

Highlights

- ≈ The premise that the Ford site can and should be designed to reduce auto-dependency was embraced by many, but some remain skeptical that it's possible
- ≈ Cars and driving will be a part of the Ford site, at some level, and need to be carefully planned for
- ≈ There is strong support for transportation that enables safe walking, biking and transit as a way to reduce car trips and improve livability
- ≈ Many agreed that transportation networks on the Ford site should be designed to “accommodate” cars; not to “encourage them
- ≈ The majority of people indicated that designing for livability is more important than designing for driving convenience, however, many people consider the two objectives compatible
- ≈ There were a range of suggestions on street alignments and connections to and through the Ford site, both complementary and competing
- ≈ People support a range of devices to calm traffic
- ≈ There is a strong preference for providing parking in structured ramps, as opposed to surface parking lots; while also providing parking in alleys and along streets
- ≈ Most people felt that the cost of building and providing parking should be shared between the private and public sectors and the users

The following pages provide the detailed input for each topic:

Background – page 2

Supply and Demand – page 3

Travel Demand Management – page 6

Traffic in Highland Today – page 7

Alignment and Connections – page 8

Traffic Impact Studies – page 10

Street Types – page 12

Roundabouts and Other Forms – page 14

Parking: Type, Location and Quantity – page 15

Parking: Public-private and Pay – page 16

Background

Do you agree, disagree or have comments on the concepts or statistics on this board?

Generally Agree – design to reduce auto-dependency

- I agree with these principles
- Yes, I wholeheartedly agree. This is what we need. What has been is not what will be.
- Consider future traffic trends. Future as in 30-50 years from now. Smart design today will eliminate redevelopment needs once cars become obsolete.
- Put the pedestrian first, then bikes, transit, then Single Occupancy Vehicles – 2 yeses
- Emphasize walkways, bikeways and existing mass transit (bus) use CPR to create greenery
- Density indeed does offer the possibility of fewer car trips. Counterintuitive, but true.
- We have such an opportunity here to make an area where the pedestrian is king (or queen). An area like State Street in Madison, WI or a Central Park, NYC. Something where people can walk and not have to look over their shoulder for cars.
- We need to go “gung-ho” on mass transit. Make it quick, easy and cheap. And make good bus shelters
- Alternatives to private autos should have priority
- The more we can decrease automobile dependency, the healthier and better off we and our children will be
- My kids hate sitting in a car – they want to bike and walk everywhere. Need to create a community where it is safe for them to do that. 1 dot
- Transit accessible and frequent – 1 dot
- Very good principles, no sprawl development, more density, fewer cars, mass transit
- Systems strive for a variety for all abilities. Walking and run ways (trails), family bike lanes and commuter/fast bike lanes
- Build more heated bus shelters in city core! We need more of these to encourage bus users in inclement and cold weather

Generally Disagree – cars are important; design for them

- Disagree – You can’t “force” human nature; you have to plan/model for auto traffic and parking
- Cold here! And there are still a lot of middle age and older people using cars. These are unrealistic assumptions for this area.
- It’s freezing here! Cars are warmer than walking/biking in winter. Plus, there are no stores that are cheap or ideal for young adults – we have to drive from here to other places – bring the businesses!
- No matter what, people are going to need cars for the foreseeable future: many differing work places for individuals, family ages and activities with no available public transport, disabilities (permanent or occasional), age (very young or old) cannot avail themselves through public transport.
- Mass transit/bikes are irrelevant if development has operations (commercial, stores, apts) that people need cars to transport goods purchased.
- Do these national trends reflect local trends? I’m not convinced.

Other Comments

- Important to have balance between transit/bike/pedestrian options, but not be unrealistic with what’s really possible with these options, so that we plan adequately up front for increase in cars and traffic
- Are miles driven really declining? Stats only through 2010 when gas prices were higher than 2015
- How are these statistics affected by the “great recession” versus structural changes?
- Pedestrian safety must be strongly considered. – 1 dot

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Have reduced parking speeds from day one in this entire development
 - Obvious that expectations favor increased transit options: biking and walking.
 - Locate activity centers in a manner of user population i.e. low-activity/attendance should be further from major transport nodes
 - How many people rode their bikes or took a bus to this meeting?
 - Access to transit and ease of use are my keys and goal of any travel
 - Overall design of streets should allow for villages – housing clustered around greenspace for ex, and not oriented to street
 - Mix of grid and a couple NS through streets (Cleveland/ Cretin and Mississippi Blvd/Montreal) are ????
- for garages and deliveries and parking , one beautiful Summit Avenue staple Boulevard NW to SE for bikes, hikes, relaxation in large center islands, buildings set back, alley behind

Supply and Demand

What do you think about the assumptions on this board?

