

Jefferson Avenue Bikeway Public Comments: Context and Summary

Attached find the full text of comments received on the current design proposal. The comments are from two channels: Community Open House March 6 and emailed communication to project manager Emily Erickson since notice was sent regarding the current design proposal on Feb. 19.

- History (Feb. 2008-Aug. 2011)
 - Feb. 2008: City applied for Federal funding for an east-west bike boulevard that included Highland and Jefferson. Eventually, through community process, the project was shifted and funding awarded to a project located entirely on Jefferson, between Mississippi River Boulevard and West 7th (a 4-mile project length).
 - May 2010: City Council public hearing on design elements of the project, approved 6-1, including various treatments on portion of the project east of Snelling. West of Snelling included a test of a pedestrian refuge.
 - Aug. 2011: Given the ambiguous direction of what to do following the pedestrian refuge test and a notification error for a presentation to Mac Groveland, the public process on the portion of the project west of Snelling was “re-started.”
 - Feb. 2008-Aug. 2011 includes 14 community meetings regarding the project.
- “Re-started” public process (Aug. 2011-Present)
 - Notification: Five resident mailings (to approx. 1400 households), city website, Mac Groveland, Ward 3, newspapers, radio, and other media
 - Sept. 27: Informational meeting (159 attendees signed in)
 - Oct. 25: Informational meeting (65 attendees signed in)
 - Dec. 6: Design meeting, MRB to Finn (22 attendees signed in)
 - Dec. 12: Design meeting, Finn to Fairview (27 attendees signed in)
 - Dec. 13: Design meeting, Fairview to Snelling (14 attendees signed in)
 - Dec.: Online Survey (68 respondents)
 - Mar. 6: Open house (55 attendees signed in)
 - Mar. 19: Transportation Committee meeting (Recommended approval, plus Mt. Curve traffic circle and “zebra” crosswalks at Cretin and Cleveland).
 - Mar. 23: Planning Commission meeting (Recommended approval, with Transportation Committee amendments).
 - Mar. 26: Mac Groveland Transportation Committee meeting.
- Summary of public response to design proposal
 - Received comments from 42 different people at the Open House; comments from 43 different people via email (through Apr. 4), and two via telephone
 - The majority of the comments are in support of the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway project overall
 - Overall, citizens expressed appreciation at feeling heard and the responsiveness of the City to previous comments as manifest in design proposal
 - Some citizens expressed support for specific project elements, while some expressed concern. Elements with mixed feedback include:
 - Neighborhood traffic circles: 16 different people concerned (18% of those who provided feedback)
 - Two sided parking: 10 different people concerned (11% of those who provided feedback)
 - Staff have addressed concerns at public meetings; supporting information can be found on project FAQ
- Impact
 - Unmatched 4-mile east-west connection across the southwest quadrant of the City of Saint Paul.
 - Opportunity to implement the City's Comprehensive plan (including transportation policies 3.4, "Develop and maintain a complete and connected bikeway system...bikeways should be no more than a half-mile apart..." and 3.8, "Promote 'bicycle boulevards' as a new type of bikeway.")
 - If design is stripped down or not approved, other half of project (Snelling to West 7th) risks losing funding due to lack of compliance with funding application (\$750k of Federal Non-Motorized Transportation funds; matching \$250k of City money has already been spent). If Federal funding is lost, design project east of Snelling will not be built.
 - The project as proposed will make choosing to walk or bicycle a more inviting, more comfortable, and more convenient option along the project length.

Jefferson Avenue Bikeway: Open House Comments, Mar. 6

Name	Address	Comments
Paul Ogren	543 Brimhall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be nice to have a signal that could be used to stop the traffic on Cretin + Cleveland. Some sort of signal that can be tripped just by pedestrians and bicyclists.
Laura Schultz	1674 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I love the traffic circles, they make traffic flow more nicely.
Christopher Johnson	1801 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looks great! We (a family of 2 adults and 2 children) support the parking on both sides and the traffic circle!
Mary Kay [illegible]	1666 Juliet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am not fond of roundabouts. A few tickets when people run stop signs would be a step toward re-education. • I fear for bicyclists on the Jefferson hill (Fairview to Prior), if we encourage this for a bicycle route. I believe there needs to be parking on only one side or a path for bikes on one boulevard, either side.
Bob Schultz	1674 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I like all of it! Please do what you can to implement! Feel free to call me, or pass my phone number along, if you would like to discuss: 651-699-4217.
Bryan Koch	2034 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relevance of measures proposed for the Cretin-Snelling section to bicycle traffic is unclear – I am left feeling that the people in Highland had the right idea – JUST SAY NO. • Adding sidewalks east of Lexington & lights makes sense – but its relationship to cycling is unclear.
Kathy McMahon	1377 Macalester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like traffic circles + pedestrian signage. • Do not think Jefferson should have parking on both sides from Snelling to Fairview. Hard to get around now.
Jeff Zaayer	1790 Saunders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think the solutions are a great compromise based on community input. • I would like to see better reception for bicyclists at signalized intersections like Snelling & Fairview via a street side prompt button or better in road sensor technology for bikes.
Todd Strand	1877 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see some traffic calming measures (roundabouts) between Fairview and Cleveland – I liked the original plan -
Rich Carlson	300 Saratoga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great plan – I hope it goes through. • I'm a driver, runner, walker & biker.
Patrick Campion	1880 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I like the addition of the traffic circles east of Fairview. • I like the adding sharrows back to the street. • I am disappointed that treatments were not added between Cleveland & Fairview to calm the fast traffic on this stretch.
Loretta Koch	2034 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about adding parking on both sides of Jefferson between Cleveland and Fairview. • Like the round-a-bouts! • What about "rules of the road" education for bicycles?
Jim Bricher	396 Woodlawn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think the stop signs on Woodlawn on Jefferson are unnecessary since the intersection is offset. • I also don't think a stop sign at Stonebridge and Jefferson is necessary since Stonebridge dead ends there and people have to slow down to turn onto Jefferson.
Jeanine Hawkins	1370 Woodlawn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for not including traffic circles, raised platforms at intersections. I appreciate it and support what you are doing.

Name	Address	Comments
Anne Ryan	364 Woodlawn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest <u>keeping</u> stop signs at Mt. Curve & Jefferson. Cars get up to high speeds travelling from River Rd. to Mt. Curve.
Deborah O'Halloran	1961 Goodrich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I feel – as a pedestrian and biker with kids – we are making a hodge podge of traffic strategies that overall equal less safety and more potential for accidents. I see no real clear strategy overall for our city.
Clara Dockter	1877 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the blocks between Prior and Fairview, the sharrows are NOT enough. We <u>really</u> need a traffic circle to <u>slow</u> the drivers down. For my safety, and my neighbor's safety, we deserve a residential street.
Mike Hazez	1738 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove traffic circles between Fairview & Snelling, keep two sided parking.
Deb Jessen	1877 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why are there no changes between Prior and Fairview? Have there been any traffic studies or traffic counts/speed done? Have you surveyed the residents? It's depressing, disgusting and completely ridiculous that the busiest, fastest portion of Jefferson has been ignored for the benefit of autos who want to speed up the street. Thanks for your hard work.
Mary & Christopher Thompson	1945 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We like the proposed plan overall; however, [illegible] do not want to see parking added on the north side of Jefferson between Prior and Cleveland. The open space maintains elegance and flexibility for bikers, walkers, and residents. Too many cars creates a cramped and visually awkward view. In addition, as a biker, the cars actually impede progress. We would like to see <u>No Parking</u> maintained on the north side of Jefferson! Thank you!
Ted Movre	351 Macalester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I wonder how well signage will be recognized with N/S/ parking added. I think the traffic circles are generally a good idea. You need to do video-based observational studies for some of these treatments, particularly the flashing LEDs – actuated vs. always on.
Michael S[illegible]	1950 Berkeley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These projects are making my biking experience more dangerous.
Katherine Jossi	1810 Hartford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I use this road for access to softball. I would love if it were extended and made safer.
Begt Poritsky	1726 Wellesley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a driver, bicyclist & pedestrian, I very much like the idea of a bikeway on Jefferson.
Frank Jossi	1810 Hartford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I strongly support the Bikeway. It offers a safe way to travel to the river & to West Seventh & to the river on the downtown side. We have few "Bikeways" in St. Paul and I applaud the city's efforts to make this a more pedestrian friendly & bike friendly city.
Margaret Berrisford	357 Stonebridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great plan – I like what is in (traffic circles, LED ped signs & sharrows). I also like what is left out – No bumpouts of the curbs!! One lacki8ng piece is no traffic circle at Mt. Curve on Jefferson!! One needs to be there for calming traffic from speeding up/down the hill. The current stop sign is not appropriate because 1) short distance to another stop sign, so drivers don't really stop 2) On snow/icy days it's hard enough to get up the hill without having to stop at the top. The addition of stop signs at Stonebridge & Woodlawn so that drivers have to stop and look for cyclists is also a great idea!

