

# HENNEPIN COUNTY

## MINNESOTA

## Active Transportation Committee

Date: Monday, January 26, 2026

Time: 4 – 6 p.m.

Location: Microsoft Teams conference call

### Committee Members:

- ✓ Tammy McLemore, Dist. 1  
Nicole Armstrong, Dist. 1
- ✓ Billy Binder, Dist. 2
- ✓ Seth Stattmiller, Dist. 2
- ✓ Ethan Kleinbaum, Dist. 3
- ✓ Dave Carlson, Dist. 3
- ✓ Samantha Gallagher, Dist. 4
- ✓ Ryan McKee, Dist. 4
- ✓ Lou Dzierzak, Dist. 5  
Henrik Kowalkowski, Dist. 5
- ✓ Luke Van Santen, Dist. 6
- ✓ Scott Zerby, Dist. 6  
Greg Anderson, Dist. 7
- ✓ Clara Sandberg, Dist. 7

### Ex-Officio Members:

- ✓ Julian Fernandez-Petersen, HC PW
- ✓ Tristan Trejo, MnDOT
- ✓ Raymond Eliot, Metro Transit

### Guests:

- ✓ Kristine Stehly, HC Public Works
- ✓ Dan Patterson, HC Public Works
- ✓ Christina Neel, HC Public Works
- ✓ Tom Musick, HC Public Works
- ✓ Emily Schulz, HC Public Works
- ✓ Jason Staebell, HC Public Works
- ✓ Joshua Colas, SRF
- ✓ Meredith Benesh, HDR
- ✓ Amber Blanchard, MnDOT

## Notes

- **No December 2025 minutes to approve** **4:00**
  - November minutes approved at December meeting
  - Art Walk resolution passed at December meeting
- **Welcome new members and introductions** **4:00 – 4:14**
- **Highway 252/I-94 Environmental Review** **4:14 – 5:15**
  - Jason Staebell, Hennepin County, Meredith, HDR, and Amber Blanchard, MnDOT join us for a project overview with a focus on intersections and bridges that

interact with I-94 and Hwy 252. Project scope is from Hwy 610 to 4<sup>th</sup> Street in Minneapolis

- MnDOT is preparing an Environmental impact statement—the highest level of environmental scrutiny for its projects.
  - Goal is to reduce potential problems and identify areas of needed mitigation
  - Involving multiple agencies, key decisions are made during process
  - Public and agency input to be sought throughout entire environmental review process
- Overview of environmental process steps (Final in 2027):
  1. Purpose and need
  2. Scoping phase
  3. drafting environmental impact statements and technical evaluations.
    - Phase 1A: over/under Hwy 252
      - Phase 1B: Hwy 252 access combinations
      - Phase 2: why 252/I-94 Mainline alternatives (currently here)
    - 4. preferred alternatives. All alternatives will include bike/ped safety improvements at bridges.
- Hwy 252 Crossings:
  - 85<sup>th</sup> Ave N.
    - currently has sidewalk /paved path on N side of road on East side of crossing. West side has 5 ft sidewalks on both sides. No at-grade crossings today. Overpass at N side
    - Proposed alternative would remove ped/bike overpass. Add 10 foot sidewalk/shared use path on both sides of the road with at-grade crossings. Vehicle traffic at 252 would go over.
  - 81<sup>st</sup> Ave is an at-grade signalized intersection
    - Proposal would add a ped/bike overpass and remove vehicle access.
  - Brookdale Dr. is an at-grade signalized intersection with 5 ft sidewalks.
    - Proposal is a dogbone/peanut set of roundabouts. 10-foot trails along both sides and through as an at-grade crossing.
  - 73<sup>rd</sup> Avenue is an at-grade signalized intersection with sidewalks on both sides.
    - Proposal is to remove vehicle access with a local road underpass and a 6-foot sidewalk.
  - 70<sup>th</sup> Ave currently at at-grade signalized intersection with Trail at N side and sidewalk and S side
    - Proposal is to remove vehicle access and add ped/bike overpass E/W across
  - 66<sup>th</sup> Ave is currently at grade signalized intersection with a 5 ft sidewalk on both sides with wide vehicle lanes.