Generally Agree

- Goal on Ford site is to accommodate cars, not to encourage them – 2 dots
- Agree with the assumptions
- Totally true assumptions – not too many roads please
- Less cars the better!
- Build for people first, not vehicles, if we are truly going to be a “livable city”, bullet point #2 absolutely true – not debatable
- Agree
- Bravo
- Supply of vehicle facilities should be less than peak demand by 50-60%
- I agree with these assumptions. I drive if I find it convenient even when I don’t need to
- Agree
- Incentivizing people to get out of their cars is #1 goal
- True
- True- build for mass transit and make good bus shelters with 4 walls for all seasons

Generally Disagree

- No – don’t agree; the business owners will mandate parking
- No, don’t agree with assumptions here. Cars are not going away. If residential is majority of the build-out, most people will need to drive out of area to work – 1 dot
- Traffic increase will occur because of an increase in residency, not because of additional roads
- Whatever is put into development will dictate car use

Other Comments

- Business type and housing type should be considered in the assumptions. e.g. big box stores or multitenant housing increases cars – requires parking
- Balance
- Balance, but safety first.

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Agree! Cars are not going away- it will only be more frustrating with less openness for cars
- Who is coming to the site and from where? Neighbors can walk/bike. Need to preserve livability of neighborhoods. Light rail won't do that.

How should supply address demand on the Ford site?

- Types of businesses will affect car demand – no big box stores – 1 dot
- All these statements sound wonderful in the abstract! But for now, this is NOT the reality. Cleveland/Cretin has become the freeway connector between Hwy 5 and I-94. Cleveland was not designed for that. So the young people are more apt to use other forms of transportation – good for them and may they continue to feel this way when they have children, homes, and get old. I really am dreading what is ahead for the Cleveland/Ford/Cretin area.
- Supply determines demand. Decades of research confirm it
- Park with recreation facilities
- For any on-street parking consider time limits to encourage turn-over not long-term parking
- No big box stores – 1 dot
- How about a large parking area and a trolley taking people around. Trolley should go around neighborhood to let people on and off – 2 dots
- Alleys help delivery and parking on sides of only a couple through streets
- Where will people be going through this site? How many people drove, biked or took transit to this meeting – a neighborhood event?
- Motor vehicle trips within neighborhood should be very minimal, think pedicabs, etc.
- Use market (needs of the residents and Highland Community) as the driver, not technology (just because we can do something doesn't mean we should)
- Put clean manufacturing and let them deal with parking
- Pinehurst is parking lot with park and ride. Do not want park and ride here
- Shared parking potential
- Need to know density to plan this
- Architectural interest is important – without big parking space
- Event parking if there is a facility, mix of land uses will impact
- Transit should come first, then develop parcels

Should this statement -- “Design where cars are guests on the street” --guide street design on the Ford Site?

Yes

- Yes, great sentiment
- Yes, start with the pedestrian as the foundation here, not the private car – 1 dot
- Yes, slow the cars down! and fewer cars
- Absolutely – 1 dot
- Yes! Please use this statement as the inspiration for development! 1 dot
- The fewer cars in Ford site, the more livable it is – Shuttles!
- Yes
- We live in houses off Cretin and we strongly agree about not encouraging cars, but just accommodating them. We use bikes as much as we can (we're 62 and 54), and we try to take the bus and train to the airport and to games downtown
- Yes! But consider the reality of residents and guests needing reasonable access

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

No

- Doesn't work with weak/slow/inconsistent public transit. St. Paul public transit is very poor!
- No – diversity of uses should be provided. There should be plenty of areas where cars are “guests” but not all
- St. Paul is cold. Demographics of this area require ample parking. Businesses will fail if insufficient parking.
- Not completely. If we don't plan for some increase in traffic, will encourage people to park on streets adjacent to Ford site and be hurtful to neighborhoods

