

From: SGH comcast [<mailto:sgheegaard@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 10:07 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Subject: You are doing the right thing! Thanks for your leadership re: the Ford site

Dear Councilmember Tolbert,

My name is Susan Heegaard and I have lived in Highland for more than 20 years with my husband and 2 kids - I chose to live in St. Paul (I am from a many generation Minneapolis family) after moving back to MN. We support a yes vote and no delay on the Ford site plan. I have concerns and worries (mostly about density and traffic) but am more for than against the plan. It is a starting point and we will be in a better bargaining position with a plan prior to the sale and prior to the election of the next mayor. I worry that a delay will open us up to a big stall. The criticism of you and fuzzy facts presented by the opponents of the plan are troubling. I also think that there are a few opponents who behave as if their voice and view matters more than the rest of the neighborhood. We all live here and you speak for me and my family as well as many neighbors and friends. We are not the island of Highland, we are part of the city and county too. I want a viable and welcoming city for years to come. It is easy to complain and hard to lead. Thank you for leading!

Thank you, Respectfully, Susan Heegaard

From: Bielinski, Suzette J., Ph.D. [<mailto:Bielinski.Suzette@mayo.edu>]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 4:38 PM
To: Kelley, Pattie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: Oppose Ford Redevelopment Plan
Below is a link from the editorial board of the Pioneer Press – an independent voice that echoes the sentiments of my prior email communication.
<http://www.twincities.com/2017/09/17/editorial-take-the-time-to-move-antagonism-toward-agreement-on-ford-site/>
Given the strong opposition of the neighborhood and a collaborative history of working with other wards, I would advise the council to delay the vote until the new Mayor is in office.
Suzette J. Bielinski, Ph.D., M.Ed., FAHA | Associate Professor of Epidemiology | Division of Epidemiology | Department of Health Sciences Research | Mayo Clinic College of Medicine and Science | 507-538-4914
Monday, Tuesday, Thursday | 651-528-2771 Wednesday and Friday | Assistant: 507-284-5545 | Fax: 507-284-1516 | bielinski.suzette@mayo.edu | Mayo Clinic | 200 First Street SW | Rochester, MN 55905 | www.mayoclinic.org
From: Bielinski, Suzette J., Ph.D.
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2017 10:58 AM
To: 'Kelley, Pattie (CI-StPaul)'
Subject: RE: Oppose Ford Redevelopment Plan
Pattie,
I have thoroughly reviewed the current plan as well as the traffic impact statement but thanks for the summary. Again, this is more of a social experiment than a well thought through redevelopment plan. Councilmember Tolbert's amendment is insufficient to address the concerns of the highland residents. His continued support of this specific plan – in opposition to the majority of the highland residents – is not logical nor serves the people he represents.
Suzette Bielinski

From: Jane Smith [<mailto:pdq997@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 9:28 PM

To: Tolbert, Chris (CI-StPaul)

Subject: ford site

I am writing to you elaborate about my thoughts of the Ford site plan.

1. The Ford site traffic plan is grossly inadequate.
2. The plan creates too much density.
3. The lower density "Urban village plan 4" is far better.
4. High density belongs along University, West 7th and Snelling.

It seems as if the project planners have not considered that there is a point where traffic congestion and human density creates a neighborhood where no one wants to live. I am not convinced by the traffic analysis by Nelson/Nygaard, SRF Consulting and Utile. They should be required to provide real data to be reviewed by the public.

It is assumed that living at the Ford site would provide short within-city commute times. But the intersection of Ford Parkway and Cleveland avenue is acknowledged to be a "pinch point". I estimate approximately 10-15 minute wait times. I saw no analysis, but if adding 15,000 vehicle trips doubles the traffic, then 30 minute wait times will be standard. Since the density is much higher in the plan the currently exists in the neighborhood, I would guess that wait times will be substantially more. Opening up Cretin/Montreal and other streets may reduce this local time a bit, but just increase wait times at further locations such as Cretin/Marshall, the Cretin entrance to 94, and Ford Parkway/Snelling. Public transport in the Twin Cities is too infrequent to be used by most commuters except for those who live along a light rail or high frequency bus route that takes them directly from home to work. Adding a trip from Highland adds too much time. Increasing housing density along University Ave, West 7th and Snelling makes Far more sense.

As a bus commuter, I know that bus transit routes change constantly! Buying or signing a one year rental contract while depending on the "A line" that likely requires at least one transfer would be very foolish!

I asked "Yes" folks if they wanted to live in a ten-story building and Everyone said no. They guessed that someone else might want to live there such as older retired independent people. But the retired folks I spoke with did not want to live without a car and garage. They find walking difficult and very often the are caregivers for children and other older adults and need a car for these functions.

Reducing the number of cars at the site will just increase parking in nearby neighborhoods!

The plan should do away with the high density development and increase the number of row-homes such as that of the "River Mews" at Franklin and Thornton in Minneapolis.

