

From: [Gayle Bonneville](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] With attachment -- Comment For Aug 20, 2026 Climate-Infrastructure committee municipal consent public hearing
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 5:11:42 PM
Attachments: [municipalconsenthearing.pdf](#)

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from wyomingcats@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

To the city clerk:

I am unable to attend the public hearing Thursday regarding municipal consent for the Central Avenue MnDOT plan, so please forward my attached comments to committee members prior to the meeting. Thank you!

Gayle Bonneville

[EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the City of Minneapolis. Please exercise caution when opening links or attachments.

Aug. 19, 2026

Comments on MnDOT's Central Avenue Plan Seeking Municipal Consent at Aug. 20, 2026, Climate and Infrastructure Committee Meeting (which I am unable to attend)

As a longtime resident of Minneapolis who has over the past two-plus decades tried to be engaged in Central Avenue NE issues, I am requesting you NOT give municipal consent at this time to this plan. My three main reasons are:

- It does not follow the city's own 2040 Comprehensive Plan, which includes a report on Central Avenue NE approved by the Minneapolis City Council after countless hours of community engagement and a special task force that methodically studied our "main street."
- MnDOT's process of community engagement was weak, and more discussion of aspects of the vague and truncated online version is needed to ensure the public understand what is happening and where.
- The plan appears to have dysfunctional aspects to it. (See below.)

My initial reaction to seeing the "final" design from MnDOT is confusion. I expected to find each block in the Minneapolis portion to be depicted, but I don't see that. I see only the main 4-5 Minneapolis intersections. My comments here are directed to the area from 18th Avenue NE up to the border at 37th Avenue NE, since this is the area I mostly frequent as a resident living just off Central Avenue. (The portions north into Fridley have some concerning elements as well, but that is for another discussion by another city.)

My next reaction was alarm at the amount of "concrete medians" included in this entire plan. I thought Minneapolis realized slabs of concrete were not the way to go. I know I am charged/penalized for the stormwater factor of concrete at my home, so why would the city approve this on Central Avenue? In addition, as noted in previous Central Avenue planning by the city, the existing median on Central north of St. Anthony Parkway was NEVER planned to be or implemented as concrete. A professional landscaping firm, working with the city, neighborhoods and others, devised and implemented plantings and greenspace here. The plan was implemented, looked great, but fizzled when the city failed to maintain it. Also please read how the Central Avenue Plan in the 2040 Plan describes this area. The city needs to work with MnDOT to stop this excessive concretization of our community and restore greenspace to this existing median and the others proposed. I see other cities adjacent to Minneapolis with great medians. Central Avenue deserves the same treatment.

The Central Avenue Plan/2040 Plan also calls for an Art Trail, an idea which now has caught the eye of residents once again. The community back when the idea was first

discussed advocated for “functional art;” two pieces are already in place on the existing shared trail adjacent to the golf course. More of this type of enhancement should be considered for Central. I heard there was a committee formed to address this, but today MnDOT did not have details for me, so I would like this process to be an open, transparent one.

Related to this, I was told by the previous city council member when he was in office that architectural pieces of the city-designated historic landmark Shoreham Roundhouse at 2800 Central were salvaged by the city, documented by a professional photographer before demolition and saved for some type of commemoration or use on Central Avenue. The city should follow through/follow up on this and put a plan in place with the community, since Shoreham Yard stretches along a substantial portion of blighted territory of Central Avenue. It has long been an embarrassment and traffic issue to the neighborhood, exacerbated by the city and mostly by MnDOT around 2018 or so when they approved a stacked cargo shipping container “parking lot” eyesore at 28th-29th and Central Avenue. Now is the time for the city and MnDOT to remediate that error, but I see no graphic of that area on MnDOT’s web site so I can’t tell what the intersection and roadway there will look like. What are the details here?

