

Dear Councilman Thao,

I am strongly opposed to the current Ford Site Zoning plan and am urging you to wait until we have a new Mayor in Jan to take up the issue. This is such a unique opportunity to make Highland Park a special place for the people of St Paul and the current plan seems more focused on making it a special place for Developers.

Thank you
Kim Maas

From: Joshua RUhnke [mailto:
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 7:49 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: I support the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan

Jane Prince,

I am writing in support of the current Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan.

While I have been a resident of St. Paul for more than 12 years, I am a relatively new resident of Ward 3. I was at CM Tolbert's town hall last night to hear more details the city's plan. I think it is a very well thought out plan and look forward to seeing it move forward.

#SayYesStPaul

Joshua RUhnke

jlruhnke@gmail.com

1823 Berkeley Ave

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55105

From: Anne D Brataas [<mailto:annebrataas@mac.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2017 2:10 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Subject: Chris, at tonight's Ford site meeting please get honest about Parks...you don't own the ball fields...

Highland Park Fine Print Reader Asks Councilperson Tolbert:

Is a Park Land Buyout Under Discussion at the Ford Site? Will It Be Like The Wall: You'll Make Highland Kids Pay for Parks?

Resident notes revised St, Paul's revised zoning permits developers the option to " pay a fee in lieu of dedicating land" to create parks.

"Under the revised ordinance, any development that increases the number of residential dwelling units, increases the floor area of commercial, industrial, or storage buildings, or any combination thereof, will be required to dedicate land for park space as determined by the City Council or pay a fee in lieu of dedicating land. " <https://www.stpaul.gov/departments/parks-recreation/design-construction/parkland-dedication-ordinance>

Dear Chris,

Now is the time to get honest about the glaring deficiencies and possible illegalities of this Ford site plan and vote no on it. Vote to delay zoning changes until important questions are settled.

Why? So when we proceed we will be a well served and generative community. Note I say “we” and “proceed” — I am not a faction-builder or antigrowth. I am against shoddy plans that last 150 years in the built environment so a few politicians get some votes.

Please make it your goal, based in moral and community integrity, to create zoning that supports a plan you can be proud of. One that could become your signature act as an able and service-oriented (versus vote-oriented) politician. You know I know the difference.

Two reasons to vote no are that the plan is:

Dated. The current plan is perfunctory work. It is not a future-forward vision—it's been 10 more years in the concept phase, with another 20 to build a functional community identity that lasts 100 years. You need top notch future-proofing work to get 130 years out of any plan. It's not there. The plan is outdated before the build starts. Compact architecture; placemaking and makers spaces; planning for AI and robotic realities; startups and gig hubs. None of these future concepts at work in Boston, St. Louis and Seattle to accommodate new housing stock and promote diversity are mentioned. It is not just the aspiration we're after — “We want a vibrant neighborhood!” but means for doing so through the zoning and envisioning future uses.

Deficient Zoning. As you very well know, Chris, but do not tell, St. Paul's 2015 revised parkland dedication ordinance puts developers in the drivers' seat. Sure, the ordinance says developers will be “required to dedicate land” to parks...But that requirement is subject to city council vote...OR, AND WORSE... the developer must “pay a fee in lieu of dedicating land.”

Gee. Suppose a developer contributes money to a political candidate. What might the developer expect in return for \$? could it be a vote or two on rolling back the park land requirement? Easy Peasy: Parks are history; developers have a go; politicians have cash; Highland Park residents live with one of the highest residential densities anywhere in America—park free! Can't wait to manage the waste all those 10,000 new people's dogs drop, with no new residential lawns to recycle it.

More fanciful yet: Imagine a city and a developer rush ahead with a poorly detailed and highly divisive plan that has no actual park—they fake one on the map on railroad land. They listen for months as neighbors sigh with relief to see the fake rendering and exclaim the “ball fields are still there.” No, they are not. But both the city and the developer know the developer will follow the law and PAY money “in lieu of dedicating land” to get out of setting land aside, while also complying with the city's real-estate-interest skewed park ordinance.