Other Comments

- The assumption “build it and they will come” applies to all parts of this discussion: build lovely sidewalks and people will walk! Build safe bike lanes and people will bike! Keep talking about streets, not roads: this semantic distinction helps us prioritize.
- What is the assumption about demand?
- First assume that people will have cars and will drive. Second, accommodate them with a “park and ride” option that allows them to park at various lots surrounding and possibly away from the Ford site and offer regular shuttle service to people coming to shop, to visit or to go to a meeting or recreate
- Cars should not be honored guests – shared users
- Cars are a fact of life – by necessity in today's world. Neighborhood “circular” buses would reduce neighborhood traffic but not reduce the need for cars on an overall basis.
- Bike and pedestrian grid
- Slowing traffic is an important goal too, get people onto transit
- W. 7th development and Ford site development must be planned together
- Residents and businesses – some on-streets but plan for underground garage structures
- I take that to mean temporary stops/stays. I assume overnight would be off street in ramps that accommodate density
- Canadian Pacific Railway spur between W 7th and Ford site should be green space with walk and bikeways. Who would be served by light rail? No neighbors.
- No big box – this would encourage and require cars and semi trucks

Travel Demand Management

What do you think could help manage car trips within and through the Ford site area?

Walking & Biking - 43
Transit - 38
Car Share - 25
Parking Management – 15
No big box – 2
Carpool - 1
Other - 1

Comments

- Bike and walking facilities should be separate
- Businesses included in the site should have essential goods and services that residents can walk to from home or transit stop. No free parking!
- Keep commercial parking on margins and create free fare transit zone. Limit private car access (London, Bath, Paris) residential “driving” permits
- Transit for shorter trips – for seniors, mothers with kids, for those who live further from the services (groceries, UPS, haircuts) and Highland Village
- Maybe some kind of local trolley car between shopping areas. Free or low cost
- There is no way that public transport can begin to approach the needs and activities of the variety of ages needing transportation without using cars
- Without LRT through the site, access constraints will give us modest blah proposals. The city must make it known to developers that if they propose creative high-density development with very high design quality the city will build the LRT thru the site from downtown St. Paul to Mpls. Then we will get truly great proposals
- I bike to work in the winter on the River Road trail because it is promptly cleared of snow
- Bikes – e-gads!! The Twin Cities should not be in competition with Portland to be the “most bike friendly city” – not with our winters – year round commuting by bike in MN is dangerous and should not be encouraged. For what large expenditure of my tax \$ are separate bike lanes with physical barriers being planned to be built? No bike lanes on Cleveland! More [bike] travel to residential streets
- Park and ride facilities with regular shuttle service to Ford site
- Circulating shuttle with possible associated off-site parking
- Shuttle buses? Trolley? Continuous trips during business hours
- Education, personal trip planning

When designing a place that includes cars, what’s more important – driving convenience or neighborhood livability? Are they mutually exclusive or compatible?

Neighborhood Livability – 36 OR Driving Convenience – 3

They are compatible – 23 OR They are mutually exclusive – 8

Comments

- Parking management that more accurately represents cost.
- Metro mobility and vanpooling in senior complexes

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Please listen and take into consideration the input from the community
- Must treat all of these issues as a system
- Accessibility/Connectivity is an important consideration in choosing a neighborhood
- Speed limit 20 mph
- There are many people in this area that need their cars – parents and older people
- Working people change jobs and go to areas all over the metro area. It would be impossible without automobile transport.
- Driving Convenience! Most need to drive to jobs and home. To shops and home. Driving is part of our lives
- The more you accommodate car convenience the less livable the neighborhood becomes
- Neighborhood livability is really at the crux of this discussion (as in other projects around the cities) Highland needs green space in the location of Highland Village – stretched out along the river is the park by golf course and HS is too small. The Ford site should be used for a park for people to gather, not just for baseball fields
- People move into Highland mostly for livability – we don’t want this to be a little downtown St. Paul – the green space is very important
- Green space is needed, more open space – soccer fields?
- Livability decreases dramatically if we have gridlock and if pedestrian safety isn’t stressed
- Green space important
- Where is parking for visitors
- What’s best for people driving is not necessarily good for people outside of cars
- Transit car share could reduce traffic leaving the neighborhood walking and biking could work for getting around Highland and further in the case of biking
- Traffic under 25 mph
- Maybe a little trolley going through the Highland shopping area in a big loop. Then don’t need parking everywhere

Traffic in Highland Today

What do you think are the most and least congested areas and how might they be managed?