I have heard city planners at meetings suggest that developers need to dense development or ...maybe they will not bother to develop the site. Really? Show the numbers. How much is Ford asking? How much do we have to give developers in addition to the already generous TIF bundle? The lower development plan 4 of "Urban village" sounds much better.

I attended the last public meeting and heard your amendment that has since passed. This tiny gesture of compromise (granted only by a kind and generous developer) is insulting.

From: Fourofus@iphouse.com [<mailto:Fourofus@iphouse.com>]

Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 4:12 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

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

Councilman Tolbert:

Please delay the vote on the Ford Plan until there is a more reasonable proposal.

The city planners have made only inconsequential changes to the plan since it was introduced to us almost a year ago. The neighborhood concerns about increased traffic have been ignored.

If you want neighborhood buy-in, show us a comprehensive traffic plan.

Our concerns are met with two responses, neither one serious: 1) it will be 20 years before the site is built out, so don't worry about it now, and 2) our traffic studies show that the existing street grid can handle 30,000 additional trips a day. The first response is merely magical thinking that time will cure the problem. The second response simply ignores the fact that the Village area and the Ford Bridge are jammed up at rush hour(s) now, without the 30,000 extra trips the city is projecting. Cretin Avenue between I-94 and Ford Parkway is crowded and difficult to walk across for several hours a day. The Village is not pedestrian-friendly at any hour as it is. The proposed plan will make it much less safe and pleasant for pedestrians.

Also, when anyone objects to any aspect of the plan, the city planners trot out how many meetings they have had with the public. The number of meetings is any easy metric that is not meaningful. Meeting with the public does not mean that the public's concerns have been addressed. I have attended three meetings and the plan has been the same at all of them, with no changes resulting from community input.

If you look at the distribution of the lawn signs for and against the Ford Plan, you will see that there really are not any "for" signs in the area close to the Ford Site that will be most affected by the projected traffic increases. Most of the "for" signs are east of Fairview Avenue.

Another concern from the public meetings that planners will not address is the distribution of green space within the Ford site. All the public parks are on the west side, which also has the shortest buildings, the least density, and is against the river. The east side with the proposed giant apartments ("residential high") has no public parks and butts up against existing development. This will create a "wrong side of the tracks" within the proposed development.

No one is suggesting that the site be left industrial. No one is suggesting that the site not be zoned more densely than the surrounding area. We are asking for a compromise between what is being proposed and what the surrounding area is. We are asking that a traffic plan be established.

Please delay a vote until the neighbor's legitimate concerns are addressed.

Laurie Schaaf

2159 Bayard Avenue

From: Pratik Joshi [<mailto:jpratik@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 8:35 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward5 <Ward5@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Reconsider the Ford site redevelopment plans

Dear Councilmember Brendmoen,

The city planners need to rethink the priorities as expressed in the draft Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan, particularly related to the number of dwelling units and parking spaces.

The planners tout this to be concentrated urban development where people live, work and play, yet they are open to the possibility of having more than 10,000 additional vehicles in the 122-acre site given the number of proposed dwelling units and the mixed use development on the parcel.

The draft document also states the possibility of developers suggesting amendments when drawing up the final plans.

The Multimodal Transportation Study and Report for the site also glosses over the potential problems of congestion in an already congested area. It downplays the external trips generated to and from the Ford site. People who live in condos/apartments and like to bike and hike do not necessarily give up their vehicles, particularly in areas known for sub-zero temperatures.

I wonder if the planners are expecting to have new jobs/offices move to the Ford site, or they are expecting jobs/offices to move from other parts of the Twin Cities? Chances of the latter being the case are disproportionately high, and in that case one can only surmise the number of workers who'll be driving back and forth.

The Highland Park area already suffers from a traffic congestion problem, which can only become much more acute given the proposed development at the Ford site. It'll also severely lower the quality of life in Highland Park. Also, the proposed density at the Ford site potentially can add to urban crime in our neighborhood. The incidence of violent crime per square mile rise rather than fall with population density. Imagine its impact on the property values in the neighborhood?

I've read in newspapers that the draft plan was approved in a rush and that the St. Paul City Council is only concerned about expanding its tax base, and lining the pockets of developers in the process with total disregard to the wishes of the people who call Highland Park home.

I ask the St. Paul City Council members to show this is not the case and that they not approve the Planning Commission's report. The council should ask the commission to rethink its position.

We are not against development, but it should take into account what's feasible and is in the long-term interest of the area and the city. If the neighborhood becomes unlivable, people aren't going to stay here. We should limit the number of dwellings to less than 2000.

I wonder if we can ask the Ford Co. to donate the land to the city and get a tax write-off, allowing the city to avoid the temptation to maximize density in the proposed development.

Let the development of the Ford site be an opportunity for this council to leave a lasting legacy.

Thanks, Regards, Pratik Joshi, 1690 Beechwood Ave.

From: Clarence Chaplin [<mailto:cachaplin@mac.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 10:49 AM

To: Kelley, Pattie (CI-StPaul)

Cc: Chaplin Clarence

Subject: Delay the Ford Site Council Vote

Chris,

Having gotten up to speed on this issue as the city council nears a vote, I believe it is in the best interest of the community to delay a vote on this critical issue for our neighborhood and our city. I attended your meeting at the Lutheran Church on Snelling recently where opinions were offered on both sides of the debate, and I came away confused about what is the best plan for the site.