And the city will reward the developers' outlay of money for the park buyout with increased high-density zoning so the developer can pay for the park buyout by cramming more people in their rental units and get more rental \$.

Note: none of the 10,000 extra people now envisioned for Highland are moving into single family homes, which is the actual and valued architectural heritage of this neighborhood. Our 10,000 new neighbors are not building equity or permanent community — they are maintaining cash flow for developers long gone and developments likely to be sold to Asian investment banks. Or Russian.

Chris, at tonight's meeting, vote no against this plan and your own amendment. Please take 2 actions:

1. confirm the park land buyout scenario is impossible—a developer can't buy his or her way out of creating park land. Cite your legal ordinance-based evidence, not just your wish. Convince me.
2. Personally and legally guarantee significant — 20%—of land will be a parkland in the new Highland. And that the land is owned by the city, or likely to be owned by the city as evidenced by a legally binding letter of intent.

Or are Highland parks — *Highland Park*, get it?! — like the president's wall? Are you going to make the kids pay for parks?

Thank you for your time and attention. Do the right thing. It is different from the expedient thing.

Sincerely,

Anne Brataas
Ward 3 homeowner since 1995

From: Zimmermans Dry Goods [<mailto:zimmdrygoods@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2017 4:11 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Subject: I OPPOSE the Ford Plant zoning - please DELAY the planned vote on September 27th

I opposed the ford plan and ask you delay the September 27 planned vote.

Allan Brill

593 montrose lane

St. Paul 55116

Zimmerman's Dry Goods

1656 Grand Ave St. Paul, MN 55105

From: Ashley LeMay [<mailto:heyalemay@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2017 8:05 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Subject: I say yes to the Ford site plan

Council Member Tolbert,

My name is Ashley LeMay. I grew up in Saint Paul, attended Highland Park High School and moved to Highland in 2014. I have lived in the city since 1996.

I strongly support the Ford site plan and greatly appreciate your work. Not to confine anyone to a box, but I find it very frustrating that the generation responsible for the housing struggles faced by my generation (and generations to come) are yet again still doing anything and everything possible not to ease the housing crisis faced by so many.

From the opponents I have seen, it seems that most will not be around when the project is completed. For those that will still be around, I think this development will come with more benefits than drawbacks. For a city that that I consider home and hope to take pride in its progressiveness, it is upsetting to see this be an issue at all. I think the progressives have been spread thin dealing with the many political qualms that have arisen this year and the opponents, whom I believe are out numbered by supporters, appear to have the upper hand as they have banded together, have more time for organizing and probably more money for funding their campaign.

If they want to live like the suburbs, maybe they should go live in the suburbs.

Thanks.

Ashley LeMay

From: CAROL GREGORSON [<mailto:gregorsonc@msn.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2017 8:46 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Subject: Ford plan

Hi Chris Tolbert,

I oppose the present plan for the ford land. Please hold the vote, until parking is addressed, the height of buildings lowered and park land provided.

Thank you for your consideration,

Carol Gregorson

1770 Hartford Ave.

gregorsonc@msn.com

From: Leslie Brandt [<mailto:lnwbrandt@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2017 8:52 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Subject: Ford Site Zoning

Dear Council member Tolbert,

I OPPOSE the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan. Please delay the City Council vote until the new Mayor is sworn into office in January.

Respectfully yours,

Leslie Brandt

Highland Park resident

Thursday, September 07, 2017 9:16 AM

Subject: Ford public comment

Phone call from

Susan Crosby

575 Montrose Lane.

Narrow range of things the city has boxed itself into. She'd almost prefer a Costco, wants parkland, and said the housing units should be limited to 500. Tolbert should represent our neighborhood and not just the city's economic interest.