Name	Address	Comments
Carol Kist	1959 Palace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Jefferson between Prior and River – how about a separate paved bike path on boulevard, which is extra wide and hardly used, almost every property has just grass, no flowers, bike path could be between the trees and the street on north and south, one way going west on north, one way going east on south side. Maybe make Jefferson a bike & pedestrian mall between Prior and river, no cars since some of it has limited parking anyway. People walk down the middle of the street (not just when sidewalks are icy, some parents set up little softball games in the middle of the street. We might as well make it safe for everybody, not just bikes.
Colleen Kelly	1803 Juliet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am deeply disappointed to have been this involved in the project to get traffic impediments out of the street to only have 3 proposed traffic circles installed b/w Fairview & Snelling. I <u>strongly</u> oppose.
Chris Clonin	1903 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not enough being done between Fairview & Cleveland. I would like to see speed bumps. Any inconvenience is appropriate – it is only inconvenient if you are going too fast. Adding 2-sided parking will slow traffic but increases safety risk: doors opening, kids walking out ...never trade off convenience for safety.
Bill Berg	2148 Wellesley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rich [Lallier] & John Maczko: the plan as viewed on 3/6/2011 is wonderful and a greatly improved version of the “Jefferson Avenue” Bikeway!
Cara Anthony	2103 Berkeley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I like the LED flashing signs. Similar (but not LED) have been very effective on Summit at Finn. I like all the proposed traffic calming measures. Zebra striping at major crossings would be nice.
Nancy Kohl	1683 Juliet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic circles at Davern & Macalester <u>REDUNDANT</u> – stop signs are adequate. Do <u>not</u> put parking on North side of Jefferson between Snelling & Fairview – street too narrow for safety if both sides have cars. Jefferson too narrow to replicate either Summit or Randolph bike lanes. Thumbs down on project.
Mary Karlsson	1717 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Snelling to Fairview: I <u>strongly support</u> the proposed design: parking on N. side of Jefferson, sharrows, traffic circles at Jefferson & Macalester, Davern, & Wheeler.
Toni Karlsson	1717 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between Snelling & Fairview – I really like the parking on the north side & traffic circles – I truly believe that this will reduce the speed and makes it safer for everybody to share the road. Other parts of the project – looks really good to me.
Elizabeth Fabel	1880 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thanks for the work you’ve put into this. Why no traffic circle at Prior? Would love to have seen SOME traffic calming on the double block between Fairview and Prior to control speed. Is it too late to put up No Right Turn on Red signs at Jefferson & Fairview?
Karen Schultz	1674 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I’m glad to see the traffic circles between Snelling & Fairview. The stop signs make biking less convenient and the cars are louder as they stop and accelerate. Also glad to see the parking! Thanks to the Public Works Dept. for their hard work and patience!

Name	Address	Comments
Andrew Singer	2103 Berkeley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's great!!! I'd add "beefier" zebra striped crosswalks at Cretin & Cleveland and embedded flashers in the pavement. Consider making embeds & signs bike/ped actuated rather than 24/7.
Brian McClellan	285 Macalester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If there are still funds available then please add more circles, and less stop signs.
Thomas Rubbelke	187 Wheeler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Say <u>No</u> to Jefferson Bikeway.
John Haas	1607 Jefferson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do I get rid of the [sharrow] in front of my house. I want to park on north side of street.
David Devine	2003 Palace	<p><u>The Bike Path</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jefferson between Snelling and the river receives no preferential plowing treatment. Does it make sense to make such a significant investment in a street which would have sever bicycle use limitations from November through March? Instituting parking on both sides of Jefferson has been mentioned by city staff as a possibility. How does doubling the number of parked cars on Jefferson make it more bicycle friendly? Why has the timing of the traffic light at Jefferson & Fairview been changed to rarely allow Jefferson traffic to proceed? Why put six foot bump outs on a bike path street forcing the cyclist into the middle of every intersection? These "improvements" are not biker friendly! On other successful on-street bike paths in the city (Summit and Marshall come to mind, both bicycles and cars keep moving and the set-up seems to work very well. Why are we trying to reinvent the wheel on Jefferson by multiple impediments in the street to make in unusable for cars? <p>Traffic Circles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I fear traffic circles will be the next equivalent of the 3-foot bump out. Meaning, they are rapidly placed in mass across Mac-Groveland without significant testing before the city admits a few years later they are ineffective. "That's pretty dangerous building a road in the middle of the street." <i>-Kermit the Frog</i> I can't exactly place my finger on it, but there is something inherently wrong with erecting large concrete structures in the middle of intersections on residential streets. Didn't we just spend millions of dollars paving these streets so cars could comfortably travel on them? Traffic circles are ugly, and the eight signs which accompany them (four black and yellow caution signs and four circle/arrow signs) only make them more so. Planting flowers/plants in them has been proposed by city staff as a way to beautiful them, but this is a tremendous danger! How are drivers going to see young and short people over/through greenery? There is a city ordinance limiting the grown of such things on boulevards for safety reasons; why would we think it is safe to do it in the middle of the street! Every intersection between Snelling and the river already has a stop sign or traffic light, in addition to intersections between Fairview and Cleveland having 3 foot bump outs; why would we use additional resources to place traffic circles on Jefferson? <p><u>Traffic on Jefferson</u></p> <p>I drive Jefferson between Cleveland and Kenneth daily, and I drive Jefferson between Kenneth and Fairview on a regular basis, there is never heavy traffic, no excessive speeding, and drivers are not running stop-signs left and right. Jefferson is hardly busier than any other non-arterial street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All people (myself included) feel traffic is too busy/fast on their own street. The sensationalism of the traffic situation by Jefferson residents (especially those on the Fairview-Prior block) needs to be taken with many grains of salt.

Name	Address	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To solve this problem, get quantitative data on Jefferson traffic speeds before making a decision. The city has done a fantastic job over the past three plus years conducting studies and seeking community involvement on this project; don't make a final decision before getting <u>quantitative</u> data on which to base your decisions. • If it turns out traffic is moving at a significantly higher speed than other side-streets, then consider reducing the speed limit to 25 MPH and placing stop signs at every other intersection (like on other residential streets) to create a slower and smoother flow of traffic. • If stop signs really no longer work, as was hinted at during the 12-12-11 meeting, then a scalable plan needs to be devised for the entire city, not a piecemeal approach to spend \$1.25MM on one street. • If speeding continues to be a problem, hire a police officer to sit on Jefferson with her cherries flashing for one hour per week during both the morning and evening periods. I guarantee the word would get out that Jefferson is a speed trap and drivers would crawl along the street. Of course the \$250K would run out eventually...assuming \$50/hour wage increasing at 3% per year, the money would only last 30 years (and that doesn't take into effect the ticket revenue). <p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As I pay federal income taxes, I consider the true cost of this project to be \$1.25MM, not \$250K. • Just as not all arterial streets are created equal (e.g. Randolph handles 2x the number of cars as St. Clair) not all non-arterial streets are created equal. Meaning, if Jefferson has more traffic than Juliet or Wellesley, that's okay! We don't need to keep plowing money into Jefferson (and forcing traffic onto nearby residential streets unequipped to deal with it) until it has the exact same traffic count as other streets around it. if this response to this is "we need to slow/reduce traffic because of the bikes", that is laughable. Summit is example 1 and Marshall is example 1A against this argument. If people want a tranquil east-west biking experience, they can take Juliet, Wellesley, Palace, Stanford, James, etc. • Reducing car traffic on Jefferson does not solve any traffic problems, it simply moves them onto other streets. yes, some of the cars will move to Randolph and St. Clair (note: there is a heavily used park/playground and school located on St. Clair; why would changes be made which would put additional traffic on this street?), but many will end up on Juliet, Wellesley (where there is another school!), and north-south streets such as Kenneth. At the 12-12-11 Jefferson meeting the residents between Fairview and prior talked about all of the kids on their block. I highly doubt they have more kids than the 800+ kids at the school one block over. • The people who live on Jefferson knew what they were getting into when they moved onto their street (as city staff noted at the 12-12-11 meeting, traffic on Jefferson has actually been reduced and slowed over time). Their street isn't Snelling, but it's not Stanford either. Their property values reflect that. Neither the City of Saint Paul, no its taxpayers, are obligated to turn Jefferson into the equivalent of its east-west neighboring streets. What if everyone who felt their street was too busy got \$1.25MM spent on their street to slow down and eliminate traffic? We'd be broke with nowhere to drive. <p>In summary, Macalester-Groveland is a wonderful neighborhood with many family-friendly streets, most of which are great for biking. Please do not squander \$1.25MM of public funding to push cars off Jefferson onto these family-friendly streets in the name of making Jefferson more biker-friendly.</p>
Janine Valento	333 Macalester St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has already been two traffic circles in our area and stop signs removed! The traffic moves even faster through the area. We are opposed to traffic

Name	Address	Comments
		circles on Jefferson between Fairview and Snelling, but do agree with parking allowed on both sides of Jefferson in that stretch. Stop signs still do work better.