I look at the rush hour traffic on Cretin today and am concerned that adding up to 7,000 people could have a significant impact on congestion, air pollution, and quality of life. Hopefully, before the site is built out, technology will provide us viable alternatives to the current automobile. However, I haven't heard enough from the city on your vision of how to accommodate all these people without the impacts I mention above.

I therefore, believe that delaying the vote is in order. I also like the idea expressed in the Pioneer Press today that the next mayor should have a voice in this decision.

thank you,

Clarence Chaplin

Hello Dan:

Just thought I would send you a quick note concerning my opposition to the current plan for the Ford land.

Please read over the email below and let me know your thoughts on my comments concerning the current Ford Plan being pushed/forced on the Ward 3 constituents.

90% of the land should be dedicated to "Active" recreation. An "active" recreation area with an Amphitheater, fields for baseball, soccer, lacrosse, cross country skiing trails, bike trails, ice skating, ice hockey & sled hockey rinks, football, tennis courts, pickle ball, basketball courts, archery. There should be no multiple story buildings. No apartment buildings. No more than 50 Single family homes. The homes would consist of 3,500 or more square feet per home. These homes should be situated on the river bluff.

A minimum of 15 acres should be allocated/used for farming - local residents can grow vegetables, raise chickens.....

Plant many pine trees, maple trees, oak trees. The active recreation area would be a year round destination area. There are plenty of businesses in the area already. No need for more businesses. The current plan is being forced on the people. The constituents will not accept the current Ford plan. It needs to be scaled to provide active recreation for young and the not so young minds and bodies. We need to build an area that will provide sustained healthy active life styles for all.

Thank you for your attention. Good luck in all your efforts to support the constituents. Not an easy job as you well know. I look forward to hearing from you.

Tom Traxler
1780 Scheffer Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55116

Dan Bostrom,

I am writing in support of the current Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan. My husband and I have attended meetings on the Ford plan for 3-4 years. I have admired the expertise and creativity of the staff and volunteers tasked with crafting the plan. I have been awed by the opportunities for public input at every meeting, especially the meetings aimed at certain topics (e.g., traffic, housing, green space, etc.). Between those meetings and the articles in the Villager, I feel well informed about the plan and strongly support it. My only quibble is that I wish there could be a bit more green space, but even without that, I still strongly support the plan as giving the neighborhood and the city a terrific chance to improve the lives of those who will use the site as residents or visitors.

I feel that many of the "Stop the Ford plan" signs have been put up by neighbors who have not stayed informed about the planning process. Some neighbors that I have talked with do not understand that Ford owns the property and will decide who to sell it to. Nor do some neighbors understand that more traffic and density is inevitable, because Ford's sale of the property is inevitable. I keep emphasizing that the city should do everything it can to make sure that the eventual buyer of the property constructs a high-quality well-thought-out forward-thinking community for the century to come. In Highland Park, we've had the good fortune to have a buffer to our south for nearly a century. Now we have the good fortune to help direct the use of that property in a direction that benefits many many people.

We proudly have a "Say Yes" sign in our front yard and are enjoying the conversations that it is generating.

#SayYesStPaul

Christina Kunz

christina.kunz@mitchellhamline.edu

484 Montrose Lane

St. Paul, Minnesota 55116

Some numbers:

850

60

0

850: The approximate number of St. Paul kids (650 boys, 200 girls) who played in the Highland baseball and softball programs this season. Four years ago the number was "only" 700. It's still growing.

60: The number of years Highland baseball has been operating at the Ford Fields location. (I think the precise number is 63.)

0: The amount of money the City of St. Paul has spent on the program in those 63 years.

And here is another 0: The amount of protection given this program in the city's current Ford redevelopment plan.

This program has served the city for more than sixty years, tens of thousands of kids, at no cost to the city. Now, when it needs protection (and protection has been promised, promised, and promised by PED staff), the city's planners look the other way.

Does that seem right to you?

What would you do if a program like this were threatened in your ward?

Paul Nelson
1661 Ashland
[651-271-3227](tel:651-271-3227)

Dear Council Member Bostrom,

I am a resident in the Highland/Macalester Groveland neighborhood and I **OPPOSE** the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan and you want the City Council to delay the vote until the new Mayor is sworn into office in January.

Please understand that I live in Highland/Mac Groveland and have purchased my home paid taxes for over 20 years. The proposed Ford Site plan would make the site too densely population so that it would drastically affect our neighborhood traffic, infrastructure and air quality and culture of the neighborhood. This development is not appropriate for its location which is a mile off the highway and at a beautiful river front area. Please do not urbanize Highland. We need green space and a variety of housing, but not several apartment/condo buildings over 3 or 4 stories. The neighborhood cannot support the increase in population. This is not what Highland is or stands for and we demand that the council listen to its citizens.