- Proposal keeps vehicle access but adds a roundabout. Also adds one 11 ½ ft trail on N side and sidewalk on S side. Trail would tie into proposed trail on Willow Ln.
  - Questions for this section?
    - Luke Van Santen in chat: “re:85th - the radii of the on/off ramps look quite large.”
      - Amber Blanchard in chat: “Hi Luke! Thanks for the comment. I believe the larger radii is for semi-truck turning movements, but we can explore those more.”
    - Dave Carlson: The 81<sup>st</sup> Ave overpass section what is the width of that?
      - Amber Blanchard: 12 ft but still proposed so we’ll look at this. Will certainly be wider than 10 feet at minimum.
        - Dave Carlson: wider the better! Brookdale and other locations could also be wider. Also 90-degree angles can be hard at the roundabouts, so softening these could be helpful for those with bigger bikes.
      - Dave Carlson: At Willow Ave / 66<sup>th</sup>. Why not have the trail on the South side? Only crossing 2 lanes at W lanes but crossing 4 lanes at current location.
        - Amber Blanchard: There is an active regional trail on W side. Trail doesn’t go down Willow Ln. Trail gap that is being proposed to be closed as part of this project.
          - Dave Carlson: Still, South side would be more convenient for users.
    - Tammy McLemore: Can you please go over the 85th and 252 removal of vehicle access info and the bike/ped facilities. Concerned at how vehicle traffic would be re-routed. What is the alternative to move along traffic?
      - Amber Blanchard: in our traffic modeling we see more traffic going between 85<sup>th</sup> and 81<sup>st</sup> through Humboldt and snaking along that west side.
    - Seth Stattmiller: Big picture, this is a heartbreaking expansion of car infrastructure for a pipeline that cuts our city in half. This reduces density, hurts communities and our planet. This is a big step in the wrong direction.
      - Amber Blanchard: This is aimed to be a safety-driven project for bike/peds and vehicles. Your concern is noted for sure
    - Luke Van Santen in chat: “re:Brookdale - so many lanes to cross! Is there any way to get grade separation for those crossings? re:MRT connection - how wide is the MRT? If it is larger than the proposed bikeways, can the bikeways be made to match? Any grade separation on crossings possible?”



- 57<sup>th</sup> Ave proposed condition is like existing conditions. Vehicle lane width reduced to 11 feet. Two-way bikeway and sidewalk to remain.
- 53<sup>rd</sup> Ave currently has a buffered two-way bikeway with bollard/paint buffer.
  - Proposed curb protection between sidewalk and bikeway, barrier between drive lane and sidewalk.
  - Luke Van Santen in chat: "re:53rd bridge, can the deck-level bikeway be separated by a curb like Minneapolis has done on Hennepin? Instead of just stripes or flexposts?"
- 49<sup>th</sup> proposed design adds a two-way bikeway with curb protection, and a barrier between a shared use path and vehicle lanes. Vehicle lanes reduced to 2.
  - Luke Van Santen in chat: "re:49th - poured concrete barrier to separate the two-way bikeway sounds great! Removal of free right - Excellent!"
  - Nicole Armstrong in Chat: "42nd Ave. Can look at the plan on bicycle movement from Webber Parkway to East side Mississippi Parkway regarding bike and ped interruption with the 2 lights. Movement to south should help proposal."
  - Seth Stattmiller in chat: "42nd is my bridge. Bikes are supposed to stay off of the protected sidewalks and ride along with cars doing 50 mph (even though the speed limit is 30mph). The lane reductions and bike lanes are a big deal. I support cross section B."
- 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave W / Camden bridge. Currently a 4 lane with barrier and 7 foot sidewalks.
  - Proposed is to reduce turning radii and add a 2-way separated bikeway on one side of the bridge.
  - 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave East side proposal is removal of free-right and adding ped island and transition to grand rounds trail system.
  - 2 Cross section options for bridge:
    - Option A: 15ft shared use path, 2 travel lanes with 1 shoulder, barrier, 12 ft two-way bikeway, and 8 ft sidewalk
    - Option B: 8ft shared use path, 2 travel lanes with buffered concrete median between them, two-way bikeway, and 8 ft sidewalk.
- Washington Ave currently has 8 ft sidewalks and a paint-buffered two-way bikeway with 2 vehicle lanes. Proposal adds curb protection to the bikeway and extends south sidewalk to a 15 ft shared use path.