Jefferson Avenue Bikeway: Email Comments, Feb. 19-Apr. 4

Date	Name	Address	Email
2.22.20 12	Tom Dietsch	435 Mt Curve Blvd	<p>Hi Emily,</p> <p>We can't attend the meeting, but we are TOTALLY opposed to putting ANY kind of "traffic slowing" obstacles in the intersections of Jefferson with Cretin or Cleveland.</p> <p>They are nothing but potential traffic accidents waiting to happen (especially in the winter when there can be many feet of snow and lots of ice, like last winter). Both of those cross streets are WAY too narrow to add stupid crap like that to make drivers have to swerve to avoid them. Not to mention the inability to make left turns, what kind of improvement in our lives is that going to achieve?</p> <p>All in all, those are the kind of ideas I would expect from a 4th grader, not a real traffic planner. A better plan would be to figure out how to make bike riders obey TRAFFIC LAWS, like stopping at stop signs. Now that would be a big improvement for everyone. Once you figure that out, then we can see what other minor tweaks might be helpful for those bikers (who only use the roads half the year anyway, not like motorists!!)</p> <p>All the rest of the signs etc. are fine, they won't hurt the vast majority of the street users who are DRIVERS.</p>
2.27.12	Leland R Whitney	1835 Jefferson Ave.	<p>It clear now from your online presentations, that you are simply going to ignore the input from the majority of Jefferson Avenue residents between Prior and Fairview.</p> <p>I remind you that we are in the top 5% of property taxpayers in the city. We are experiencing tax increases this year of 10 to 15%. You are forcing us to bow down to the demands of bicyclists from Minneapolis.</p> <p>We do not want traffic circles (we have 4 way stops); we do not want medians in the middle of block, preventing parking among other issues; we do not want the noise from speed bumps.</p> <p>Shame on you. We are experiencing enough tyranny in our lives as it is. Please, let the residents have a real voice. Apparently the listening supposedly done to date by the city officials has been a sham, pretending to listen just to calm us down so you can do as you and Minneapolis please.</p>
3.6.12	Tom Dietsche	435 Mt Curve Blvd	<p>Emily,</p> <p>Thanks for the update.</p> <p>I am a little worried about removing the 2 stop signs on Jefferson at Mount Curve Blvd.</p> <p>We live at 435 Mt Curve and walk our dogs up there all the time. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic at that intersection, including dog walkers and kids who live on 2 of the corners who are playing there all the time.</p> <p>Jefferson is already a raceway for many drivers going between Cretin and Mississippi River Blvd. I am afraid this will increase the risks to both pedestrians and to drivers going north and south on Mt Curve who have gotten so used to it being a 4-way stop that they will inadvertently forget it has changed, and walk out or drive out in front of oncoming traffic on Jefferson.</p> <p>So, I recommend NOT removing those 2 stop signs. If they had never been there, it would be less of an issue, but old habits are hard to change.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>

3.6.12	Jill Dobie		Thanks for your prompt response. Glad they aren't narrowing Cleveland.
3.6.12	Ann McMonagle	1972 Wellesley Ave.	<p>Emily and John – thank you for listening to my suggestions of not putting any traffic impediment in place on Cleveland where it meets Jefferson. I think the new 4 signs on Cleveland are okay. I would like to comment, though, on your apparent suggestion to change the parking on Jefferson between Kenneth and Prior and Fairview and Snelling to 2-sided parking. I think this would be insane. The street is simply too narrow for parking on both sides of the street. The one block where 2-sided parking is already in place is between Prior to Fairview and I travel that block regularly, and it's a nightmare to get through, especially if residents have packed the street with parked cars and at night. Adding bikers to the mix just makes it even more frustrating and dangerous to allow parking on both sides of the street.</p> <p>Also, cars should not be allowed to park on Jefferson so close to the traffic light at Fairview. (on the west side of Jefferson at Fairview). I believe there's a law that you cannot park right up next to a traffic light. There is supposed to be space in front of the light for people turning right to be able to turn onto Fairview without having a parked car in the way to impede the turn. Traffic on the west side of Jefferson needs to be clear at that intersection with the traffic light and it's not. Parked cars unnecessarily clog the street at the traffic light.</p> <p>Thank you again for including the neighborhood this time around. I was extremely upset at the median and am glad to have been brought into the discussion.</p>
3.7.12	Tony Klein	345 Warwick St.	<p>Dear Emily Erickson and members of the Transportation Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council,</p> <p>I have reviewed the draft design plan for Jefferson Ave and would like to say that it looks great.</p> <p>Congratulations on a job well done. The traffic circles between Snelling and Fairview are a great idea, along with the increase in parking. The project will improve our neighborhood.</p> <p>There are 3 bicyclists in our household and we are all looking forward to the completion of this project as designed.</p> <p>A hearty and enthusiastic "YES" to this project.</p> <p>Regards, Tony "two thumbs up" Klein (Only a few houses away from Jefferson)</p>
3.7.12	Colleen W-F	1897 Jefferson	<p>Hi Emily,</p> <p>I live at 1897 Jefferson and attended the Dec meeting about bikeway ideas between Cleveland and Fairview. I read the final proposal and only see 1 traffic circle and no calming on my long block. Can you tell me why that happened? I thought I and other neighbors made a clear plea for more help regarding Jefferson getting more calming measures.</p>
3.8.12	Michael C. Bann	1881 Jefferson Avenue	<p>I have tried to stay away from this issue but I can no longer in good conscious do so.</p> <p>As someone who lives on Jefferson Ave (1881) and who is an avid road biker (logging 2000 plus summer miles annually) I like to think I offer a knowledgeable opinion!</p> <p>When I first heard about this Bike path I figured it would just die away as anyone who looked at Jefferson Ave would have no problem seeing what a total misuse of funds this is. Yesterday, today and tomorrow, summer and winter cars need to pull over so one car can drive down the road. I refused to let my kids play in the front yard as there was too much traffic. Who in their right mind would ever even consider putting a bike path there?</p> <p>Either there is too much money sitting around looking to get spent in frivolous manners or a bunch of truly ignorant people are involved. I'm not sure which one scares me more but there are no other options. As I mentioned I am a serious biker with immense knowledge and experience. Upon my leaving my house on a bike ride my only goal on Jefferson is to get off of it as soon as possible</p>

			<p>which is ½ block away to prior Ave.</p> <p>In today's economy and with so many other REAL issues I still cannot believe this is being considered. Hopefully someone will gain a modicum of sense and put this in the trash bin it needs to go in. It is very sad for me to think this is the best our public officials can do but honestly not surprising!</p> <p>God Help us all!!!</p>
3.12.12	James Jacobs	2044 St. Clair Ave	<p>I support the addition of bicycle lanes on Jefferson, including the Sharrow marks, and the pedestrian aids at Cretin and Cleveland.</p> <p>I am a long term resident and a bicycle rider who uses his bicycle for transportation. This minor infrastructure change will greatly increase the safety for myself and other bicyclists, pedestrians and children going to and from school.</p>
3.12.12	David Devine	2003 Palace Ave.	<p>It was nice talking to you last Tuesday evening at Nativity regarding the Jefferson bike path. One point I brought up with Paul, and I just wanted to hammer home one more time, is the need to have more up-to-date traffic counts before making a final decision on any bike path implementations. Specifically between Snelling and Fairview, the traffic count data ranges from being as old as six years to as recent as four. To get an accurate count of what is currently going on I firmly believe updated counts are needed. If current traffic counts have fallen below the 1,000 mark (I received this threshold figure from city staff at the meeting) then additional measures may very well not be needed.</p> <p>If traffic counts have not dropped or have increased, I recommend a scaled approach to offer traffic calming measures to this stretch of Jefferson. Why not start with a "free" approach by beginning with the addition of parking to both sides of the street? If after a year this hasn't been effective, then institute parking back to one side only and add traffic circles. If after a year this hasn't been effective then add parking to both sides along with the traffic circles. This type of scaled approach is 1) much more cost effective if data shows parking on both sides alone does the trick and 2) might provide a useful study moving forward for future bike projects.</p> <p>All this being said, I am very hesitant to support any measures being taken on this stretch of Jefferson because it will simply have the effect of pushing traffic onto nearby streets. I know historical studies would suggest cars will choose St. Clair or Randolph instead of Jefferson, but take a closer look at the data. Between Snelling and Macalester, 1,644 cars travel daily. But on the next block to the west (Macalester to Davern) the count drops to 1,038. This means 606 cars travel one block on Jefferson and then veer off on Macalester to presumably end up on Juliet, Wellesley, Stanford, etc. If this stretch of Jefferson is turned into the most car-unfriendly street in Macalester-Groveland as currently proposed, this could send up to an extra 1,000 cars per day down residential streets off of Snelling. My point here is the residential streets neighboring Jefferson are going to bare a large share of the burden caused by the proposed actions on Jefferson.</p> <p>Thank you again for all of the time you and your colleagues have put into making this proposal so transparent and welcoming of public opinion. I hope I don't come off as biker unfriendly (my garage currently houses seven bikes, a child bike trailer, and a one-wheel child's bike which connects to the seat of an adult bike), but I am not supportive of a project which moves car traffic onto the wonderful residential streets of Macalester-Groveland.</p>
3.13.12	Nancy Kohl	1683 Juliet Ave	<p>After attending the open house at Nativity School, I would like to share my thoughts on the proposed bikeway. I do realize that much planning has gone into this and although I can appreciate the desire to have Jefferson be part of a connected bikeway, I feel that the proposed changes would decrease the safety of Jefferson and the adjacent residential streets.</p> <p>From Snelling to Fairview, there are 3 intersections, each with four-way stops, which, although quite effective at controlling the traffic, are going to be replaced with traffic circles. Although there was no information presented at the open house as to how many accidents have occurred at these intersections, the Public Works representative stated that people "roll through" the stop signs and traffic circles would be better. I have lived in the neighborhood for 6 years, use Jefferson, Macalester, and Davern for my work commute and have observed that drivers make the stops and are aware of pedestrian and bike traffic.</p> <p>Jefferson is also too narrow for instituting parking on both sides of the street. The rationale</p>