Other comments:

- St. Anthony Parkway at Central: Needs a green arrow for traffic turning off the parkway turning north and south. The south turn is especially dangerous because traffic comes blindly roaring up an incline.
- I use the above intersection almost daily. Rarely see bicyclists on this area of Central, so why narrow it so much? Would rather see the two lanes maintained on Central from 18th to at least 27th due to clogged up traffic even with two lanes now, making it difficult to utilize the businesses, find parking, or even move along the road. I suggest keeping the on-street parking (vs. a concrete median anyway!) and ensuring we don’t have any of the turning issues that have occurred on Lowry Avenue NE (had to be redone because the turn was too tight) and Johnson (still hearing complaints about that one, but at least that’s mainly a residential street and less traffic than Central but I still encounter people pulling out into oncoming traffic to get around buses, delivery trucks and the like. It’s just the reality of car traffic, and efforts to change that reality are not working.
- The Presidents Bike Boulevard on the streets adjacent to Central was created years back so that bicyclists didn’t have to risk their safety by using Central Avenue. Why not use that as planned instead of fouling up vehicle traffic and parking on Central?
- My guess is clogging up traffic and reducing parking in the 18th to 26th area (heart of the business node) by doing the “road diet” will just drive traffic either to avoid the area altogether or slop over onto adjacent residential streets. How does this help?
- Due to the limited graphics on the MnDOT site, I can’t tell whether the dedicated bus lanes are throughout this corridor of Minneapolis or just sporadic. If just sporadic blocks or alternating north/south, this will end up like Johnson Street on steroids, with traffic clogged up waiting for a bus stopped in the single lane of traffic.
- What is your plan for the many semi tractor trailer trucks coming out of Shoreham? Will they block traffic when unable to make a sharp turn to one-drive-lane Central?

Better yet, keep the Shoreham trucks off Central and mandate that they use the University Avenue entrance/exit from Shoreham where there is no residential area heading north to the 694 freeway. This should have been done when you and MnDOT approved the cargo shipping container parking lot that lead to demolition of the city-designated historic landmark Roundhouse. There is plenty of land over on that side of Shoreham, and University is two lanes each direction going north while feeling like an underused freeway over there.

- MnDOT web site indicates the last Minneapolis meeting was over a year ago. From the list there, I count only 3 meetings specific to the Minneapolis portion, not including “pop-ups” for which broad notice may not have been given or the early virtual meetings with no locations given at that generic stage. I have communicated to MnDOT several times outside of the few meetings I heard of about adequacy and timeliness of engagement, and we just disagree. Community engagement was a large part of my employment for 20 years. I suggest that the Minneapolis portion needs more discussion and community engagement before you give your OK to MnDOT. MnDOT told me today Columbia Heights was still doing some meetings to ensure they get the best outcome, so Minneapolis should too for this major project.
- The graphics don’t show all the blocks, so I would like to know where the new BRT bus stops will be. In the past, there have been comments that BRT reduces the number of stops - for the convenience of suburban commuters, not for local access. Are the bus stop numbers being reduced? If so, how is this a benefit to Ward 1 residents?
- Don’t make the to-be-closed-off roadway at 32nd another slab of concrete, weed pit or parking lot. Ensure this becomes decent greenspace. Better yet, leave it alone - Traffic coming off Central backs up at rush times already on the one eastbound lane of the parkway, so leaving both eastbound access points would lessen the backup by giving us two options instead of just the one. What is your solution to this back-up problem?
- One lane, two lanes, whatever. None of this works if the city doesn’t clamp down on speeders. Speeding is rampant from 37th Avenue NE south to the parkway because it’s a downhill slope coming out of Columbia Heights. Please hire more traffic enforcement. (Plus, I hear the city needs money ; -) Slowing traffic by clogging it up in one lane just makes for road rage, unhappy people, and potential customers annoyed enough to just avoid Central altogether and keep driving past local businesses to shop in the suburbs!

Gayle Bonneville
Ward 1 resident

Good afternoon, Council Members. My name is Nancy.

I am speaking on behalf of Sinykin Investments. Our family has owned our commercial building at 726 Central Avenue since 1972. For over five decades, we have invested in this property, maintained our building, and paid our taxes right here in Northeast.

As a long-term commercial property owner, my primary concern with the current Metro F Line proposal is the direct, negative impact it has on property value and asset viability.

Year after year, our property taxes continue to go up. Yet, at the same time, the city is advancing designs that systematically strip away the foundational infrastructure—like parking and customer access—that our tenants rely on to generate revenue.

When you permanently eliminate essential access and customer parking, you directly diminish the economic productivity and market value of the real estate. It creates an untenable double standard: property taxes increase, while the utility and value of the building are actively degraded by municipal design choices.

We are not opposed to public transit, but transit planning must respect the private property rights and economic health of long-term taxpayers.

We ask the Council to direct Metro Transit to refine this design and preserve our parking access.

Thank you.