- Dowling Ave existing conditions have a 2-way curb-protected bikeway on S side and 8ft sidewalk on both sides. Proposal is to keep as-is but refine intersections for ADA improvements.
- At 34<sup>th</sup> the project team is studying the addition of a Bike/Ped-only overpass. The overpass would cut through the park and cross I-94 onto Washington Ave. Proposal would be to add curb extension to the Washington Ave side to connect to 34<sup>th</sup> and slow traffic at the intersection.
  - Luke Van Santen in chat: "re: potential ped bridge at 34th - is the intent to actually access the terminal site, will people have to drop down to 33rd / use existing roads? Or will there be a new way to cross the railroad & the parcel at 3310 2nd St N,? "Probably outside your scope, but..."
    - Amber Blanchard in chat: "That is outside of our scope, however I am not sure of the redevelopment that is taking place there. We can talk more with the City of Mpls to make sure they are aware of our plan"
  - Clara Sandberg in chat: "What is the potential for connection to trails on the E side of Washington bridge?"
- County did a 4 to 3 lane at Lowry Ave in 2025. Proposal is to add barriers and 15 ft shared use paths on both sides here.
- N 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue proposal is to add concrete curb to protect bikeway and increase sidewalk to 8 ft. Also, intersection adjustments for safety like curb extensions.
- W Broadway existing condition is a 6-lane divided. Proposal interacts with the blue line extension. Have not proposed to reduce vehicle lanes but do reduce lane width. Added ped refuge island for ped safety.
- Plymouth Ave N existing condition has an 8ft sidewalk on each side of the bridge and an 8 ft bike lane protected by a concrete curb -which is only present in the middle 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the bridge.
  - Proposed condition would keep cross section the same but extend curb protection for the full length of the bridge as well as adding curb extensions at intersections. Need to tie into bus stop at W end of bridge.
- Questions:
  - Seth Statmiller: Another outside of scope idea, connecting washing to the 42<sup>nd</sup> street bridge. Where I live and I ride the bridge a lot. A lot of bike traffic doesn't want to be on the N side of the bridge. When you get to the E side of the river bikes want to be on the S side of the bridge. Can we get bike lane on south side of the bridge instead of North? It would be a significant improvement and move traffic through there better. Group

rides I'm part of actually go into the park and pass through the dirt under the 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave bridge to get to Washington safely and easily.

- Clara Sandberg in chat: "I'll second that need for a connection from 42nd to Washington! For big-picture future plans, is there any sense that some of these bridges are redundant for car-carrying into a park?"
- Scott Zerby: Whenever as a I driver I'm going through Minneapolis and St. Paul it can be confusing/unclear where bike paths are and where to go. These bridges are all slightly different, how do we make sure drivers know what to do? Is it a question of signage or striping? Just raising that concern.
- Dave Carlson: I don't think medians need to be 6 feet, seems like wasted space. I'd also prefer 1-way bike tracks on each side.