See map

Comments

- We need a back exit from Lund’s and other stores. This should be done now! Even a temporary gravel road would work.
- Turn River Blvd. one way
- No speed bumps!
- Slow speeds down, speed bumps on Mississippi River Blvd.
- Please do not increase traffic and speeds on Mount Curve Blvd. This would decrease property value and taxes on this beautiful street
- [? – not legible] move up of Ford Bridge as route to Minneapolis, and the rail tracks as route to south

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Need a big park space in the Ford site along the river is only for bikes and walkers – it’s a greenway- a bike path, not a play picnic area
- Please no connections of Cretin or Mount Curve to the river road. Please think traffic calming
- Coming from the north side have a separate dedicated lane for traffic going into the Ford site
- Transit option in [? – not legible] as example
- Please avoid increase of traffic and speeds on Mt Curve Blvd. – it will detract from this beautiful street
- Shuttle service to Ford site businesses
- Ave daily traffic both ways 24 hours – Cretin 9250 – 662 peak traffic one way during one hour
- TDM to reduce car trips as much as possible
- The city needs to institutionalize counting people on foot and bike. Where are those #'s?
- Construction – Cleveland parking with bike lanes a problem
- Cretin from I-94 to Ford is already very busy. Look at Hwy 55
- Possible to build parking structures on unbuildable sites
- Ensure sidewalk access to all businesses. Currently no access to Lund’s
- Ford/Cleveland should have right turn lanes
- Maximize transit options, maximize pedestrian access, biking options – Agree with these points
- It is so tough to cross Ford at Woodlawn on foot today – a river of cars whose drivers often won’t stop. Slow Ford from Minneapolis!
- Could there be an alternative entrance to the Lund’s lot other than at Finn? Traffic backup at Cretin, Finn and Cleveland
- How do other large established cities handle a change like this? Berlin? London? NYC? Can we learn from them?
- Roundabout at inner drive/boulevard/Cleveland. St. Paul – very poor for driving and pedestrians
- No – Mt Curve extension south could /should be in the ??? to take a bit of pressure off Cretin
- Beauty of living in “village” and not with strip mall is small businesses – we need to preserve their parking or no one can patronize
- Just south of Ford Parkway on Cleveland Ave. where it splits with St. Paul Ave. should be addressed – dangerous intersection
- I live at Highland and river road + on foot in my car skirt Ford + Cleveland now – can often avoid. Street grid is so important to disperse.
- Has the Ford Bridge to Hiawatha been considered?

Alignment and Connections

What alignments and connections do you suggest and why?

Comments

- Have the rail spur become a hiking and biking path
- Take curve out of Mississippi River Blvd?
- Extend Montreal to River
- This project will not attain its potential without LRT through the site
- Montreal connection to River and Cretin
- A curved connection of Montreal/Cretin connection. Reduce curve on Mississippi River Blvd.
- Hiking and biking trail where RR is now

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Concerned that Cretin Montreal would become a pedestrian biking well.
- Please do not connect Cretin through to the River Road. First, this will not be traffic calming but will encourage people to drive even faster than they already do – They already speed on a regular basis – someone just drove so fast that their car left the road recently. Second, the area by Colby Street near the north side of Hidden Falls is an area that still has all of the wildflowers etc. that Hidden Falls area no longer has. It is a haven for birds, wildlife and flowers. – 3 dots
- Add a connection to Miss. Blvd! Roundabout at connection Cretin/Montreal – 3 dots
- Make the new Cretin and Montreal connector more curvy or a round-about at the intersection
- Do not want a connection to Mississippi River Blvd. Traffic here is already heavy and increasing with bikers, runners, etc.
- Don't make/allow Mount Curve as a relief road for Cretin congestion/off loads. Also, don't feed Mt. Curve into Ford level, Mt. Curve is a residential road
- Please avoid traffic through Mount Curve Blvd. This will detract from the beautiful street and decrease home and tax value
- The green Cretin Montreal way makes good sense – enter from Ford Parkway only have River Blvd., Cretin & Cleveland
- Do not align and connect Cretin. The traffic has increased in the past 25 years and if there is more we will move.