From: Kristin [mailto:heinmets_kristin@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2017 9:44 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3; Kelley, Pattie (CI-StPaul)

Subject: Feedback - Ford Plant development

Hi Councilmember Chris,

I am a resident of Highland Park. My family lives on the 1800 block of Pinehurst Ave and I want to voice my concerns on the record about the proposed plan for the new Ford development. I strongly oppose any plan that allows for 7-10,000 new residents/high density. The plan calls for possible removal of the Little League recreational ball fields and very little green space. I realize Ford owns the property, but the city can zone it so high density/10 story buildings won't be allowed, and also give room for more green space as well as recreational space. The property by the River is truly a crown jewel, a once in a century opportunity, and should not be developed for stack and pack housing, but the focus should be on the river, green and park space. We don't want to look back as we do now on Block E in Mpls about what a bad decision it was.

I did love the letter in the Villager that called for the entire parcel to be a forest (that would be ideal!). I also love how a parking lot in Mpls was made into Gold Medal Park - a model to follow.

We already have a traffic problem in Highland Park, because we're on a peninsula and not close to major highways, and to have 10K more residents is truly insane! The only people who win in this scenario are the developer and the groups hired to promote a high density agenda under the guise of sustainability. The developer will build stack and pack housing, take the profit and won't have to live in the neighborhood - he doesn't care if he creates a traffic nightmare. While it's a nice dream to think people won't need cars, in Minnesota, most absolutely do, especially with kids and activities. Almost everyone on my block and the block east of us said they will eventually move if the plan is approved as is. Sure, most are not vocal like me, as they are busy with kids' activities and don't want to get involved in politics. We are the tax base, and my family and others will move to a suburb where it won't be so crowded and we can find parking at the grocery store, library and restaurants. If you drive around Highland Park, almost everyone has a sign that says STOP the Ford Plant (except for folks on the planning committee like Kevin Gallatin - who of course have a vested interest and a biased opinion to see the current plan succeed).

I know that you and the other planners and committee members will go through all the motions to "listen" to residents, but in the end it will be super high density living/stack and pack housing because

it's part of the Agenda for sustainable development by the UN. Maybe you don't believe me - but whether you agree or not, I invite you to read this article and realize it's all happening just as they laid out. So my husband and I know that we will eventually be moving out of the neighborhood.

<http://www.democratsagainstunagenda21.com/>

No matter where you live, I'll bet that there have been hundreds of condos built in the center of your town recently. Over the last ten years there has been a 'planning revolution' across the US. Your commercial, industrial, and multi-residential land was rezoned to 'mixed use.' Nearly everything that got approvals for development was designed the same way: ground floor retail with two stories of residential above. Mixed use. [SOUNDS LIKE WHAT HAPPENED WITH THE FINN APARTMENTS ON CLEVELAND AND HIGHLAND PARKWAY, NO?] Very hard to finance for construction, and very hard to manage since it has to have a high density of people in order to justify the retail. A lot of it is empty and most of the ground floor retail is empty too. High bankruptcy rate.

So what? Most of your towns provided funding and/or infrastructure development for these private projects. They used Redevelopment Agency funds. Your money. Specifically, your property taxes. Notice how there's very little money in your General Funds now, and most of that is going to pay Police and Fire? Your street lights are off, your parks are shaggy, your roads are pot-holed, your hospitals are closing. The money that should be used for these things is diverted into the Redevelopment Agency. It's the only agency in government that can float a bond without a vote of the people. And they did that, and now you're paying off those bonds for the next 45 years with your property taxes. Did you know that? And by the way, even if Redevelopment is ended, as in California, they still have to pay off existing debt--for 30 to 45 years.

So, what does this have to do with Agenda 21?