			<p>given for having parking on both sides of the street was that the more congested a roadway is, the more attention is paid to other vehicles and conditions are safer. This was contradicted by a neighbor who lives on Jefferson west of Fairview where parking is allowed on both sides of the street; he said that people drive so fast on that part of the street that he is looking for a way to slow that traffic down. Having parking only on the south side of the street enables cars to easily pass each other and allows enough room to safely pass bicyclists.</p> <p>Finally, neighbors voiced concerns that the traffic circles would divert traffic off Jefferson onto the adjacent streets and increase the traffic flow. This was acknowledged by our presenter to be a known side effect of traffic circles. My fear is that increased traffic, with unhappy drivers, will pose a danger to the many families that use those streets to get to Mattocks Park. In good weather there is a steady stream of parents and their kids, bicycles, strollers, dogs on leashes, who go to the park. The neighborhood doesn't want increased traffic on these streets.</p> <p>Lastly, the steep grade on Jefferson under 35E makes it a prohibitive choice for a bike throughway, regardless of all the other issues. Randolph might be a better choice, as the grade is less steep and the roadway is wider.</p>
3.14.12	Eric Leishman	2183 Jefferson Avenue	<p>My wife and I are residents of 2183 Jefferson (NW corner of Jefferson/Cretin intersection) and obviously have a vested stake in any changes to the intersection as a result of the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway. We were not able to make the open house on March 6th but have reviewed the proposed changes. Overall we are supportive of the design, and are <u>very</u> in favor of any efforts to calm/slow traffic on Cretin Avenue, whether a result of the bikeway or not. Having reviewed the map of the proposed changes we do have a very serious concerns about one of the design elements - the proposed installation of an LED flasher on the corners of Jefferson and Cretin and Jefferson and Cleveland. As I understand the proposal, one of these LED flashers would be installed directly on 'our' corner. Our concerns are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The intrusiveness of having a constant flashing light directed at our house. It would be clearly visible from our front and east facing windows and would significantly impact the livability of our home. This is of utmost concern and feel it can only be mitigated with a non-lit sign. - A flashing light in our opinion is not consistent with other bikeways in the area and having a a flashing light 24 hours/day, 7 days/week is an excessive measure given the length of the bicycle season and the bicycle traffic we have observed on Jefferson Avenue. - A lack of data showing a flashing sign will be any more effective than a non-lit sign. <p>In summary, we favor the calming of traffic on Cretin Avenue and are in favor of the proposed painted crosswalk, and would support some kind of non-lit signage. We are strongly opposed to having any kind of lit signage on the corner.</p> <p>I trust you will include my comments in the packets to Transportation Committee and Planning Commission. We are prepared to attend the City Council public hearing on April 4 and testify in front of the Council in person if this design element remains in the proposed plan. Please keep me updated as best you can.</p>
3.15.12	Toni and Mary Karlsson	1717 Jefferson Avenue	<p>Council Member Tolbert, Planning Commission Chair Wencil, and Transportation Committee Chair Spaulding,</p> <p>As the Jefferson Avenue Bike Boulevard moves through what we hope are the final steps of the City Council process, my husband and I wanted to let you know that we <u>strongly support implementation</u> of the Jefferson Avenue Bike Boulevard from Snelling Avenue to East River Road. In addition, we <u>strongly support the bicycle boulevard design</u> staff recently shared at the March 6 public open house. We also deeply appreciate that the design reflects the results of a welcoming and respectful public involvement process that created opportunities for everyone -- project opponents and supporters -- to share their concerns and aspirations for this part of Jefferson Avenue.</p> <p>Please join us in supporting implementation of the most recent design for the Jefferson Avenue</p>

			Bike Boulevard. Implementation of the Jefferson Avenue Bike Boulevard will help Toni and I believe more strongly that we were and continue to be wise in paying more to purchase property and make a home for our growing family on Jefferson Avenue in Minnesota's capital city and that our elected and appointed officials are working hard and effectively to keep St. Paul the Most Livable City in America.
3.16.12	Denise Miller		I thought thee parking on the north side of the street was dead? Now I read that it's going to happen. We have a handicapped son and we DON'T was parking on the north side..We live on the north side of jefferson. Having parking is going to force us to get signage to load and unload our son. Plus we would be blocking the street with the bus since it would be too narrow for anyone to pass. This street is too narrow for parking on both sides.
3.19.12	Toni and Mary Klein	345 Warwick St.	I'm writing in support of the Jefferson Ave bikeway project which I understand is coming up for review before the St. Paul Transportation Committee. In my view the project, when completed as designed, will be a great asset to the neighborhood. It represents a vision of an evolving transportation infrastructure that is not solely focused on the automobile. (For the record, I would have preferred the diverter at Cleveland, but I understand the need for compromise in order to get the project done. So regardless of diverter, the whole idea remains fantastic.)
3.19.12	Denise Miller		I see that your agenda is to talk about the Jefferson ave bikeway project. I live on Jefferson ave and I have a handicapped son. Currently we do not have parking on the north side of the street. As part of this new proposal, it looks like parking on the north side of the street between fariview and snelling ave may get approved. I have problems with this for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I could get handicapped parking signs for my house but that doesn't mean someone else could use it. We had an outwalk made accessible for a wheel chair last summer during the R.S.V.P project. Now we may not be able to use it. 2. The bus that picks up our son has a lift out the back. The bus would not be able to fit between the signs and us be able to use the outwalk. 3. We need access to our outwalk. We live in the middle of the block. 4. It would be a safety concern having parking on both sides of the street since it would be difficult for cars and bikes to pass on the road.
3.20.12	Brian J Valento	333 Macalester Street	My wife and I have lived in the Macalester Groveland neighborhood for over 35 years; we've seen many changes to our neighborhood over that time. One thing that has been consistent within the Macalester Groveland neighborhood is the architectural integrity of our housing stock and traditional street layout. I find the addition of the "traffic calmers" a suburban architectural intrusion into our traditional "craftsman" neighborhood which violates the architectural integrity of the entire Macalester Groveland community. From my perspective they represent visual "concrete crop circles" which simply do not fit our neighborhood nor will they prove safe to bicyclists, pedestrians or those living along Jefferson Avenue. We worked hard to get "basket-weave stop signs placed in our neighborhood to slow down vehicular traffic, they worked although I see increasing signs of drivers "passing through" stop signage rather than making a complete stop. Enforcement by police officials could change that rather quickly. As part of our RSVP program last year a "crop circle" was installed at Stanford & Macalester Streets, all stop signage removed. Over the course of last Fall & Winter I've experienced that the "crop circle" actually allows vehicles to move through the intersection at a faster rate of speed with no regulation; this is an accident waiting to happen; especially when the "crop circle" is cultivated, further reducing visibility. I strongly disapprove of the addition of ANY "traffic calming" circles into the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway plan. I looked carefully at the photo example (traffic calmer) used on the display at Nativity library and found it interesting that the Charles & Albert intersection had a stop sign at one end the intersection? It didn't appear that was in the plans for Jefferson Avenue Bikeway plan? I believe a better solution to the problem between Snelling & Fairview would be to KEEP the stop signage on the north south streets, remove the stop signs from east west streets. No traffic calming circles constructed period, instead I believe a speed bumps (similar to those used near Town & Country on Otis Avenue) installed before the north/south streets with stop signage would slow traffic to a stop before crossing Jefferson Avenue. Vehicle and bike traffic would have the