Do you favor more [street] connections to the site or fewer?

More – 14 dots

- Montreal continue thru to Miss. Blvd. Why not? 2 dots
- No high volume through site. Bring traffic to periphery.
- Logical to connect Cretin with Montreal as the main artery inside the development, and extend to River Road
- One road intersects becomes a nightmare. More dispersion.
- Connect Cretin through on Montreal
- More connections will spread traffic and alleviate the congestion areas. Full connections for Cretin Ave to Mississippi River Blvd or a full connection from Montreal Ave to Mississippi River Blvd. absolutely should be considered too. Creating a big intersection at Cretin and Montreal would be messy without a continuation to the river. With that said, create street scapes that naturally slow down traffic.
- More Connections = Better for All
- We need a back exit from Lund's and other stores. This can be done now! Could be temp gravel road – 3 dots
- Make a real park like boulevard ??? NW to SE wide median for hikers, bikes, and relaxation. Road set back from sidewalks only a ??? intersection
- We can't send all traffic around Ford and Cleveland bottleneck. Everyone should share in the traffic
- Reduce congestion on Cretin and Montreal intersections
- Cretin can be difficult to cross now at Highland because traffic in cars won't stop
- Connect street grid through with more frequent connections and smaller blocks to build a safe foundation for pedestrians and walkability
- I live on River Road now and when driving my car have other drivers pass me when I'm going the 25 mph speed limit. Speeds have to be slower to make it safe for people biking and walking
- Some connectivity to River Road but keep it slow, don't isolate either bike/walk connections to it are critical

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Is there any mention to making a one-way rectangle out of Cretin, Montreal, Cleveland and Ford? It would make bike lanes and pedestrian crossings easier to manage.

Fewer – 10 dots

- River Blvd is over trafficked now. No new connections. – AGREE
- It is too busy, cars already drive 20-25mph over the limit, stop signs create backups
- Keep historic Mount Curve calm please
- Fewer connections discourages non-local traffic
- Do not connect to S. River Blvd.
- Parking garage (city owned) at intersection of Cretin/Montreal – shuttle to local businesses
- Yes, Cretin and Montreal should connect and serve as the main artery through the site
- Fewer makes sense – Cretin is the only true through street and Montreal definitely can take more
- Few connections – will keep neighborhoods more livable while providing more throughout (via Cretin/Montreal) to alleviate congestion at – e.g. Cleveland and Ford parkway

Traffic Impact Studies

What should be evaluated in the 2015 Traffic Modeling Study?

- Impact on Cretin Ave. and I-94 and Cretin and Marshall – it’s already pretty busy and if you use Cretin as throughway, increase impact upstream at I-94.
- Concerned about traffic flow into Lund’s shopping and pedestrian safety with increase in traffic there and at Cleveland/Ford
- Traffic speed on all adjacent roadways to the site
- Concern regarding increased traffic and speeds on Mount Curve. Worried increased flow and speed will detract from this beautiful residential road
- Improve transit, biking, walking options
- Prevent increased use of MRB to thru-way traffic – especially south of site
- Accommodation of transit – multiple modes of transit for the future
- Design streetscapes to reduce traffic speeds naturally
- Continuation of Cretin Ave to connect with possibly an extension of Montreal Avenue
- Mount Curve impact – traffic plans need to account for cut-through rights – people using Mt. Curve Crest Street as an alternative to major roads like Cretin
- How to move traffic thru Highland from Hwy 5 & I35 to I-94. This traffic requires a major interstate to handle the volume. I don’t know what the answer is, but Cleveland, Cretin, Fairview and Snelling are almost at capacity and plans should not be simply to fill those roads with traffic to peak capacity plus much more! Our Forefathers would be flabbergasted and I’m sure quite disgusted with the way developments with \$ are always the winners when in conflict with neighborhoods and residents. I can understand the need for density by building apts. /condos, large developments, but these should be planned around current transit available and not try to cram more modes of travel into neighborhoods. No bike lanes on Cleveland!
- Add bike lane to Cretin Avenue. The road can’t handle more traffic. How about using the Ford Bridge to Hiawatha?
- Look at Hwy. 55 as entry/exit. What will be impact on River Road which is heavily utilized all year by recreation and car transit? How will this affect schools and children walking and biking?