Redevelopment is a tool used to further the Agenda 21 vision of remaking America's cities. With redevelopment, cities have the right to take property by eminent domain---against the will of the property owner, and give it or sell it to a private developer. By declaring an area of town 'blighted' (and in some cities over 90% of the city area has been declared blighted) the property taxes in that area can be diverted away from the General Fund. This constriction of available funds is impoverishing the cities, forcing them to offer less and less services, and reducing your standard of living. They'll be telling you that it's better, however, since they've put in nice street lights and colored paving. The money gets redirected into the Redevelopment Agency and handed out to favored developers building low income housing and mixed use. Smart Growth. Cities have had thousands of condos built in the redevelopment areas and are telling you that you are terrible for wanting your own yard, for wanting privacy, for not wanting to be dictated to by a Condo Homeowner's Association Board, for being anti-social, for not going along to get along, for not moving into a cramped apartment downtown where they can use your property taxes for paying off that huge bond debt. But it's not working, and you don't want to move in there. So they have to make you. Read on.

Bikes. What does that have to do with it? I like to ride my bike and so do you. So what? Bicycle advocacy groups are very powerful now. Advocacy. [THE ANGRY BIKE GROUPS ARE VERY ACTIVE IN ST PAUL - HENCE CLEVELAND AND JEFFERSON AVE BIKE LANES] A fancy word for lobbying, influencing, and maybe strong-arming the public and politicians. What's the connection with bike groups? National groups such as Complete Streets, Thunderhead Alliance, and others, have training programs teaching their members how to pressure for redevelopment, and training candidates for office. It's not just about bike lanes, it's about remaking cities and rural areas to the 'sustainable model'. High density urban development without parking for cars is the goal. This means that whole towns need to be demolished and rebuilt in the image of sustainable development. Bike groups are being used as the 'shock troops' for this plan.

Thanks,

Kristin

From: Mary Gruber [<mailto:marygruber03@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2017 9:14 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1; #CI-StPaul_Ward2; #CI-StPaul_Ward3; #CI-StPaul_Ward5; #CI-StPaul_Ward6; #CI-StPaul_Ward7

Subject: Ford Site Plan?

Dear Saint Paul City Council members:

I request that each of you read Joe Soucheray's column published today, September 7, 2017, in the Pioneer Press (it will probably appear in tomorrow's edition for those of you who still read a daily newspaper) or at Pioneer Press Twin Cities .com for those of you addicted to electronic media.

The only thing that Joe, himself, overlooked is the opportunity that the presents itself in that lifeless black hole once known as downtown Saint Paul.

Perhaps the "expert city planners" that you engage at taxpayers' expense should look up from their textbooks and sniff the exhaust of these opportunities that continue to race past them and leave them wiping egg off their faces.

Thank God for the likes of Joe "Sooch"

Gerald F, Gruber (life-long resident of Saint Paul)

1140 Juliet Avenue, ST. Paul, MN. 55105

From: Ben Babcock [<mailto:babco062@umn.edu>]

Sent: Friday, September 08, 2017 8:35 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Subject: Please delay the Ford plan vote

Dear Councilmember Tolbert,

My name is Ben Babcock. I am a homeowner in Ward 3, and my house is less than a mile from the Ford site. I am in my 30s, commute to work mostly via bicycle or bus, and my family enjoys the current features of the Highland Park neighborhood. We hope to live in the neighborhood for a long time.

I am writing you today to request that you delay the currently planned September 27th vote on the Ford development plan. The plan as it is now proposed places too much population density into a neighborhood with infrastructure and basic geographic barriers that make attempting to support such density a foolhardy move. While developing the site with multi-use structures is a good idea, the proposed high rise structures in the current plan are bad for the long-term health of the Highland Park

neighborhood. Structures that are more similar to the one that Edina Realty recently built on Cleveland and Highland Parkway would be much better for the neighborhood. I implore you to delay the vote in order to rethink the current plan.

An additional thing that I would encourage you to do is to drive or walk through the neighborhoods near the Ford site. While there, please count the number of "Stop the Ford Plan" yard signs and compare that to the number of yard signs that show support of the Ford plan. This will give you an idea of how your constituents feel about the plan, as well as how they might vote in future elections if the current Ford plan moves forward.