Thank you.

Julie Kaupa
1763 Juliet Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55105

651.698.8884

Dear Councilmember Bostrom,

My name is Susan Heegaard and I have lived in Highland for more than 20 years with my husband and 2 kids - we chose to live in St. Paul (I am from a many generation Minneapolis family) after moving back to MN. Please consider voting yes on the Ford site plan. I have concerns and worries (mostly about density and traffic) but am more for than against the plan. It is a starting point and we will be in a better bargaining position with a plan prior to the sale and prior to the election of the next mayor. I worry that a delay will open us up to a big stall. The criticism of Chris Tolbert and fuzzy facts presented by the opponents of the plan are troubling. I also think that there are a few opponents who behave as if their voice and view matters more than the rest of the neighborhood. We all live here and Councilmember speaks for me and my family as well as many neighbors and friends. We are not the island of Highland, we are part of the city and county too. I want a viable and welcoming city for years to come. Please vote yes.

Thank you, Respectfully, Susan Heegaard

651-324-0174

Dear Councilmember Bostrom,

The city planners need to rethink the priorities as expressed in the draft Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan, particularly related to the number of dwelling units and parking spaces.

The planners tout this to be concentrated urban development where people live, work and play, yet they are open to the possibility of having more than 10,000 additional vehicles in the 122-acre site given the number of proposed dwelling units and the mixed use development on the parcel.

The draft document also states the possibility of developers suggesting amendments when drawing up the final plans.

The Multimodal Transportation Study and Report for the site also glosses over the potential problems of congestion in an already congested area. It downplays the external trips generated to and from the Ford site. People who live in condos/apartments and like to bike and hike do not necessarily give up their vehicles, particularly in areas known for sub-zero temperatures.

I wonder if the planners are expecting to have new jobs/offices move to the Ford site , or they are expecting jobs/offices to move from other parts of the Twin Cities? Chances of the latter being the case are disproportionately high, and in that case one can only surmise the number of workers who'll be driving back and forth.

The Highland Park area already suffers from a traffic congestion problem, which can only become much more acute given the proposed development at the Ford site. It'll also severely lower the quality of life in Highland Park. Also, the proposed density at the Ford site potentially can add to urban crime in our neighborhood. The incidence of violent crime per square mile rise rather than fall with population density. Imagine its impact on the property values in the neighborhood?

I've read in newspapers that the draft plan was approved in a rush and that the St. Paul City Council is only concerned about expanding its tax base, and lining the pockets of developers in the process with total disregard to the wishes of the people who call Highland Park home.

I ask the St. Paul City Council members to show this is not the case and that they not approve the Planning Commission's report. The council should ask the commission to rethink its position.

We are not against development, but it should take into account what's feasible and is in the long-term interest of the area and the city. If the neighborhood becomes unlivable, people aren't going to stay here. We should limit the number of dwellings to less than 2000.

I wonder if we can ask the Ford Co. to donate the land to the city and get a tax write-off, allowing the city to avoid the temptation to maximize density in the proposed development.

Let the development of the Ford site be an opportunity for this council to leave a lasting legacy.

Thanks

Regards

Pratik Joshi, 1690 Beechwood Ave

From: Lisa Ymail [mailto:lisa_mcginis@ymail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 11:44 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Subject: Ford Site Plan

Dear Councilman Tolbert,

As I look around my neighborhood, I am surrounded by "STOP" signs. It appears my views maybe in the minority. As such, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the Ford site plan. As a resident of 1068 Colby Street, my home is in close proximity. I have read the 135 page plan that you will soon vote on and these are the elements of the plan I particularly like.

- Rezoning the land from light industrial to a combination of multi family, civic and business use.

Currently the site is all ready surrounded by these land uses and an extension of that seems very appropriate. The additional population added to Highland Park, once the site is fully developed, is still less dense than St. Paul.

- Relocation of the community athletic fields. The current location has access, parking and lighting issues. It would be a great asset to the community to improve the current situation.

- Restoration of the Hidden Falls head waters. The restoration is a great opportunity to enhance the green space, naturalize the headwaters and improve the stormwater run off in the area.

Overall the plan is well thought out and comprehensive. It would serve as an excellent tool for the master developer and the city planners as they move forward with the reinvention of the land use at the Ford site, making a profound and positive impact on the Highland Park community.

Regards,

Lisa McGinnis

1068 Colby Street

St Paul, MN 55116

Moni – Left VM 9/19 at 12:30 pm – She is against the Ford plan as is everyone in her neighborhood who are not willing to put up with increased traffic. She is old enough where she can move where there is less density and taxes are lower; she saw the same thing happen in MD, VA and the suburbs of Boston – people just moved. She said she did not expect a return call but if we wanted more information on how she feels to call; I returned her call at 1:16 pm and left a VM that if she had more to add to please call and let me know and that her comments will be included in the public record.

