

Thanks to Alice for reminding us about the history of this proposal, and the many opportunities for concerned neighbors to weigh in on the issue.

My family of seven has lived on the 1900 block of Iglehart for thirteen years. What we have noticed over the last five or so years is the increased flow of traffic on Marshall during rush hour (especially the evening rush). I'm not sure where all this traffic is coming from.

It has meant more traffic down Iglehart, though, as another person has already posted. Will putting this median on Marshall increase that flow even more? I don't know, but I would bet it would.

Like any such project, the median on Marshall has benefits and costs. Do the expected benefits outweigh the expected costs? Just as important though, who bears the burden of argument in this instance?

I would propose that the burden falls on those who want the median, not those who oppose it. And they need to show, with a preponderance of the evidence, that the benefits will outweigh the costs.

The evidence should be in the form of traffic-flow studies of this area, or, absent that, of an area as similar as possible to it. Unless I am mistaken, those have not been undertaken.

Finally, it seems to me that there is a spectrum of solutions to the problems thus far identified (speeding; u-turns; etc.), and that the median represents an extreme solution. Does not prudence dictate less extreme solutions *first*, and only after they have proven to have failed, moving on to the next?

A number of people have made what I think are reasonable proposals for less extreme solutions (better law-enforcement; flashing lights; zebra-stripping the cross-walk at Wilder; etc.). I would be in favor of a less extreme approach, at least at the outset.

Paul J. Wojda  
1970 Iglehart

--

**Paul J. Wojda**  
1970 Iglehart Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55104