			<p>right of way to proceed through the east/west intersections. I believe that visibility is critical at all intersections and straight lines of traffic would improve overall safety for everyone. It would further allow emergency equipment access to our neighborhood (fire, paramedics). It would also solve the problems of snow plowing around the traffic calming devices.</p> <p>In conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support the proposal for parking on both sides of Jefferson Avenue between Snelling Avenue & Fairview. 2. I support the proposal for the intersections of Jefferson Avenue & Cleveland Avenue and Jefferson Avenue & Cretin Avenue. 3. I do not support the use of any traffic calming circles within the Jefferson Avenue Bike Path proposal or anywhere else within the Macalester Groveland neighborhood. <p>--</p> <p>Thank you for responding to my email, I also want to stress that I feel the circles pose a greater risk to biker/pedestrians than other options. Both my wife and I bike, it is a scary experience to move through our circle at Stanford and Macalester Street with a vehicles along side. I use a "burley" with my grandson almost everyday and I travel the alley to avoid that circle. I think if our streets were wider than the 32 feet they are the circle option might be a safer option. Also, visability issues when the circles are planted raises concern for me as a biker.</p>
3.21.12	John D. Schade	1795 Jefferson	I just wanted to express my support for the draft design plan for Jefferson Avenue. I live at 1795 Jefferson Avenue, and am excited about the traffic circles and parking on both sides of the street.
3.21.12	Betsy Judkins		<p>Regarding this project, I object to the removal of Stop Signs on Jefferson at Mount Curve. People drive down Jefferson very fast and I think that particular sign is needed. I live on Mount Curve a few houses away from that corner. How about making the speed limit 20 mph on Jefferson? Also, regarding the traffic circles on Jefferson between Fairview and Snelling, I don't think all three are necessary. Also, regarding on-street parking on streets where it was before prohibited, I think that would NOT be good for bike riders.....that's what this is about, right? I am a bike rider and people in cars open their doors without looking all the time.</p> <p>Here is something I WOULD like you to spend a few bucks on.....restoring the "biking" and "walking" signs along the river (between St. Clair and Hwy 5). People have ripped a few down, one was pushed over during a car accident (where the car went down the embankment just a block south of Temple of Aaron...the cement part is still there) and little arrows need to be added to some of the new signs. Also, I think you should restore the painted Stencils "Bikes only" signs on the path themselves.</p> <p>From Betsy, avid bike rider and follower of the rules...including stopping at stop signs!</p>
3.22.12	Andrew Larson	1701 Juliet Avenue	I just received notice in the mail about the proposed changes to Jefferson Avenue. I would like to express my support for the project. I bike to work at the University of Minnesota several times/ week and this would be a welcome change. I am sure that some people will object to the proposed changes, but the way Jefferson currently is set up only encourages people to use it as a through street rather than take St. Claire or Randolph. When Jefferson was closed between Fairview and Snelling last summer, it didn't seem to effect the traffic in the area all that much. I also agree that trying to cross Cleveland or Cretin on Jefferson is very difficult and dangerous, and this project will help a lot. Don't let the NIMBY's derail this project.
3.22.12	Jill Welter	1795 Jefferson Avenue	I would like to express my strong support for the draft design plan for Jefferson Avenue in Saint Paul. I live at 1795 Jefferson Avenue, and I am excited about the traffic circles and parking on both sides of the street. I think these changes will be a great addition to our street and neighborhood and help to control the speedy traffic that we currently experience.
3.22.12	Theresa Lauber	2191 Wellestley Ave.	I received a letter this week detailing elements of the proposed design for the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway. I am writing specifically concerning the proposed removal of stop signs on Jefferson Avenue at

			<p>the Mount Curve intersection. This proposal concerns me because a large number of grade school children ride their bikes and walk on Mt. Curve and cross at Jefferson. I already instruct my children to stop at that intersection and look both ways, as I'm sure other nearby parents do also, but the elimination of those stop signs still makes me nervous; without that mandatory stop there, I worry about the possibility of a west- or east-bound car hitting a child. The steep hill for eastbound traffic might also prevent drivers from seeing children crossing Mount Curve as clearly as if the road were level, especially if children are crossing on the east side of the intersection.</p> <p>The stop signs at Jefferson ensure people drive at a fairly calm speed for the short block between Cretin and Mt. Curve avenues. Almost every neighbor there I can think of except one has children. One difference of that short block is that all the northside the houses actually face Jefferson. In contrast, most, but not all, of the houses between Mount Curve and the river face the streets bordering them on the east and west. I point this out to highlight that many kids do use that short sidewalk between Cretin and Mount Curve and do cross onto Mount Curve there. Additionally, although I do not know specifics about the public school bus routes, I do see children walking home from that general area.</p> <p>I appreciate this information being taken into consideration. One need only sit at the intersection of Jefferson and Mount Curve on the afternoon of a nice day to see how many kids use it.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p>
3.22.12	Kate & Andy Burda	2196 Berkeley Ave.	<p>I have heard that there is a proposal to remove stop signs on Jefferson Avenue at the Mount Curve intersection. Is this so bikers do not have to stop? If so I must comment that I <u>*NEVER*</u> see bikers stop at stop signs even though they are supposed to do that. That aside, there is a large number of grade school children, including my own who are very young grade-schoolers, who ride their bikes and walk on Mt. Curve and cross at Jefferson.</p> <p>Removing those stops signs would concerns us greatly! We cannot emphasize this enough. Without those stop signs there, I worry about a car hitting a child. As it is now we have near daily occurrences of cars traveling at a very high rate of speed down Mt. Curve (from north to south), and running the stop sign at Mount Curve and Stanford! This is 2 very short blocks from Mount Curve and Jefferson. If the signs are removed at Jefferson I can't imagine how fast the cars will be going once they get to Jefferson. In addition, there is a steep hill for eastbound traffic that prevents drivers from seeing children crossing Mount Curve as clearly as if the road were level, especially if children are crossing on the east side of the intersection.</p> <p>The stop signs at Jefferson are there for a reason. It is to ensure people drive at a reasonable and safe rate of speed given this is a residential neighborhood which has a lot of foot/kid/kid bike traffic. Every neighbor at that intersection except one has children.</p> <p>I appreciate your attention to this matter and hope you will take our feedback into consideration as decisions are made.</p>
3.22.12	Dede Leininger	2159 Juliet Ave.	<p>I would like to say a few words concerning the proposed dramatic changes to Jefferson Avenue. I am not in favor of the changes to Jefferson. I believe these changes will alter the traffic in the whole neighborhood. The cost of there changes are a burden on a city already struggling with balancing the budget. I have very carefully watched the bike traffic on Jefferson. There is virtually none. I pay taxes to live in my home and drive my car. This money is used to maintain streets. I am paying to have the streets altered for the convenience of a biker so they do not need to stop. I have seen more than one car go the wrong way around the traffic circle on wellesley. I also find it hard to grasp how this will not cause the snow plowing to be disrupted. The changes to Jefferson past Snelling east have been minimal. Painting sharrows, speed signs, and lane reductions. The</p>