From: catherine hunt [<mailto:katemhunt@outlook.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 1:04 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7; #CI-StPaul_Ward6; #CI-StPaul_Ward5; #CI-StPaul_Ward4; #CI-StPaul_Ward3; #CI-StPaul_Ward2; #CI-StPaul_Ward1

Subject: Ford Site Pollution

Dear Council Members,

I urge you to please read the the pollution report and respond to concerns expressed by Friends of the Mississippi River in its July 14, 2017 letter. It would be indefensibly reckless for the City Council to approve the current zoning plan in light of significant toxic ground water pollution.

Vote no to the plan.

Respectfully,

Kate M. Hunt

Ward 3

<http://mischellaneous.com/2017/09/19/thallium-on-the-ford-plant-site-the-poisoners-poison/>



Thallium on the Ford Plant Site: The “Poisoner’s Poison.”

mischellaneous.com

In all of the debate over the future of the Ford site in Saint Paul very little attention has been paid to the level of pollution that is on this site. Remember, Ford wasn’t growing crops on...

From: jcwinterer@gmail.com [<mailto:jcwinterer@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 1:35 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Subject: Ford site comment from a neighbor

Dear Councilmember Tolbert,

I have attended virtually all Ford plant meetings open to the public over the past two years. I was shocked and not in a good way when the final version of the plan was announced at the St. Thomas meeting last fall. It is not at all what the majority of us were expecting. I know people use the word “shocked” a lot, but that is really how I felt.

I have lived three doors from the Ford property for more than 20 years.

I have written to you about the Ford Plan before, and have submitted comments to the planning process. But on the eve of the City Council hearing, and in light of the wave of opposition to the plan that is clearly evident throughout the neighborhood, I have four short comments:

You are throwing our neighborhood under the bus.

You are failing in your duty to represent us on the city council.

The compromise you are offering is worthless.

The rush to adopt this plan is self-imposed. We have time to do better. We can develop this property without destroying the character of a neighborhood we love.

As someone who lives in your ward, and even as someone who used to put rear axles on Ford trucks, I am asking you to slam the brakes on this planning process and reconsider the density the proposed plan would promote. If I wanted to have lived in a downtown, I would have moved there.

Thank you for your reconsideration.

Jim Winterer

1032 Bowdoin St.

St. Paul, MN 55116-1812

From: Tom Traxler [<mailto:ttraxler@captainkens.com>]

Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2017 2:32 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward2 <Ward2@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Cc: Maki, Taina (CI-StPaul) <Taina.Maki@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: Opposition to The Ford Plan - Please Promote an Active Recreation Area

Hello Rebecca:

Just thought I would send you a quick note concerning my opposition to the current plan for the Ford land.

Please read over the email below and let me know your thoughts on my comments concerning the current Ford Plan being pushed/forced on the Ward 3 constituents.

There should be no multiple story buildings. No apartment buildings. No more than 50 Single family homes. The homes would consist of 3,500 or more square feet per home. These homes should be situated right on the river bluff. 90% of the land should be dedicated to "Active" recreation. An "active" recreation area with an Amphitheater, fields for baseball, soccer. lacrosse, cross country skiing trails, bike trails, ice skating, ice hockey & sled hockey rinks, football, tennis courts, pickle ball, basketball courts, archery.

A minimum of 15 acres should be used for farming - local residents can grow vegetables, raise chickens.....

Plant many pine trees, maple trees, oak trees. The active recreation area would be a year round destination area. There are plenty of businesses in the area already. No need for more businesses. The current plan is being forced on the people. The constituents will not accept the current ford plan. It needs to be scaled to provide active recreation for young and the not so young minds and bodies. We need to build an area that will provide sustained healthy active life styles for all.

Thank you for your attention. Good luck in all your efforts to support the constituents. Not an easy job as you well know. I look forward to hearing from you.

Tom Traxler

1780 Scheffer Ave.

St. Paul, MN 55116

From: Douglas Robertson [<mailto:droberts@umn.edu>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 2:24 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward3

Subject: Ford Site Master Plan

Mr. Tolbert

We live in Highland Park, near the Ford site. We are very concerned about the proposed housing density for that area. We understand that the more people who live and work there the more taxes can be collected, but so many people will destroy the character of the neighborhood.

I strongly urge you to have the City Council delay the vote on the Master Plan until a new Mayor is sworn into office in January. This is a really important issue and needs more time to consider alternative plans and details need to be worked out. Issues like the Ford baseball field, a comprehensive traffic plan, congestion, public transportation, and tax burden need more study.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Douglas and Terry Robertson

From: Gary and Mary Fischbach [<mailto:garyandmaryf@msn.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 2:24 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1; #CI-StPaul_Ward2; #CI-StPaul_Ward3; #CI-StPaul_Ward4; #CI-StPaul_Ward5; #CI-StPaul_Ward6; #CI-StPaul_Ward7

Subject: Ford site

I hope you folks will read this, and actually count it as received. I know there has been some past accounting problems with letters that didn't fit your plan.

A. Will the tax generation exceed the amount of TIF you give the developer? So, with TIF, the neighborhood gets socked for extra taxes?