• **Cedar Ave Phase 2 Reconstruction Project** **5:15 – 5:38**

- Emily Schulz, Hennepin County & Joshua Colas – project introduction
- Lake Street to 42<sup>nd</sup>. Construction begins this year, and phase 2 is next year.
- This is a very important corridor with many considerations. Goals:
  - Improve safety for all with priority on people walking and rolling.
  - Improve surface of the road
  - Reduce speeding through roadway design
  - Improve drainage and climate resiliency
  - Integrate Cedar Ave into Hennepin County and Minneapolis multimodal transportation infrastructure
- Current Concerns:
  - Low visibility (especially for peds)
  - Deteriorating pavement
  - Speeding vehicles
  - Stormwater drainage problems.
- Open House in November. Overview:
  - 45 attendees mostly from surrounding neighborhood
  - 2 participatory boards, one roll plot for comments
    - Top 3 priorities were traffic calming, safer crosswalks, and maintaining parking.
    - Comments included need for left turn lanes, complaints about truck traffic loud, and desire for bikeability.
  - Common themes:
    - Traffic calming
    - Desire for safer, more hospitable walking, safer crossings and more lighting
    - Maintaining or even removing parking in some areas
    - Transit needs and bus stop placement comments

- Online survey as well:
  - 103 respondents.
  - Priorities were:
    - Traffic calming, safer crosswalks, and green space and tree canopy. Also desire for multimodal improvements
- Project team is transitioning from public engagement round 1 to concept layout design.
- Questions:
  - Ethan Kleinbaum: I was at the bike audit going through this. One issue raised there was that the existence of bike boulevards at 17<sup>th</sup> and the future 21<sup>st</sup> might preclude the need for bike lanes on cedar. Bike boulevards become impossible to use in the winter. Bike lanes get cleared of snow and bike boulevards do not. Bike boulevards only exist for a fraction of the year. Also, I heard you mention BRT readiness, but I am feeling a little burned by the BRT readiness on Lyndale, can you expand on that?
    - Joshua Colas: The team is still in the process of evaluating the feasibility of bikeways and BRT. Priority is BRT, and bikeways are not in the triple A plan. We will still evaluate this option thoroughly though. BRT readiness in this instance refers to ensuring sufficient space for BRT stations along the corridor.
      - Raymond Elliot: BRT readiness is more about BRT compatibility. Not necessarily as extensive here as what was proposed on Lyndale. Cedar is a potential C line expansion candidate, but discussions have been limited so far to station design. Still no feasibility study so this is very preliminary.
  - Scott Zerby: Looks like street parking was less of a concern for online participants. Why were people online more likely to not rank parking important as in-person folks?
    - Joshua Colas: Interesting observation. Breakdown of open house may not be wholly reflective of all the conversations that were had, though. We did have a lot of discussion and comments from folks who wanted to preserve it and those who wanted parking removed.
    - Emily Schultz: Usually, business owners are also often those asking to preserve bike parking and are often at in-person events as well.
  - Sam Gallagher in Chat: "I'd just add that 35th, 38th, 42nd in particular have great commercial spaces that are also create curb traffic congestion/clusters. I'd like these intersections to have curb extensions that also allow business patio space - I know they want to keep their parking, but it doesn't really work at these intersections"

- **TZD Action Plan – Postponed until next month’s meeting**

- **Member announcements**

**5:38 – 5:42**

- New co-chair election during February meeting. Please nominate yourself or someone else by contacting Julian Fernandez-Petersen.
- Dave Carlson: Bicycle Alliance of MN has its annual day up the hill on Thursday Feb. 26<sup>th</sup> where they go through their legislative authority.
- Feb 26<sup>th</sup> the ATC has been invited to a happy hour at Utepils Brewing from 4 to 6pm to celebrate and thank Jordan Kocak for his years of service to Hennepin County and to the ATC
- Seth Stattmiller reminds people to carry whistles. You can get them at Recovery Bike Shop.

Next meeting: February 23 | 4 – 6 p.m. Microsoft Teams