			bump outs were enough of a problem. The citizens were not in favor of them and now we are replacing them with roundabouts? I feel that the city of St Paul is bike friendly in our neighborhood. We know the cost of putting in the roundabouts. Lets look at the cost of leaving the intersections alone.
3.22.12	Marc Light	1804 Wellesey Ave.	<p>I live with my wife and two teenage daughters on Wellesley avenue on the block between Wheeler and Fairview.</p> <p>We bike on Jefferson Avenue frequently. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - my daughters bike along Jefferson on their way to play HGRA soccer on the Talmad Torah fields and Carondelet fields, - my daughters have also biked along Jefferson on their way to play softball on the Cretin fields, - we all bike along Jefferson, on our way to the Highland Park Pool, - I frequently use Jefferson when biking to visit friends in Westside (I take the High bridge), - we all bike along Jefferson on our way to Sea Salt at the Minnehaha Falls. <p>In short Jefferson is central to our biking. We all bike to work or school and thus bike pretty much every day there is no snow/ice on the roads.</p> <p>I am convinced that the proposed plan for the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway will make it safer for my family.</p>
3.23.12	Michaela M. Lauer	2023 Wellesey Ave.	<p>I am writing in response to the letter we recieved from the Department of Public Works regarding the Jefferson Aveue Bikeway. Because we were to be out of town on the day of the "Open House" scheduled to be at Nativity School , March 6, 2012, I called you and asked that you send me an advanced copy of the proposal so that I could respond in writing or through a neighbor. You did say you would make that available on Monday, March 5th, but you did not contact me in any form, nor was it available. Now that I have been told of the proposed changes, I would like to register my displeasure of the excessive traffic circles proposed to be put in on Jefferson between Fairview and Snelling Avenues. In that short amount of space, three is far too many. Could you please see your way clear to only having to put in ONE traffic circle? This seems like such a waste of time, money, and is a very disruptive change to the neighborhood. I realize the vote is to be on Friday, March 23rd, and would lilke you to please alter the plan by removing at least one of the traffic circles you have proposed to be placed between Fairview and Snelling. Thank you.</p> <hr/> <p>Thank you for responding to my e-mail. I never did get a previous one from you, as I did check my e-mail while we were out of the country. I have no idea where the glitch occurred. Regardless, I am grateful that you will share my concerns at the April 4th public hearing.</p>
3.23.12	Mike Mills	2051 Jefferson Avenue.	Please consider this email a vote of confidence for the proposed Bikeway. I live at 2051 Jefferson Ave and our family fully supports the bikeway. I sent you an email a few months back prior to one of the Nativity meetings state my support. Good luck with the hearing.
3.23.12	Calvin Roetzel	Jefferson Avenue	Hello. Calvin Roetzel here, Jefferson AVenue resident since 1971, biker, runner, walker, and father of 3 children raised on Jefferson and now deployed nationwide. I have followed the bike discussion with keen interest, and have been dismayed at the crazy obstructionist tactics used to hamper the project. The proposals suggested all look good. The only problem I see looming is at the intersection of Jefferson and Cleveland. I have crossed Cleveland as a marathon runner in training and biker thousands of times. The one thing i have noted in my 40 years of residence and activity on the street is that the traffic on Cleveland has become more dense and faster over time. My uninformed guess is that at peak hours over 50% of the cars are exceeding the speed limit. In any case it is fast and dangerous. The simple painting of a cross walk will not solve the problem. The only solution i see working at this stage is a traffic light. Please do something before some kid is killed by a speeding car. Thanks for your good work.
3.23.12	Sandy Titus	1766 Jefferson	"If this is in fact about bicyclists, it seems it me it would be wonderful if the traffic circle at Jefferson and Wheeler...if on our new corners...if there were a slanted ramp on the traffic circle...if there were a wide ramp and a concrete bench to be able to take a rest on the traffic circle...that was the idea I wanted to put forward...if you made it a courtyard on the center, so that it could be a rest stop....there are family cycling on Jefferson and they often have little ones so it seemed to me... if it wasn't at this corner...even up by Macalester, the park is very popular for children. I think it would be nice for the neighborhood because it has a welcoming, community invitation." (Phone call)
3.23.12	David DeRusha	1775 Jefferson Ave.	<p>I am a long time resident of Jefferson Ave. I live between Wheeler & Fairview, on the north side of the street.</p> <p>Overall, I support the bikeway concept and plan. As energy will not become cheaper, our society</p>

			<p>needs to find ways to reduce our use of fossil fuels, especially oil.</p> <p>I strongly support lifting the north side ban. Safety is my main concern. Because of the traffic semaphore at Jefferson and Fairview, Jefferson is more heavily used than other residential streets in the area. Cars move at a good clip, often attempting to "make" the light. Plus they tend to speed up after stopping at Wheeler. With many small children in the area, the closeness of the traffic to the sidewalk is concerning. I do not park on Jefferson, because I installed a parking pad.</p> <p>I am not certain the traffic circles will slow down the traffic, but am taking a wait and see attitude.</p> <p>My only strong objection to the plan involves the semaphore at Fairview and Jefferson. I would prefer that it be programmed to a pedestrian activated light. Changing the light's function would be a deathblow to commuter traffic on Jefferson. Currently the crosswalk is heavily used by the local private school. My informal observation is that other pedestrians in the neighborhood do not use the intersection any more often than other Fairview crossings. I would also support a traffic island at the Jefferson- Fairview intersection. I realize that is a non-starter after the Jefferson-Cleveland experience.</p> <p>Many years ago I was a member of a neighborhood committee to localize Jefferson. The traffic semaphores were turned off, the traffic died down considerably. However, people did not want to change their driving patterns and the local priest complained about the safety of school kids crossing Fairview. At that time the school children were crossing at Wellesleys not at Jefferson. The Jefferson light slowed the traffic between St. Clair and Randolph. I appreciate the need to slow this traffic. I fear that determined commuters will continue to use Jefferson, regardless of restrictions if the traffic light at Fairview continues to function in the same way.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and work,</p>
3.23.12	Darryl and Tracy Heaps	1728 Jefferson Avenue	<p>We are residents at 1728 Jefferson Avenue.</p> <p>We are NOT in favor of installing traffic circles and removing the 4 way stop signs at Wheeler, Davern, and Macalester intersections.</p>
3.23.12	Jill Welter	1795 Jefferson Avenue	<p>Thanks for your reply. I know I already emailed you, but I just looked at the proposed plan again, and I just love it - even more on my most recent review! I am in complete support of the Jefferson Bikeway plan. It is just what we need to create more community, slow down the speedy traffic, and provide more opportunity for alternative (more healthy) modes of travel. I like the idea of my street providing a home for people engaging in alternative, unmotorized, forms of transportation. It is greatly needed and should be supported. I am not much of a bicyclist myself, and even so, I love this plan! I am an avid pedestrian though and with the current structure I find it difficult to walk to the river due to heavy, fast-moving, and pedestrian unaware traffic congestion on Cretin and Cleveland. Even crossing at the lights at the major intersections in our neighborhood (with a walk sign) can prove a bit challenging. This plan will certainly provide a more safe and community-oriented route for walking, running, biking, etc. and reduce problems with speeding traffic and noise. Both the traffic circles and the two-sided street parking have my strong support!</p>
3.23.12	Ryan Ricard	407 Snelling Ave	<p>As a resident of Macalester-Groveland, I've been closely following the progress of the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway. After reading the recent mailing and reviewing the proposed design online, I'm happy to voice my support for this project. I regularly commute to work via bicycle both to downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis, and Jefferson is an indispensable part of my route in either direction. My wife and I also enjoy touring the neighborhood via bicycle on the weekends. I think that the proposed modifications to Jefferson Avenue do an excellent job striking a balance between the needs of auto, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic, and I commend the city on its efforts to help encourage the safety and activity of bicyclists. Proposals like this make me proud to live in a city that understands that its roads are for everyone, not just for automobiles.</p>
3.24.12	Gene Baum		<p>We received a letter from the city in regards to Jefferson Ave. One of the proposed plans is to install bicycle detection on Jefferson & Fairview. What is bicycle detection??? And why there instead of Cretin or Cleveland where there don't appear to be anything being done. We live on a dead end alley with the only access to our garages is from Fairview. If one wants to leave during</p>

