committee Process Board
- Goals and Objectives Board
- Schedule Board
- Area Map and Issues Board

Station #2: Existing Situation and 2030 No-Build

- Intersection Map/Aerial Board
- Grand Rounds Missing Link Board
- City of Mpls Bike Count Map
- Traffic Count and Forecast Board
- Existing AM Queuing
- Existing PM Queuing
- 2030 AM Queuing
- 2030 PM Queuing

Station #3: Recommended Approach – Short Term

- Modified 5-Leg Signal, Traffic Management Plan/Intersection Board
- Traffic Management Plan, Franklin Bridge Lane Configurations Board
- Signal Phasing/Pedestrian Intervals

- 2014 Traffic Forecast Graph
- Queuing comparison exhibit
 - Existing AM to 2014 AM Queuing
 - Existing PM to 2014 PM Queuing

Station #4: Alternatives Considered

- Traffic Signal Board with
 - Modified 5-Leg Signal – Traffic Management Plan
 - 4-Leg Signal
- Roundabout Board with
 - Single Lane Roundabout
 - Multi-lane Roundabout
 - Hybrid Roundabout
- Trail Grade Separation Board
 - Trail Tunnel
 - Trail Bridge

Station #5: What happens when the Traffic Management Plan is no longer effective?

- If the Long Term Plan is a 4-Leg Signal . . .
- If the Long Term Plan is roundabout . . .
- If the Long Term Plan includes a trail grade separation . . .

Staff from Hennepin County, the City of Minneapolis, and SEH consulting firm were at each of the stations to explain the information and graphics, to respond to questions, and to listen to comments.

Presentation

At approximately 7:15, Hennepin County Director of Transportation Jim Grube opened the meeting with a welcome to all participants. He announced that the purpose of this final Open House was to present the recommended traffic management plan.

Mr. Grube introduced Hennepin County Commissioner Peter McLaughlin. Commissioner McLaughlin made a few remarks about the complexity of the intersection issues, including the uncertainty of the magnitude of the traffic impacts of the initiation of the Central Corridor light rail transit service along University Avenue including traffic pattern changes expected with the creation of a transit mall on Washington Avenue on the U of M campus. He advised that the Central Corridor LRT project appears to have all the approvals and is moving ahead. He referred to the impending start of the Northstar commuter rail service, saying that this is an exciting time for the Twin Cities. He thanked all those who have participated in this process and acknowledged the sound technical work of the consultant team and their interaction with the Prospect Park and Seward communities, and U of M and Park Board officials throughout the process.

Mr. Grube also recognized Robin Garwood from Minneapolis City Council member Cam Gordon's office.

Mr. Grube outlined the Agenda, and then turned the presentation over to consultant team member Dan Cornejo.

Mr. Cornejo recapped the study process over the past several months. He stated that the February 19 Open House focused on problem identification and presentation of map graphics and video that demonstrated the complexities of operation of the intersection. The June 9 Open House was a progress report that presented the range of potential solutions, including conventional signalized intersections, various types of roundabouts, and the bridge-tunnel options for a grade-separated trail along East River Parkway. He noted the involvement of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) (comprised of residents from Prospect Park and Seward, the Hennepin County Bicycle Advisory Committee, the Minneapolis Bicycle Advisory Committee, and a representative of Transit for Livable Communities, which met six (6) times with the consultant study team. He acknowledged the involvement of bike/walk experts brought in by Transit for Livable Communities. He noted the project website (www.sehinc.com, online projects), and the many comment cards and e-mails the consultant team received throughout the process.

Project Manager Mike Kotila revisited the Study Objectives:

- Improve pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle safety
- Improve intersection clarity to satisfy user expectations
- Reduce delay for all users.

Mr. Kotila then presented a map graphic to illustrate and explain the recommended Modified 5-Leg Signalized intersection, which he termed the Traffic Management Plan. He explained the recommended curb adjustments needed to better align vehicle traffic toward their desired destinations across and through the intersection. He noted the few locations where right-of-way would need to be adjusted and where property acquisition would be required. He pointed out the saving of all the trees along the southern right-of-way of Franklin Avenue west of Thornton, and the need to remove one tree on the northern right-of-way at the northwest corner of Franklin Avenue and Thornton. And he explained the various signal operations for each of the intersection's five legs. He also pointed out the proposed bike lanes across the Franklin Avenue Bridge and along 27th Avenue. He described the proposed bike boxes on the eastbound Franklin Avenue and southbound 27th Avenue approaches to the intersection. He explained the improved situation for pedestrians in terms of increased frequency of service and much lower maximum wait times that can be accomplished with the more efficient traffic signal operation. He also explained how the proposed changes would improve clarity of the operation for all users.

Using another map graphic, Mike described the recommended lane changes on the Franklin Avenue Bridge, designed to better sort vehicles to their intended lanes as they

approach the East River Parkway intersection and to accommodate bicycle lanes across the entire length of the bridge.

Jim Grube concluded the presentation by describing the next steps, which included presentation to the Minneapolis City Council and Hennepin County Board, the preparation of plans and bid documents, construction sometime in the next year if funds are available, monitoring intersection operations over the next 4-5 years with potentially changing traffic patterns during construction and initiation of Central Corridor LRT. He advised that he was examining his overall Capital Budget to try to find the needed funds (around \$500,000) and seek County Board approval.