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Return bus service (e.g. 134 and possibly 74) to Cretin to take load off of Cleveland / Ford Parkway intersection
- Look at rail too Highway 5 to the GAO/Fort Snelling Station – also rail to downtown Saint Paul. Do not connect to River Road, but do study it.
- Pinehurst, Highland Parkway, Eleanor, Schaeffer need protection from cut-through
- How will transit, biking and walking be included in this study? Good question and walking especially needs to be maintained
- How might mode share shift? Driving, biking, walking and transit
- Make sure no conflict of [? – not legible] with master developer [? – not legible] for traffic [? – not legible] study. He who pays to piper - [? – not legible] Please make study broader and remove conflict
- Determine what drivers are going where, design traffic to accommodate them. E.G. if most traffic is going through not to HP provide few stop, broad avenues for them
- Increased demand for blueline and access to it (bike, PED, bus, shuttle, etc.), additional outlets i.e. bridge to 55, demands on Cretin, Cleveland and Montreal, BRT to Blue and Green
- I think Montreal and Cretin make sense as access routes. I am concerned about destinations to the area originating from other parts of town and very limited access to cross the river
- Look at [? – not legible] as a mystery – car, people, biker, light rail, etc.
- 2015 study- give us a computer model that we can run volume #s through different street pattern designs so we can easily study various options.
- Minor thing: include in study predicted wear and tear from increased traffic on historic Ford Bridge. What is its current capacity? Cost of modifications?
- Greater use of Montreal as alternative to Ford east, St. Paul as route to 7th, Hwy 5, ???, Ford Parkway west across bridge to 46th in Minneapolis to move traffic west
- Bring traffic to the periphery of the Ford site, but not through [? – not legible]
- Where the input/output should be from the site, access north on Cretin to the freeway
- Make sure traffic study is representative of all modes, seasons and times
- How we can discourage cars and encourage public transportation
- Environmental impact
- Traffic calming
- Minimize through traffic on Mississippi River Blvd
- Determine origin and destination of travelers for Highland traffic
- Limited access roadway connection between Cretin and RR spur to pull traffic off Cleveland
- Connect Montreal all the way to Mississippi River Blvd

Street Types

Which street forms do you like within each of the 3 categories? Why?

A. Very Low Volume:

Residential Lane – 16 dots

- Needs trees – trees = traffic calming, shades for PEDs, reduce heat build-up – 2 dots

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- These can function as “celebration streets” where neighbors can close motor traffic for party – 1 dot

Alley – 8 dots

- very functional, private and good use of space

B. Low Volume

Residential Corridor – 9 dots

- Preferred

Local Connector – 3 dots

C. Medium Volume

Collector / Arterial – 16 dots

- Yes to single lane driving in each direction
- Garage at intersection of collectors: Cretin and Montreal – shuttles from garage
- Use and build protected bike lanes – 1 dot

Mixed-Use Corridor – 11 dots

- Need some businesses (on-street parking)

Major Connector – 4 dots

- Access for all modes is good

Comments

- Consider more dynamic street types, [? – not legible] for interior streets – 1 dot
- We need more rails to trails - where the old tracts are! Make it Saint Paul's [? – not legible]
- Park in corner garage, central pedestrian green commons, trolley to get to shopping areas
- Use old rail corridor – Let's use the existing rail road right-of-way to take volume from the development all the way to West 7th/Hwy 5 –2 dots
- Make this rail road section into a rail to trail success story! A NEW [? – not legible] for St. Paul
- Street design elements must also address safe crossing – not just sidewalk width
- We need better movement through roads/neighborhoods. Ford/Cleveland needs to help more people through the area
- Consider cul-de-sac design where possible
- Incorporate best practices in snow/ice mgmt-solar heaters? What innovations are there?
- Safety is important. Room for fire/emergency equip. too many residences could limit street width
- Local connection – could be this area “collector” as a park way
- Help mobility restricted shoppers, maybe a site circulator – small trolley. Some people can't walk 6 blocks
- Parking nodes no on-street parking – picture
- Please collect input as to whether to have bike lanes protected by parked cars, or on same side of street as traffic. I prefer as much protection as possible.
- Street widths need to leave 20ft, fire dept. access width per state fire code
- Keep bikes separated from auto and pedestrian traffic
- Need car free streets ala Milwaukee Ave in Minneapolis

