

Safety is what I like when I bike. I will continue to bike in the street on Summit if the raised path is built. The separate raised path WILL be full of dogs dog leashes kids on trikes roller-skates and skate boards etc. this path will also not be safe because cars on side streets and every driveway will drive to the street and stop- not stop before the intersection where the raised path is. NOT SAFE !!!  
Sent from my iPhone

We definitely should not mess with Summit Ave. I bike here and have been a cyclist for many years and find this decision economically and environmentally insane. Forget about a raised lane.  
Sent from my iPad

Please include licensing for bikes. Like automobiles, they should have to renew every year.  
Sent from my iPad Kim

- Bike paths are NOT NEEDED in St. Paul
- I'm sick of my taxes going up in St. Paul - no bike paths, especially on Summit Ave
- This will ruin Summit Ave - don't be another San Francisco
- bicyclists can only use bike paths six months of the year
- These paths ruin city streets/trees and are a waste of taxpayer money
- Bike paths are making traffic more unsafe
- the 1% of city tax is the last straw for us - we're moving out of the 7-county metro area - Thanks Melvin Carter, et al.
- You'd think the Carter office will put the brakes on their government decisions... businesses and people are fleeing the city of St. Paul - not safe, hardly anything down there and criminals run the streets

Melissa Albrecht

Hi there,

As a West 7th resident, I fully support the St. Paul bicycle plan! I will not be able to attend the Friday meeting so wanted to submit this now.

Best,

Emily

Although I moved to Falcon Heights about 30 years ago, I continue to identify strongly with St.Paul, where I lived & worked for 30 years. I am in St.Paul most days. I subscribe to the Pioneer Press. I love St.Paul.

In my travels through St.Paul, summer & winter, I see very few bicyclists, maybe one per month. I am careful in my driving near them to ensure their safety. This is sometimes difficult as these (all adult) cyclists rarely follow the road rules & are unpredictable in their actions.

I do not believe there will be a surge in bicyclists in St.Paul in the near future. I believe it is a serious mistake to destroy St.Paul's unique Summit Avenue in hopes that more cyclists will magically appear. While I am a supporter of all transportation alternatives to individual autos (I was a loyal bus rider until my 2 available routes were cancelled), I do not think the plan to destroy Summit will result in fewer cars on St.Paul streets. I know that biking is good exercise, & I biked to my classes at the U of M & to stores in my youth. However, I do not think the plan to destroy Summit will result in healthier St.Paulites.

Please do not destroy Summit Avenue.

A public hearing about bike lanes is becoming increasingly moot. Bike enthusiasts turn out to district councils, they vote, donate and the Mayor and Councilmembers gladly tag along.

So, go ahead and build the bike lanes.

When we're finished building the "multi-modal city of the future" and appeasing the 15 guys in Highland who will use the bike lanes four (4) months out of the year as a leisure activity, please come-by and clean-up the drugs where our children play.

There are parks in my ward 1 neighborhood that are overrun by drug use, specifically fentanyl. There are overdoses, deaths, open drug use and no one at City Hall or anyone with influence cares.

I wish we cared 1/10th about drug use in our community as we do about bike lanes. We might actually see some progress if that were the case.

Dillon Donnelly

Ward 1

Dear Committee Members:

I am a biker and a pedestrian. I also pay property and sales taxes in the city.

I do not think that the current bike plan, as proposed, is something St Paul can afford. I also don't think some of the bike lanes slated for re-construction are as bad as others make them out to be. I bike on Summit all the time, and while I strongly support changes like adding a stop sign on Mississippi River Blvd where the bike trail needs to cross it, I don't feel it is responsible to spend millions per mile to add a separated trail. Even if the number of bikers doubled as a result of the new lanes, they would still only be used by less than ten percent of the city. It's inequitable to spend such a huge amount of money on so few people.

To the point about climate change requiring a move to bikes - Yes. I agree we need to move away from personal cars. I drive fewer than 20 miles in a car per week. But there are ways to reduce car-driven miles without spreading even more unnatural hardscape across the city and with a much lower price tag.

I'm attaching a letter written by someone who really took a close look at the budget. I support all the points in the attached letter. [added below by staff]

Yours,

Laura Norén

St Paul, MN

Comments on St. Paul Bicycle Plan – February 2, 2024

Gary R. Todd

682 Summit Ave

St. Paul, MN 55105

The City has an obligation to adopt plans that:

1. Are fiscally responsible
2. Benefit the largest number of its citizens
3. Foster its strengths, to attract people and businesses

This new bicycle plan fails in all three of these requirements.