B. It was never in your intention to keep the ball fields, was it? We have no money right now, do you really think we have enough money to make the Highland Nine into a massive athletic field complex AND put rinks or ball fields at the water tower site?

C. Is the large tall building plan because we don't want Ford to do more cleanup? Is there still some nasty stuff in there?

D. Riverview Corridor is way, way down the priority list with the Met Council. Are we promising stuff to Ford and their real estate company about it happening?

E. Because they will be receiving handouts in the form of TIF, does that mean that there will be low income housing?

F. What are your plans to handle the increased crime from the low income housing and density both in the new development and the rest of the neighborhood?

I don't think you have any idea of the future consequences that will happen with all this density.

I don't think your Utopian New Urbanist vision for this site is good for the neighborhood or the city .

Gary Fischbach

567 S Saratoga St

St Paul MN 55116

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

jlrhnke@gmail.com

18xx Berkeley Ave

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55105

Neighbors for Responsible Development Position Statement

SNELLING AVENUE SOUTH ZONING STUDY

As concerned residents and citizens, we oppose the Snelling Avenue South Zoning Study as written, and we urge the Planning Commission and City Council to amend this zoning proposal per the following considerations:

- The Snelling Avenue South Zoning Study encourages drastic redevelopment of South Snelling Avenue and its cross streets. Accelerated development will not allow for adequate planning, compatibility, controls, and measures of impact and sustainability. The Snelling Avenue South Zoning Study as written will introduce increased traffic congestion, additional public safety concerns, and result in a decline of neighborhood property values. The Zoning Study is not compatible with the existing land use of the area. (South Snelling Avenue is contained WITHIN the boundaries of three established neighborhoods comprised primarily of single-family homes (77%) and hosts neighborhood-serving B2 community businesses.)
- T3 zoning should be removed from the Snelling Avenue Zoning Study for all properties south of the Soo Line Rail Spur and north of Ford Parkway as outlined in the Zoning Study, as this area of Snelling Avenue includes and abuts single-family homes.
- Forward facing homes should NOT be rezoned. Current zoning should be maintained to retain the dual character of the neighborhood and its mix of residential and community business properties.
- Dimensional standards for T1 and T2 zoning should be amended to accurately and specifically limit building heights, floor area ratios, and sizes of building footprints, and the standards should clearly establish minimum lot size requirements and adequate setback requirements for all properties.
- All zoning levels should have specific provisions for inclusion of green space and large trees which are environmental necessities as stated in the Climate Action Plan for Saint Paul.
- Implementation of the Snelling Avenue Zoning Study should be very gradual, so that careful decisions are made regarding the integration of new development. This would allow impact and sustainability benchmarks to be applied, tested, and adjusted before the Snelling Avenue Zoning Study recommendations are fully adopted.

SAINT PAUL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

As concerned residents and citizens we urge the Saint Paul Planning Commission and Saint Paul City Council to adhere to the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Snelling Avenue South Zoning Study contradicts the stated policy goal of the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan Housing Strategy 2: “To Preserve and Promote Established Neighborhoods.” The Comprehensive Plan defines established neighborhoods as follows:

“Substantial growth is not expected in all neighborhoods. Established neighborhoods are residential areas of predominately single-family housing AND adjacent neighborhood-serving commercial uses. These are areas of stability where the existing character will be essentially maintained.”

SAINT PAUL ZONING CODE

As concerned residents and citizens we urge the Saint Paul Planning Commission and Saint Paul City Council to adhere to the stated purposes of the Saint Paul City Zoning Code, specifically as it purports to:

- Promote and protect the public health, safety, morals, aesthetics, economic viability and general welfare of the community.
- Ensure adequate light, air, privacy, and convenience of access to property
- Provide for safe and efficient circulation of all modes of transportation, including transit, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic.
- Encourage a compatible mix of land uses, at densities that support transit, that reflect the scale, character, and urban design of Saint Paul's existing traditional neighborhoods.
- Conserve and improve property values
- Prevent the overcrowding of land and undue congestion of population

I agree with all of the views stated in this position statement.

Susan O'Neill
14xx Scheffer Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55116

-----Original Message-----

From: Kim Maas [mailto:Kim.Maas@ci.stpaul.mn.us]
Sent: Wednesday, September 6, 2017 11:38 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Stop the Ford Plan

Dear Councilman Prince,

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

Dear Jane,

It was so nice to see you at O'Gara's last week. We wish we had more time to visit with you

We are writing to ask you to vote NO on Snelling Avenue Zoning on September 6th. Holly and I oppose the T3 and T2 Zoning. We feel this type of zoning will eliminate too many single family homes and destroy our wonderful St. Paul neighborhoods.

Jane, thank you for your time. We hope to see you soon.

Best Wishes Always,
Jerry and Holly Farrell
15xx Palace Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105

From: Christa Treichel [mailto:ChristaJT@live.com]

Sent: Monday, September 11, 2017 10:08 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1 <Ward1@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward2 <Ward2@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward5 <Ward5@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward6 <Ward6@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: Stop the Ford Plan

As a resident of Highland Park living on Mississippi River Blvd, I oppose the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan. I request delay of the vote until January 2018. Christa Treichel

From: Rachel Shands [mailto:info@actionnetwork.org]

Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2017 5:43 PM

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.