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Make River Parkway one way – north bound. Add a north bound bike lane. Prohibit bikes on walking paths. Would mean only right turns on or off. Could also consider A.M. north bound and P.M. south bound
- A Cretin/Montreal connection is a great idea with minimum stopping between them – 1 dot
- Can Montreal connect to River Road?
- Add more bike lanes that are protected and wide enough too!
- Think about network that will accommodate demand for walking/bicycling events with street closures
- Collector/Arterial – spine of the site connection Ford Parkway and southern access roads Montreal Bridge to TH 55, Res. Ln and Corridor most of the site

Roundabouts and Other Forms

What street design forms should be considered for the Ford site?

- Roundabouts – 31 dots
- Two-Way Streets – 21 dots
- Angled/Curved Streets – 19 dots
- Chicanes – 14 dots
- Bump outs – 11 dots
- Other – pedestrian/bike greenway grid, don’t have too many roads, speed bumps, narrow residential streets (see Montrose Lane in Saint Paul), Pedestrian only roads

Comments

- Across the country, cities are pulling out roundabouts. Why do we want to build them?
- Roundabouts are appropriate in feeder streets, not internal to the neighborhood
- Healthy mix of all (roundabout may be challenging to scale of site) Zoning will define activity which will determine traffic type
- Roundabouts need to meet state fire code radius for fire lanes
- Permeable surface
- Traditional street grid is efficient and fits well with neighborhood
- Make sure there are more protected bike lanes and connecting to existing bike trails
- Roundabouts are often not friendly
- Angled / Curved streets – not too good for idiot drivers! Every weekend, cars knock down trees and signs on the curved roads on parkways on both sides of the Mississippi
- Roundabouts work really well once people get used to them. Should also use them outside site on Ford Parkway and Cleveland
- Roundabouts are great! We need more of them. No more semaphores.
- Look at what NYC is doing regarding pedestrian safety and street design. Article in recent NY Times
- Short blocks are critical for walkability and crossings matter
- Bikes are safer on the quieter thru-streets like Finn, Prior, and Kenneth. We never bike on Cleveland and Cretin or Snelling – Agree
- How does/do these ideas blend with bike lanes? Grand Rounds?
- Curved streets can waste space – there are alternative smart spaces uses for calming traffic speeds
- What about permeable asphalt? Need to reduce water runoff and use water appropriately. Also rain gardens, what will happen to the water runoff? Please no pesticides/herbicides. Use native plants and trees please
- Trees reduce traffic – 1 dot
- Check out this type of intersection (drawing) in Salt Lake City

Parking – Type, Location and Quantity

What types of parking are most appropriate on the Ford site?

Building Garages – 43 dots

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Yes underground better
- Enclosed parking, shared with businesses and residential apts.- like 7 corners parking garage

Driveways or Alleys –23 dots

- Perfectly acceptable (agree)
- Consider residential streets like Milwaukee Ave in Minneapolis

On-Street – 19 dots

- reverse angled parking good too
- check out River Falls WI main street
- Look at small town main street parking – e.g. River Falls, WI

Public Ramps – 16 dots

- Yes! utilize these and have foliage greenery at street level, underground better

Small Lots – 14 dots

- Yes please implement! Think of Milwaukee Ave in Seward neighborhood in Minneapolis, +1 and a yes added

Large Lots – 0 dots

- No
- No! Horrendous, looking and wasted space, awful idea
- No
- No large parking lots!
- Need to avoid big box stores that encourage reams of people to flock to the site and require car for shopping i.e. no Home Depot, Target or Costco

How and where should parking be provided?