Public Comment and Feedback

At times during the presentation, as well as following the presentation, the participants, study engineers, and planners engaged in a dialogue regarding the recommended traffic management plan. Comments and questions from the audience included:

- This concept looks like it will work. You have been listening to us when we advised that you should make some adjustments now and monitor it to see how traffic reacts over the next few years until LRT starts up.
- Bike boxes are a good idea, but have you considered special signal indications for bikes to go first before other vehicle traffic? (Response: bike boxes will allow bikes to move to front of the queue; video detection will be used to be sure that bikes “place a call” to be served from all approaches even if larger vehicles are not present; the proposed signal operation allows the bikes to go first from the Franklin Bridge; Special bike signal indications are not widely used and at this point we have no experience with them so they are not part of the current plan)
- I think west-bound traffic will continue to back up on Franklin Avenue in the morning. A roundabout would work too, maybe better, but I worry that it would work too well and bring more traffic.
- I like what I see. This solution will work for now. We’ll see what happens when LRT is in operation.
- With 27th and Franklin planned as the Grand Rounds Missing Link, it would be nicer if trucks were not allowed.
- How long will this intersection re-construction take? (Response: There may be some work activity at the intersection over the course of a month or so with spot lane closures along the edges but it’s not expected to be very disruptive to traffic through the intersection except for periods when the pavement resurfacing is occurring which will be focused within a period of a week or less.)

- I'm concerned about how the lanes are planned on the west end of the bridge, especially the bottleneck that is created when 2 lanes are reduced to 1 lane. You should be sure that turn lanes, through lanes and bike lanes will work together on the west end. (Response: additional bike lane planning is underway for Franklin from the river bridge all the way to Hennepin Avenue by Minneapolis Public Works. They will coordinate with this traffic management plan and all of the issues raised will be considered.)
- This solution doesn't go far enough. You need to re-do the Franklin Avenue Bridge too, to get the room you need for proper vehicle alignment and to handle the volumes.
- This solution makes sense, as a short-term adjustment.

At the request of Jim Grube, Council Member Cam Gordon had the final word: He thanked the County, the consultant study team, and everyone who participated in this process. He said that if anyone had any additional ideas or thoughts, that they should e-mail the consultant team. He stated he believed that this recommended solution would help us get through the next 4-5 years until LRT begins.

Mr. Grube thanked everyone again for coming and participating, and said that he and the consultants would remain for the next half hour by the boards to respond to anyone who had more questions or wanted to make further comments.

The Open House ended about 8:30 pm.

#####

Dan Cornejo
09-21-09

Type	Subject	Comment	Study Team Acknowledgement
Reaction to Recommended Approach	Modified 5-leg Traffic Management Plan	I like the proposal as is.	Thank you for your feedback.
		I like and support the current recommendation as a short term fix. The bike boxes are great.	We look forward to implementing the bike boxes which are expected to serve user needs very well on the intersection approaches that will also be served by bike lanes.
		Bike boxes great idea.	
		I don't see a proposed bike box for traffic following Franklin Ave SE west direction across the bridge. From my experience, this is a difficult left turn for bikes with 2 lanes of traffic, many traveling across to the River Road (N). I understand bike boxes are experimental. I'd encourage considering placing on at this point as well.	A bike box on the westbound Franklin approach would be considered if bike lanes were able to be included to allow bikes to pass by waiting cars
		Love the outcome. The presentation tonight - clear and very easy to listen to. Love the lane concept for calming traffic.	Thank you for your feedback.
		Overall I am pleased with the traffic management approach and optimistic for the future present of bicyclist on the Franklin Ave bridge as well as the continuation of bike lanes along Franklin/27th Aves. Any doubts I have remain with the alternative solutions and major physical changes to the intersection (which, aside from grade separation of the River Road bike/ped lanes remain unnecessary - for lack of a better word). I hope that we can deal with increasing traffic and continually work to decrease traffic overall. Thank you.	The traffic management approach is expected to address some of the existing issues as well as enable the intersection to be responsive to modest levels of change. The City and County will monitor safety and intersection operations over the next several years as traffic patterns change.
Reaction to Long Term Alternatives	Roundabouts - General	I hope the City and County will continue to consider a roundabout and not be deferred by the "conservative" - no change mentality of those who feel they can have the neighborhood [to themselves]	Balancing the needs of all users against local impacts is always a consideration in a long term decision making process.
		I enthusiastically support a roundabout as a long term solution.	Thank you for your feedback. Through the course of this study process, feedback we've had generally supports your sentiment. If a larger solution is needed, a roundabout that is "right sized" to serve all user demands seems to be the favored long term solution.
		Ultimately sometime in our future, I support a roundabout proposal for this signal. Thank you.	
	Trail Bridge/Tunnel	<p>I would also support the idea of studying the feasibility of a bike/ped bridge over the end of the bridge along the River Road. (We have a beautiful bike/ped bridge across Hiawatha, which has been a great improvement there, and could be used as a model in concept if not design)</p> <p>North/south peds and bikes on the path (next to the river) could pass the intersection via a catwalk under the bridge. It is cheaper than a tunnel and open (not scary).</p>	The US Park Service has indicated that a pedestrian/bike bridge would not likely be approvable due to the visual impacts from the river and West Bank. The bridge underpass/cat walk idea would have a visual impact as well especially as it passes in front of Bridal Veil Falls.
Study Process	General	Just wanted to say : Thank you for your time and effort	Thank you for recognizing the efforts of the study team.
		Good Job	