First, the plan does not discuss any of the costs associated with building 153 new miles of separated, off-street bike trails. The plan recommends the most expensive biking facility for the majority of the new construction. Using the cost figures from the proposed Summit Ave Regional Trail of ~\$2.7 million per



mile, this new plan envisions an overall cost of over \$413 million for this construction. This is nearly 50% of the latest annual budget for the whole city. How does this qualify as a fiscally responsible plan? Secondly, and tied to the first point, what percentage of the population benefits from planning to spend this huge amount of money? Currently, at best there is about 2-3% of the population that are regular cyclists. This plan does not give any estimates on how many more cyclists would result from these new trails. Nor does it give any estimates on how much vehicle travel will be reduced. How do you justify this plan in that it only benefits a small portion of our citizens? Is this the most equitable way to spend our tax dollars? Maybe spending to develop more walkable neighborhoods would benefit a larger group of people and be a better investment to reduce vehicle miles driven.

Thirdly, St. Paul's population is decreasing at an annual rate of 1.2% and the City is struggling to retain businesses. The strength of St. Paul is its neighborhoods. What analysis has been done to determine the best biking facilities for all these neighborhoods? Have these target neighborhoods been asked or expressed interest in having these new separated trails built? Imposing a one-size-fits-all plan everywhere does not qualify as context-sensitive design, ignores the uniqueness of each neighborhood and risks damaging the primary strength of St. Paul. The insensitivity of the City forcing plans, without consent of the people, drives both people and businesses away. This will shrink the tax base and bring us back to the first point.

Please avoid approving a blanket, one-size-fits-all plan for our city. Demonstrate that the City will engage with all its citizens, and not just a small, partisan group, before committing to spending taxpayer dollars.

Thank you.

Gary R. Todd

To whom in may concern,

I am writing to show my support for the continued improvement of St. Paul's bike infrastructure. As a fairly new resident of Minnesota (less than a year) I wanted to make it known that my family was drawn to the area because of its existing bike infrastructure and its plans to keep on improving. My brother currently does not live in the Twin Cities but has seriously considered moving here because of the purposed improvement plans to the bike network.

Please know that if St. Paul continues to refine and expand its bicycling network it will absolutely attract people. It was already a huge component in getting my family to come here from several states away and the improvements could very well draw in my brother's family as well.

Continuing to invest in the city's bike commuting network will give the area a huge boost going into the future.

Thank you for your time,

Derek J

St Paul has much higher priorities than kowtowing to a small fringe group of Coalition Biker activists. This plan is too expensive and property taxes are too high. Just fix the roads and include painted bike lanes.

### *Surface repairs and pavement improvements*

Streets with cracks and potholes are difficult and uncomfortable to drive on. The same is true for biking, and depending on the condition of the street, one in poor shape can present a legitimate hazard for people biking. **Street surface condition was identified in community engagement as one of the main reasons people do not bike.** (92)

Best solution: just fix the roads., add painted bike lanes and bike boulevards.

Alex Johnson

Here is my public comment on the Bike Plan: No, thanks. Sometimes you have to just tell the kids they can't have a pony.

This plan costs too much and benefits too few. Based on recent projects -- the bike trail in the median on Wheelock, the trail on Cleveland Ave, and the proposed mess on Summit--hundreds and thousands of trees will be lost (replaced with saplings that aren't watered and die) and more pavement will be added. This makes run off worse and our city hotter. We cannot take trees for granted anymore.

The city should have bike lanes, but within reason. Trails are for parks, bike lanes are for streets. And, better yet, bike routes can be on residential streets and with striped lanes on the less-busy or the arterials. There's no need to spend \$3 million a mile to put bikes "safely" (in quotes because they're not safe) on the same prime arterials as city busses and trucks traveling at 35, 40, 45 MPH, when there's almost always a parallel street with very little traffic just a block or a few blocks away with very few cars a 20 MPH speed limit. We have a grid pattern!

But, in order to accomplish this silly plan, the city is proposing to REMOVE 34 miles of cost-effective bike lanes and replace them with exorbitantly expensive confusingly named "separated bike lanes and paths" (SBLAP?) that cost 2.5-3.0 million per mile (based on the controversial Summit bike trail-style pathway). In total, the proposed bike plan has 153 new miles of "separated bike lanes and paths." At 2.5 million per mile, the cost is \$383 million, and 3.0 million per mile, the cost is \$459 million, and you know in the end it will cost even more. Half a billion? For 1% of the people?

Let's just fix the pavement -- that helps EVERYONE, in ALL WEATHER, not just the privileged cyclist community that is mostly white and mostly male.

Paige Olson

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Bike Plan. We are a biking family and we do not support the plan. I have participated—attended meetings and submitted comments—throughout the planning process. My family and I invested considerable time writing heartfelt comments and making thoughtful suggestions. I know I am not the only one who submitted concerns with the plan. And, in the end, the final plan is essentially unchanged from the draft last March. Soliciting public comment is meaningless if there is response to it.

Instead of re-sharing my comments, I am instead going to quote from an article from the [Pioneer Press](#).

Shoemaker acknowledged that **separated bikeways** pose challenges. They tend to require a full reconstruction of the entire street to install, which means building a network **takes more time, money and planning** than simply drawing lanes in the road or posting signage. Cyclists have also pointed to maintenance concerns, such as delayed snow clearance. [...]