			<p>rush hour and go North on Fairview we often have to wait thru several cycles of the Jefferson light , or go South to go North. This was caused by changing Fairview from a 4 lane street to a 2 lane street. As residents whose only way to get to work is by getting on Fairview, we were never asked about that change either. By the way, there are two dead end alleys in the area that can only access Fairview.</p> <p>If saving energy is so important, why do we have to drive farther to get to destinations North of us.</p> <p>I have been working in the neighborhood all winter and have seldom seen more than 2 or 3 bikes on Fairview on any given day, verses many cars. With the economy in the tank and the city so short on funds that they cut the fire departments budget and then put roughly that same amount of money into making a bike way seems like the wrong thing to do at the wrong time.</p>
3.25.12	Joyce Krech	1696 Jefferson Avenue	<p>My name is Joyce Krech and I live at 1696 Jefferson Avenue (at the corner of Jefferson & Davern).</p> <p>I support the recommended changes to Jefferson Avenue between Snelling and Fairview, including the traffic circles and North side parking.</p> <p>I live on the Southeast corner and on a daily basis witness cars and bicycles failing to come to a complete stop (or stop at all) at this intersection. I welcome a traffic circle which should slow both cars and bicycles. I look forward the added parking on the North side. I feel both changes will have a positive impact on Jefferson Avenue.</p> <p>Davern sees a lot of pedestrian traffic, especially families and children on their way to and from Mattocks Park. I hope pedestrian safety is improved as a result of the planned changes.</p> <p>I plan to attend the April 4th City Council meeting. In the event I cannot, I wanted to be sure to send you an email in support of the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway Plan.</p>
3.25.12	Stephen J. Willett	329 Stonebridge Boulevard	<p>I am a resident within one block of Jefferson Avenue, and also a long-time user of Jefferson as a bicycle route. I am a regular bicycle commuter to my job at 3M Center, and use the entire length of Jefferson as part of my route. I was pleased to review the proposals for the Bikeway west of Snelling, which will enhance safety for cyclists, pedestrians and drivers alike. I encourage the Council to approve the design plans that were amended and approved by the Planning Commission on March 23.</p>
3.25.12	Jennifer Jeannette	1696 Jefferson Avenue	<p>My name is Jennifer Jeannette. I live at 1696 Jefferson Avenue in St Paul. I have lived on the southeast corner of Jefferson and Davern for over 22 years.</p> <p>I reviewed the Jefferson Bikeway Plan for the stretch of Mississippi River Blvd to Snelling Avenue. I support the plan and I am very happy and excited for many of the changes/community enhancements proposed.</p> <p>The stretch of Jefferson Avenue between Snelling and Fairview will benefit from removing the stop signs and replacing them with the 3 traffic circles. Everyday I witness traffic behavior and the lack of compliance of the stop signs by both motorized vehicles and bicycles. The traffic circles will help prevent accidents and calm both traffic and potential tragic accidents. The parking on both sides of Jefferson Avenue between Fairview and Snelling will be a welcomed feature that will be especially effective in slowing vehicles down and making Jefferson Avenue safer for bicyclists, pedestrians and residents. I, and all the neighbors I have talked to, are very eager for parking on both sides of Jefferson in this stretch between Fairview and Snelling, to enhance the bicycle boulevard and our neighborhood.</p> <p>Thank you for all the planning and efforts on the proposed Jefferson Avenue Bikeway roadway improvements from Snelling Avenue to Mississippi Blvd. I support the plan.</p>
3.26.12	Steve Larson	1752 Juliet	<p>In the past few months, I have been hit with a \$2200 bill for street paving and streetlights, a \$1663 bill for sewer, and a healthy increase in my property tax statement which also included yet another sewer "fee" of \$100.</p> <p>And now I have received a notice about the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway project. Excuse me if I wonder exactly how much this one is going to cost. I know it includes "Sharrow" Pavement</p>

			<p>markings (just the word itself is irritating), dynamic speed display signs, LED pedestrian warning signs, multiple traffic circles and "bicycle detection" signals. All of this would be nice if the City had a surplus of funds, but I suspect we are all going to see yet more "fee" notices and additional levies on our property taxes.</p> <p>I say all of this in the way of offering a caution - I'm feeling abused and I am as far removed from a Tea-party person as one can get. I had one of your signs in my yard and attended my neighbor Sieben's DFL fundraiser last summer. But if I am feeling like this, imagine what other residents are feeling who do not share our political leanings. I'm afraid it's going to be quite a rude awakening for those currently in City office.</p> <p>I think the Bikeway project is great in theory, but how critical is it in need and practice? How many people will it affect and at what per capita cost? I suspect it could be trimmed quite a bit. And this is coming from a guy who has lived in St. Paul for 40 years and never written a letter like this before.</p>
3.27.12	Connie Karlen	Wellesley Ave & Davern	<p>I live on the corner of Wellesley Ave & Davern. I wanted to let you know my personal concerns regarding the Jefferson Ave bike plan.</p> <p>It seems to me that the bike plan has taken on huge & unnecessary complexity and as detailed in the March 16 letter to residents in my area- I believe it will have a negative impact on those of us who live in the neighborhood.</p> <p>One of the things I love about my quiet area is that many people walk. We walk dogs, push baby carriages etc. We walk across the street when we see someone we know.</p> <p>Pedestrian traffic is my main concern.</p> <p>I was very sad/disappointed/unhappy to see that 3 traffic circles will be installed along Jefferson between Snelling & Fairview. We already have two traffic circles in our area. As a person who walks to work (Macalester College) - I have noticed that drivers that come round the traffic circle at Macalester & Stanford do not pause but come quickly around the corner.....it's as if it's a banked turn on a road rather than a street.</p> <p>I am a pedestrian and must guess if there's going to be a car coming fast & making a right turn off Macalester onto Stanford. It has happened several times that cars come zooming round the turn toward me as I'm walking across the street. This isn't safe.</p> <p>It's a weird thing but several of us have noticed that though the traffic circles slow cars at the given corner- many, many cars then speed up once they are past the corner. So, it's slowed traffic only to speed it up later. Imagine Jefferson with three of these circles in a row. It won't be safe for peds. Or bikes (in a tighter space with cars parked on both sides)</p> <p>There is also much foot traffic (of all ages & abilities) along Davern walking to and from Mattocks Park. If a traffic circle goes in at Davern & Jefferson- this means that <u>those who walk are definitely last on the priority list</u> and are possibly at risk. No stop signs. No cross walk. Lots of pedestrians. Cars or bikes don't have to stop.</p> <p>This new Jefferson plan cuts the area in two as cars & bikes are given preference to the quiet neighborhood where a good number of us walk....to the park, to visit neighbors, to Brewberries, to Ace Hardware, to St Kates etc. It's clear that pedestrian traffic is not at all a priority in this plan.</p> <p>I'm also concerned that the traffic circles on Jefferson will just mean that traffic will increase on Wellesley.</p> <p>It seems that traffic circles are the only idea the city has....when in doubt- toss in traffic circles. Surely there are other tools to use.</p> <p>Please don't put traffic circles along Jefferson.</p>

			<p>Additionally.....</p> <p>As a bicyclist- I would avoid a route with all these traffic circles. Drivers are already confused & mad about the circles. I also would never choose to bike down Jefferson with cars parked along both sides and with traffic circles. Congestion. The narrowing of the streets plus drivers who are confused by the traffic circle and then speed up once they are past is dangerous for bikers.</p> <p>It's unclear on the design map where the bike lane will be in reference to parked cars but I can tell you that it would make me uncomfortable to be pressed up against parked cars while riding bike with traffic. Car doors opening, people stepping out. Not good.</p>
3.28.12	Chris Johnson	1801 Jefferson	<p>I want to confirm to you my support for the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway draft design plan as presented by city staff at the open house on March 6th. It is important to us who live on the section of Jefferson between Snelling and Fairview that the traffic calming efforts presented by the city remain in place as part of the plan.</p> <p>I believe, and studies show, that the narrowing of a street by adding parking on both sides of the street, similar to the way parking is situated on Jefferson to the west of Fairview, decreases automobile speeds making the road safer for bicycles and pedestrians.</p> <p>Thanks for your work to make Jefferson a better street for walking and biking.</p>
3.28.12	JulieB2193@aol.com		<p>As across the street neighbors of Connie Karlen we echo her concerns about the proposed Jefferson bikeway. We have not seen a plan that addresses alternate traffic patterns that will be a result of this plan.</p>
3.31.12	Mary Skinner	2182 Wellesley Ave	<p>I am responding to the March 16 letter we received regarding the plans for the Jefferson Avenue Bikeway. I attended the first meeting that was held in the Nativity auditorium. The vast majority of the many people who spoke were definitely against extending the bikeway from Snelling to the Mississippi River Blvd. I can not understand why City Engineering Dept. continues to insist upon Jefferson as a Bikeway.</p> <p>As a child I lived on Juliet Street and went to grade school, high school and college in the neighborhood. I eventually moved back into the neighborhood because we thought it was a great place to raise a family. Jefferson was a little bit busier than the neighboring streets when I was very young but eventually more people used St Clair and Randolph and Jefferson became quiet like the neighboring streets. I will be unable to attend the meeting on April 4 but would like to state that I am opposed to making Jefferson Avenue a bikeway. It should remain a quiet neighborhood street!</p> <p>I biked in the neighborhood as a child and I am still biking as a senior citizen and have never found it necessary to have a bikeway .</p>
4.2.12	Janet Humphrey	1748 Wellesley Avenue	<p>I think having three additional traffic circles on Jefferson (at Wheeler, Davern and Macalester) is ridiculous and an enormous waste of money. I live near the traffic circle at Wellesley and Wheeler which I find totally unnecessary on streets that are not heavily traveled. Putting an additional one on Wheeler only a block away and then two more on Jefferson will make these streets almost impassable in winter. Once you have parking on both sides of Jefferson, the traffic will be crowded enough to slow everything down. Traffic circles are just another very expensive unnecessary way to spend money at a time when our property taxes are already escalating. I ride my bicycle a lot and often on Jefferson. I have never felt endangered. Traffic will tend to be diverted onto Wellesley and Juliet. When I leave my alley and turn right onto Wheeler intending to then turn left to get down to Fairview, our traffic circle makes that enough of a bother so that I just continue to Stanford and then turn left. That is what a lot of people will be doing who want to travel on Jefferson. I support bicycling and this is totally unnecessary and will be nothing but aggravation</p>
4.3.12	Stephen C. Kelly	1803 Juliet Avenue	<p>I object to the Jefferson Bikeway in general, and the late addition of traffic circles specifically, because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal to install five traffic circles has not been before the Macalester-Groveland Community Council. The traffic circles were the brainchild of City staff working with outside bicycle advocacy groups. The traffic circle scheme went first to the Transportation Committee which is stacked with shills from the bicycle advocacy groups. The Transportation Committee allowed little or no public input at its meeting. Then the proposal went to the Planning Commission which only allows limited public input and now it goes to the City Council on April 4. The City Council is unable to make a decision because it has little or no public input from the residents and taxpayers directly