We are on the cusp of the biggest change to this geographic area since Ford indeed decided to build its manufacturing plant originally. It would not hurt to take a little more time to consider things given the ramifications of this change. Thank you for considering all of this.

Regards,

Ben Babcock

From: Kevin Flynn [<mailto:info@actionnetwork.org>]
Sent: Friday, September 08, 2017 12:05 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Subject: I support the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan

Chris Tolbert,

I am writing in support of the current Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan.

It's the only plan that makes sense. We can hash out the height and density issues later - when there is a developer.

It's time for St Paul to do the right thing.

Invest in our future and our infrastructure.

-Kevin Flynn

#SayYesStPaul

Kevin Flynn

kmflynn_01@yahoo.com

2199 Pinehurst Ave

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55116

Stephanie Anderson – Opposes Ford zoning. Less buildings and people.

Katie Timma – Lives on Mount Curve; opposes the Ford plan. It's too many steps backwards and is awful.

John Raines

Thank you for supporting Ford. It's a step forward; he supports you to move forward with the plan.

Ms Cioc –

Is in opposition to the Ford plan with 10,000 more people.

Sherry Finn Warshawsky –

Lives on Pinehurst for years and years; very unhappy with the Ford plan; urges you to think of the people and vision vs corporations, money and greed.

Opposed to Ford site zoning; delay for new Mayor; is a disaster; wants a lawn sign. (NOTE: did not say what lawn signMayoral?)

Miska's — 3800 Granada Way – Oakdale MN 55128

Oppose the Ford site zoning.

2112 Juno

Maggie Pittelko –

Very excited about Ford; go for it; excited about all of it.

Nora Anderson –1407 Hartford

In opposition; vote to postpone to January.

In Favor of stop the Ford plan – he gives contribution.

Will Jones – 292 Warwick

Thank you for supporting the Ford plan. It's a great plan. Good for city. Knows you are being criticized but he supports you and the plan.

Janie Jacobson – Rethink current plan; a lot going on that will change the neighborhood; she opposes the current plan.

– Jean Scheuring – 1310 Hillcrest

Strong opposition to Ford plan. Do all that you can to stop it.

Michael Stoick – Called in support for Ford; go forward with the plan.

River Road resident called to say that 30,000 more cars on River Road would make it a highway rather than the sweet road it is now, and 10,000 more people is too much. Maybe the City should consider a park instead.

Ellie Emanuel (1757) called to express strong opposition to the Ford plan. She said it is too small an area for that density and would create incredible havoc with traffic and parking. She understands it would bring more revenue to the City, but it would now make living in the area comfortable. She asks that the City be more realistic about density and include more public spaces.

David Doody – grew up in Highland (currently lives in Mac Groveland) and supports the Ford site redevelopment plan. He hopes all of the work leads to something and is not sabotaged now at the end.

Highland resident called to say the plan is too much for the area and she is against the plan. She said there are a lot of recreational fields and apartment buildings already and they don't need more of that.

Charlene Sullivan - Ward 3 called in opposition to the Ford plan. Potential of thousands of new people in the area along with vehicle traffic. Wait for new Mayor. More time is needed to develop a plan for the residents of Highland Park. Behind her home are the RR tracks.

Roger Maulik - 1847 Highland Parkway Ford plan need to be rethought. In chatting with his neighbors he learned there will be no ballfields. It is absolutely imperative the need to be there – it's an important part of the city and an important part of Highland. Also his neighbor said there will be no residential housing because of pollution concerns. That is absolutely ridiculous. There will be gorgeous residential lots along the river's edge at premium prices and will add to the tax base. Before being rammed through, need to stop and put a hold on the plan and needs more citizen input. Highland is too important to screw up. The plan is too important to screw up.