- Some convenient parking for residential guests- either on-street or convenient small lots
- Alleys are quaint, from a bygone age. Does the study analyze the valued alleys vis-à-vis their use? Is the space they take (maintenance too) worth it?
- The business oriented ramp on Grand and Victoria seems like a good solution for retail and entertainment needs.
- When asking about parking – incorporate more bicycle parking too that is secure and accessible!
- Center lane parking at an angle where median/turn lane would be (see Salt Lake City). Put garages on margins for “visitors” and limit private car traffic in development
- Excavate the sand stone layer (already partially done) and have parking below the bedrock layer. This will increase property values and in turn tax base to pay for all the construction costs.
- Where? Commercial corridor, retail district, entertainment, small lots and on-street, more active parks (baseball, soccer, [? – not legible])
- No free parking on public space by time Ford is developed hopefully SP will have entered a new era with enlightened approach to car storage
- Parking – pricing the options (underground parking) Merritt

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Is “park and ride” an option to offer to people who do not reside in the Ford site, but who want to visit/shop/recreate there?
- Developers should be required to provide enough parking spaces for all people proposed to be living at a site, or if a business – an adequate # of spaces for customers on site – so that on-street parking does not have to be utilized as the 1st choice in residential areas, parking can be so sparse that it is impossible to have visitors drive over to visit without parking blocks away
- Alleys yes, driveways no
- Needs a 50th and France parking solution, reduce parking ratios but not to zero. Most retail parking lots never full except on a few days. Some for residential, etc.
- Bike parking needs to be considered as part of the whole approach – parking is not just for cars! Different types too
- The answer varies depending upon development – 1 dot
- Any ramps should not be facing the street like the Lifetime ramp. Dead zone for pedestrian street life
- Residents need to understand they don’t have a right to on-street parking directly in front of their homes for as many vehicles as they want. (Thinking of commenter on Cleveland apt. building on Edina site who had 6 cars in his household and wanted on street parking is important)
- Large garage on the outside to connect to walking and to parks or to shopping. Then people don’t have to drive through to find parking
- Circulator bus/trolley/streetcar. Within and connecting to the rest (old) Highland Village. Use all of the neighborhood parking more efficiently – 1 dot

Parking – Public, Private, Pay

Who should provide parking at the Ford site?

- Private – Business or Landlord – 6
- Public - City of St. Pau I - 4
- Both – 38

How should it be paid for?

- User pays – 9
- Landowner covers cost – 6
- Both - 30

Comments

- The demographics of the immediate one require car access and parking. Families and older people – busy lives
- While I would not look forward to paying to park...I trust it would certainly be a deterrent to car traffic if that is a goal
- Incentive mass transit and share options
- Personally car share was my encouraging experience. Gaining popularity?
- Incentivize car share through parking price differences; keep private cars out – free transit zone

Input from Ford Public Meeting on “Streets, Parking & Traffic”, May 27, 2015

- Developers must plan for adequate parking for the people who will use what they build – for residents and customers. On street parking should not be an option, we taxpayers keep subsidizing the developers this way – long after they’ve left the area. The cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis do not require this, but I think my question why this is was answered tonight. The thought is that less parking will discourage traffic – that will definitely NOT be the case in Highlands. Why did the city allow Walgreens to be built along Ford Parkway without more parking? I’ve noticed as more and more people come to that store, it is sometimes impossible to find a parking spot. And to put a pizza place there – it should be for walkers only.
- Whoever is going to receive the revenue should build the parking – 2 dots
- Please include car sharing in a big way- enables people to have no car or fewer
- Have weekday \$ and weekend \$ and evening prices for parking. Leave it low for periods of low volume to encourage shoppers. Ex: \$1 per hour weekday and .50 on weekends
- On-street parking in front of businesses should be paid by business/land owner
- Business owners will drive for and mandate ample parking req. don’t kid yourselves
- Incent homeowners to not own cars by developing favorable financing options
- Maximize pedestrian friendly business fronts and keep parking separate (e.g. behind business) or even off-site with low cost shuttle circulators (or free shuttles accompanied by parking fees)
- I agree with the philosophy of keeping parking somewhat scarce but plentiful enough to support businesses. See 50th and France model
- Be sure to build enough bike racks. We bike a lot on weekends, and there’s rarely enough good quality bike parking.
- Too much free parking need to change that
- Make parking so expensive near businesses that drivers will prefer garage parking at Montreal Cretin intersection
- Have cheap or free trolley going in a loop through Highland and encourage people to park in a lot away and get on the trolley.