			<p>affected by this proposal. Instead the City is relying on organized “opinion” generated by outside bicycle advocacy groups who are neither Saint Paul residents, voters or taxpayers.</p> <p>2. There is no engineering review, planning or analysis as to what cramming five traffic circles along 1.3 miles of a single street will do. No report, plan or analysis is before the City Council:</p> <p>a. from public safety entities such as fire, police or EMT on the ability of its vehicles to navigate these circles,</p> <p>b. from Public Works on the ongoing costs of maintenance and difficulties in street cleaning and snow plowing,</p> <p>c. from a traffic engineer on the safety of vehicles and pedestrians, how this will affect the speed of vehicles and the consequences of additional traffic on adjoining parallel residential streets and nearby arterial streets,</p> <p>d. from a bicycle or pedestrian walkway engineer as to the effect on the safety and flow benefits and impediments of these circles, or</p> <p>e. from an expert in ADA compliance. A publication of MDOT states, “[t]he factors that might make crossing at a signalized location difficult for pedestrians who have visual disabilities include: . . . traffic circles . . .” from p 271, Minn. Dept. of Transportation, <i>Signal Design Manual</i> (Apr. 2010), http://www.dot.state.mn.us/trafficeng/publ/signaldesign/2010%20Signal%20Design%20Manual/2010_Signal_Design_Manual.pdf</p> <p>3. There is a serious issue raised by the advocacy of outside bicycle advocacy groups into this proposal. The City staff, instead of independently evaluating this proposal based on engineering, planning and street design, has chosen to accept the "surveys," cooked data, out-of-date studies and conclusionary information from such well funded outside advocacy groups as Bike Walk Twin Cities, Saint Paul Bicycle Coalition and Transit for Livable Communities. Their reliance on information from these groups is negligent and lazily ceding what is their job at best and collusion at its worst.</p> <p>4. General disapproval of residents to these traffic circles. A self report survey is no survey at all. Also, any survey which allows non-residents to answer gives no information on what the residents want. City Council members should respect the position of Ward 3's representative. You Chris represent the opinion of Ward 3 voters. Make sure the other council members know that.</p> <p>5. City staff seems to be playing a game of attrition here. They act as if having so many meetings is a good thing. Well it usually is but not if you keep changing the proposal. They should have presented one proposal and had one series of meetings. Instead, when their first proposal was rejected, they changed the proposal. When that was rejected they changed it again hoping people will get tired of the process and walk away. The residents (not outside bike advocacy groups) have said no to the Bikeway. The City Council should respect that and abandon the project. If unwilling to to that, than abandon the traffic circles because they are an unproven, un-analysed, flavor of the month piece of social engineering which costs to much and hinders rather than promotes the easy flow of traffic.</p>
4.3.12	Stacey Paske	Juliet	<p>I would like to add my comments to the discussion regarding the proposed Jefferson Avenue changes. I am a resident in the 1600 block of Juliet Avenue, immediately south of Jefferson and west of Snelling Avenue.</p> <p>I would like to emphasize two points in my comments:</p> <p>Obviously, Jefferson avenue is a very busy street and many (if not all) of the residents of Juliet use our adjacent alleyway to access Jefferson to make left turns (northbound) onto Snelling Avenue. The ease of doing so is immediately apparent due to the presence of the stoplight at this intersection. One need only drive or bicycle once on Jefferson, west of Fairview, to notice that two</p>

			<p>cars cannot easily pass each other when there is parking allowed on both the north and south sides of the street. Allowing parking on the north side of Jefferson (from Snelling to Macalester) would be a serious hindrance to all of the traffic which flows through this area, especially during rush hour.</p> <p>Additionally, I fear for the safety of our bicycling friends, particularly along this stretch of Jefferson (near Snelling Ave). I myself was unfortunate enough to strike a bicyclist from the alleyway leading to Jefferson in June of 2008. My view was obscured by the parked vehicles on the south side of the street only, as was the bicyclist unaware of my presence. Luckily the bicyclist was not seriously injured, but I fear that many more such incidents will surely occur if cars are allowed to park along both sides of Jefferson, as laid out in the proposal.</p> <p>If our proposed aim is to increase safety and promote pedestrians and bicycling, this particular part of the plan deserves to be discarded. I do not know how anyone who has spent even a few minutes observing this particular area, especially during peak usage, could approve such a measure.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
4.3.12	Emily Legace		<p>I am writing to comment on the proposed design plan for the Jefferson Avenue bikeway. I am delighted overall that your department is working on improving bicycle use in our neighborhood. I live near Jefferson Avenue and Macalester Street, and my family and I bike often. I have 3 children on bikes, and safety is important.</p> <p>I am concerned about the safety of the traffic circle additions to Jefferson Avenue. I use the new traffic circle at Macalester and Stanford often. It seems that children are less likely to know what to do when crossing or cycling, and drivers as well. The circle is so small that there is little reaction time available for the driver. The sidewalks are at a short distance from the circle, giving the drivers little time to notice a child crossing. With higher traffic volumes, where 2 cars will often be approaching at the same time, which happens at Jefferson, I think it will be even trickier for drivers and cyclists.</p> <p>The research on bicycles and roundabouts suggests that they decrease car accident severity, but that bicycle-car accidents increase. I cannot find data for bicyclists and traffic circles, but there is no reason to think that they would be safer than a roundabout, given the traffic in our area. The websites below cite a number of studies on this.</p> <p>http://blog.cascade.org/2010/11/circular-logic/</p> <p>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roundabout</p> <p>http://www.teachamerica.com/rab08/RAB08_Papers/RAB08S8CDaniels.pdf</p> <p>Please keep the 4 way stop signs in place. They will be safer for bicyclists to navigate.</p> <p>Thank you. Please contact me if you have questions.</p>
4.3.12	Andrew Olson	1761 Jefferson	<p>I am writing as a resident of Jefferson Ave (1761 Jefferson Ave) to offer my strong support for the recently proposed traffic calming measures on Jefferson between Snelling Ave and the river. Specifically, I am very excited with the proposed calming measures between Snelling and Fairview—both the two sided parking and the traffic circles.</p> <p>I am most pleased by the inclusion of dual-sided parking—something that is almost free to implement, very effective as a traffic calming measure and something that many neighbors have been actively pursuing for awhile now. On top of all this, the dual-sided parking provides an added benefit to the neighbors by allowing north-siders to park in front of their home. As a father of 3 toddlers, the added safety of not having to cross Jefferson to load my children in and out of the car is a huge plus. It also benefits south-siders by easing the parking congestion on the south side—making it more likely to find a place directly in front of their homes.</p>

			<p>We have lived at this location for 6 years and our experience so far with Jefferson Ave is that it is a veritable Grand Canyon that divides the neighborhood due to the level and nature of the traffic that occurs there. The 3 stop signs have made some impact as they are very popular with the neighbors, but that still does not stop the occasional drag-race mentality of some cars driving down this street—an occurrence which I think is directly related to the lack of north-side parking. My hope is that these measures will not only make the street safer for bikes and pedestrians, but also to bring the neighborhood closer together.</p> <p>I do have two questions for you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Is there a reason why the city decided to move forward with “sharrow” pavement markings within this section of Jefferson Ave (while designating it a “bike boulevard”), but, per the advertised design from 1-2 years ago, use a pavement marking of a bike with BLVD over it for the eastern section of Jefferson, which was also designated as a “bike boulevard”? (2) Do you know when the city plans to release their design ideas for what kind of plantings will be used for the traffic circles along the Jefferson Bike Boulevard? <p>I was, until recently, a member of the Macalester Groveland Community Council as well as its Transportation Committee. As such, I am very familiar with the lengthy process this project has gone through, the level of community involvement it has sought and all of the effort that the city has put into this. I would like to thank you for all collectively for your time and patience to see this through.</p>
4.4.12	Dan Mauer	388 Mt. Curve	Concerned about removing stop signs at Mt. Curve.