Bikeways have elicited strong reaction on all sides, with some saying that after the recent post-thaw deluge of potholes, **St. Paul would do better to focus instead on basic street maintenance that the city has been hard-pressed to find funding for.** “Look up what percentage of people (who) bike to work in Minnesota – miniscule,” said Jason George [...]

In downtown St. Paul, after separated bike facilities debuted on Wabasha Street, some businesses have complained that their delivery drivers have had trouble finding parking. In some corners of St. Paul, **a growing number of voters have begun to say St. Paul needs greater focus on core city services – including property tax relief** [emphasis added]

These quotes highlight two key flaws with the bike plan: it relies on a singular facility type that requires **the most time and money**, and ignores the fact that **what most St Paul citizens want is simply better street maintenance**. Better maintenance is a solution that benefits all people, regardless what form of transportation—be it school bus or electric scooter— they happen to be using at a given moment.

Please keep the existing plan until a new, more thoughtful and more affordable update can be developed.

Sincerely,

Sonja Mason

# Highest Possible Cost Bike Facility: Meet the Cycle Path

The Proposed revision to the common sense and affordable Bike Plan (2015) is mind blowingly out of touch with basic economics. The planners have only considered one facility type: “grade separated bike lane” (MN-DoT) or “cycle path”(NACTO). And by and large want to place this “trail” on super busy streets—St Paul’s primary truck routes, transit routes, and the roads with the highest speeds and most cars. The noisiest, dirtiest, most congested streets, that feed cars to the freeways and a state highways. By and large, these streets have many cross streets, lots of driveways and both business and residential parking needs. The big question is why? We have minor collectors, and even better, low speed, low traffic, residential streets that are already paved, and lined with trees that with slight modifications could be made into primary bicycle focused roads.

(imagine, instead of small businesses, renters, and homeowners “squawking” about parking loss and so forth, the neighbors on the quiet, residential streets will welcome the traffic calming and the diverting of Cutthrough traffic. Wouldn’t it be great to have non controversial bike infrastructure for a change?)

According to NACTO<sup>2</sup> cycle paths are “most beneficial” for an entirely different context: “Along higher speed streets with few driveways and cross streets.”


The recent example of the Summit Avenue plan is a preview of the angry meetings to come—Ms a preview of the out-of-control, skyrocketing cost of the proposed Plan. *The SART* lists a range of costs for that cycle path: from \$11.2M to \$12.5M, with an averaged estimated cost of \$11,840,325 for the 4.5 miles along Summit from Kellogg to the Mississippi. This is a breathtaking cost of **\$2,631,183 per mile**.

The current St Paul Bike Plan<sup>3</sup> estimates the cost of bike lanes at \$30,000 per mile. The City could build 87.7 miles of bike lanes for the cost of this very expensive trail.

According to crash data recently re-published on [stpaul.gov](http://stpaul.gov),<sup>4</sup> the streets with the most bike crashes are on University, Rice, Dale, Maryland and Marshall --all streets truck routes, transit routes, and state highways. Wouldnt parallel bikeway routes on quiet residential streets be a better strategy? Why are we investing in an exorbitantly expensive and unproven<sup>4</sup> style of infrastructure, when we could create more and better bikeways at a fraction of the cost? It's simple math: 87 miles of bike lanes for the cost of only one mile of this (not actually safe) style of bike facility.

Let's choose smart.

J. Baxter



I'm a biker and have appreciated bike paths and trails throughout the city.

I also am dating someone who lives in St Paul and so I am at his place on cathedral hill much of the time.

I feel like Saint Paul needs a lot of work but I don't think wider bike trails on summit avenue is where money should be best spent. Also St Paul has been in a state of construction for what seems like a year. I went to a podcast show with two entertainers from New York and they kept talking about how every street had construction on it. And I think every street truly did.

This construction on summit seems very expensive and I fear would take an excruciating long time.

Also being in St Paul I don't actually see a lot of bikers. I am probably one of the few and feel very comfortable on summit as it is.

I have a lot more to say but I'm sure this is Best kept short.

Thank you. Hallie Ross

Get [Outlook for Android](#)



Thank you for the continued investment in bike infrastructure despite the few cranky individuals wanting to hamper the public good these investments bring about.

My colleagues and I cannot thank you enough for the safety improvements, fostering an environment where people who want to bike have the ability to do so, and many other benefits brought about by this infrastructure.

Regards,

Allie

I've been reading...for months...all the news about the proposed bike plan for Summit. Here's my feedback, it's just one word: Don't.

Don't mess with Summit

Don't change anything (except maybe repair and make the street better)

Don't remove any trees

Don't remove any parking

Just don't.

That's all, pretty simple, isn't it? And best of all, it's the cheapest option...do nothing, save money! And just think of all the other places that money can be wasted (errrr, sorry, "spent") by Mayor Carter and his henchwomen (ie. City Council).

I hope you will actually take this feedback seriously and not discount it just because I made a few opinionated comments.

Thanks,

Jim