I affirm my support for the current Ford Site plan which proposes environmental, community and fiscal sustainability.

The current plan provides responsible protection of natural resources, adequate green space, and an opportunity to explore alternative forms of energy.

It also proposes medium and high density housing options which allow aging in place, equitable living opportunities, and expansion of a diverse population.

In addition, the current plan expands Ward 3 and St. Paul's tax base and will enhance commercial and economic opportunity in Ward 3 and the greater city of St. Paul.

Finally, the current plan has been available to the public over the past three years. It is a responsible plan that has been vetted and approved by the City of St. Paul.

Please #SayYesStPaul and vote to adopt the current St. Paul Ford Site plan.

Thank you.

#SayYesStPaul
Rachel Shands
13xx Lincoln Ave
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55105

From: Sam Tsai [mailto:s @gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2017 11:06 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: BIG concern about the development of Ford site in the current plan

Hi,

I am living in 22xx Scheffer Ave, Saint Paul, MN

I am serious concern about the development of ford site in current plan.

Please understand what the big concern the neighborhood has: Traffic and Culture.

By the way, the community is losing the trustee to City and the Council.

City and the Council need to earn the trustee back from the residences in this area in order to make the project moving forward. And this needs time.

Please postpone the timeline, rebuild the trustee, rethink the plan, and lower the density.

YU-MAO TSAI

From: Elena Sunland [mailto:info@actionnetwork.org]
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 4:55 PM
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.

I am an Old Lady in my 70s.

I LOVE Mass Transit.

I LOVE Walking.

I LOVE having shopping options accessible by transit or feet.

I LOVE a neighborhood that has Affordable Housing AS WELL AS other kinds of housing for all income levels.

I am an Environmental Activist.

I have lived in Saint Paul most of my adult life, near Como, near Marshall & Lex, in the Upper Landing, I LOVE SAINT PAUL! I have lived in Highland for the past 4 years, moving here to be nearer my grandchildren.

PLEASE approve the plan so that I can continue to live near family and still live a full life.

Thank you!

Elena Sunland

#SayYesStPaul

Elena Sunland

18xx Scheffer Ave

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55116-1457

From: Christina Kunz [mailto:

Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2017 5:11 PM

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. My husband and I have attended meetings on the Ford plan for 3-4 years. I have admired the expertise and creativity of the staff and volunteers tasked with crafting the plan. I have been awed by the opportunities for public input at every meeting, especially the meetings aimed at certain topics (e.g., traffic, housing, green space, etc.). Between those meetings and the articles in the Villager, I feel well informed about the plan and strongly support it. My only quibble is that I wish there could be a bit more green space, but even without that, I still strongly support the plan as giving the neighborhood and the city a terrific chance to improve the lives of those who will use the site as residents or visitors.

I feel that many of the "Stop the Ford plan" signs have been put up by neighbors who have not stayed informed about the planning process. Some neighbors that I have talked with do not understand that Ford owns the property and will decide who to sell it to. Nor do some neighbors understand that more traffic and density is inevitable, because Ford's sale of the property is inevitable. I keep emphasizing that the city should do everything it can to make sure that the eventual buyer of the property constructs a high-quality well-thought-out forward-thinking community for the century to come. In Highland Park, we've had the good fortune to have a buffer to our south for nearly a century. Now we have the good fortune to help direct the use of that property in a direction that benefits many many people.

We proudly have a "Say Yes" sign in our front yard and are enjoying the conversations that it is generating.

#SayYesStPaul

Christina Kunz

christina.kunz@mitchellhamline.edu

484 Montrose Lane

St. Paul, Minnesota 55116

From: Paul Nelson [mailto:ashland1661@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 7:26 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Cc: Jack Abdo <jack.abdo@aemcpas.com>; Shirley Erstad <shirleyerstad@gmail.com>
Subject: some numbers that may interest you . . .

Dear Council Member Prince:

Some numbers:

850

60

0

850: The approximate number of St. Paul kids (650 boys, 200 girls) who played in the Highland baseball and softball programs this season. Four years ago the number was "only" 700. It's still growing.

60: The number of years Highland baseball has been operating at the Ford Fields location. (I think the precise number is 63.)

0: The amount of money the City of St. Paul has spent on the program in those 63 years.

And here is another 0: The amount of protection given this program in the city's current Ford redevelopment plan.

This program has served the city for more than sixty years, tens of thousands of kids, at no cost to the city. Now, when it needs protection (and protection has been promised, promised, and promised by PED staff), the city's planners look the other way.

Does that seem right to you?

What would you do if a program like this were threatened in your ward?

Paul Nelson
1661 Ashland
St. Paul

PS: Though I support the soccer stadium (and live near it), I also appreciate your skepticism about TIF financing for it. For that stadium, it seems, city planning's attitude is, Let's Get It Done. For our neighborhood baseball program, the attitude seems to be, We Just Can't Find a Way. Hmmm.

Phone and email from:

From: Julie Kaupa [<mailto:@comcast.net>]

Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 3:59 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7

Subject: Please delay the vote on the Ford Site Plan until a new Mayor has been sworn into office this Jan.

Dear Council Member Prince,

I am a resident in the Highland/Macalester Groveland neighborhood and I **OPPOSE** the Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan and you want the City Council to delay the vote until the new Mayor is sworn into office in January.

Please understand that I live in Highland/Mac Groveland and have purchased my home paid taxes for over 20 years. The proposed Ford Site plan would make the site too densely population so that it would drastically affect our neighborhood traffic, infrastructure and air quality and culture of the neighborhood. This development is not appropriate for its location which is a mile off the highway and at a beautiful river front area. Please do not urbanize Highland. We need green space and a variety of housing, but not several apartment/condo buildings over 3 or 4 stories. The neighborhood cannot support the increase in population. This is not what Highland is or stands for and we demand that the council listen to its citizens.

Thank you.

Julie Kaupa
1763 Juliet Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55105

651.698.8884

From: Shirley Erstad [<mailto:s @gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 11:56 AM

To: Prince, Jane (CI-StPaul)

Subject: Ford site conversations in print, online, and my contributions to them

Dear Jane,

I hope you will vote in favor of a world-class development for the world-class site we know as the Ford site. The current plan needs more work and I ask you to vote "NO".

Thank you.

1. A piece I co-wrote was printed in the Pioneer Press on Thursday:

<http://www.twincities.com/2017/09/14/gemberling-erstad-just-ford-site-process-by-openness-and-accountability-not-just-by-number-of-meetings/>

2. Today's PiPress editorial asks for more discussion before the vote. For some weird reason, its not online yet but you can read it in print or keep searching later. The title is, "Take the time to move from antagonism toward agreement on Ford site".

3. I joined an online conversation at tcsidewalks.blogspot.com about public space and share my comments below. Please, feel free to check out the entire conversation on the site.

4. I posted on SPIF under the title, "St. Paul for MVP (Ford site: World-class site deserves World-class development" <http://forums.e-democracy.org/groups/stpaul-issues/messages/topic/27fFZbU1e52ehDyLu0koUr> See my comments below.

See 3. above:

You say you place strong value on social connection and lament privatization. Yet by overbuilding along the river, in our National Park, we promote the exact opposite of what you value. Who will be living in the luxury apartments with river views? The rich. Who will be looking at the forever-changed skyline that now is a tree canopy when on the river? All the rest of us suckers.

I've been on the river since the 75' building was built at Victoria Park. It has forever changed the experience of being on the river. What once looked like a nature preserve, thanks to that one building, is no longer. Imagine what the only gorge on the Mighty Mississippi will look like after we've lined the bluff with buildings above the tree canopy.

Rent for those penthouse views? I personally do not know but I was told \$4,500 a month in a public meeting. If that's affordable housing then our leadership has a very different view of the income level of their constituents than I do.

What did St. Paul do with the riverfront in the heyday you mention? They turned it into a National Park.

If downtown St. Paul were bursting at the seams, if the other Wards in our city were overflowing, then there might be a case for vertical building. But if this plan is approved, there will be a giant sucking sound in those Wards and badly-needed investment in other parts of our city will be delayed, again. Do you argue that the immigrant communities that already live here do not deserve the same kind of passion and fervor that you pour into the future citizens of our community? Do you argue that the recreation centers that were closed and that contribute to the lack of our current young residents having a place to go should be put aside in favor of future citizens that may or may not show up?

Parks are a vital part of the community fabric you so passionately believe in. Yet, this plan allows building in a National Park, “America’s Best Idea”, according to documentarian Ken Burns. The city does not have the tools to guarantee that parks will be part of this development.

If you are as committed as you say to community space, then fight for a zoning designation that, literally, puts parks on these zoning maps.

If you truly believe in public space and not privatization, then fight for a stronger parkland dedication ordinance that doesn’t allow the option to pay a fee instead of give land.

Mayor Coleman, city planners, Council Member Tolbert, and your fellow Planning Commissioner, Kyle Makarios, went to five European countries to learn from them on what makes a world-class city. I attended the Planning Commission meeting when Ms. Clapp-Smith and Mr. Makarios reported on their trip.

They unequivocally described the premise of those great developments in those great cities, “When you build buildings higher than five stories, an interesting thing happens. People no longer come out of their ‘towers’ and the community feeling is lost.”

Yet, those same folks on that European Tour came back to St. Paul, heard from developers about the need for tall buildings in our National Park, and somehow “unlearned” that lesson.

Staff has told me that buildings need to be high for development to be marketable. “Lobby ceilings need to be 13’ high”. Developers may WANT 13’ lobby ceilings but we don’t NEED them. People aren’t that tall! Lob off 3’ and we have a shorter building in our National Park, the same number of people in the building, and the only difference is a shorter lobby chandelier.

Developers are driving the zoning in this plan. Zoning (the tool courts have given the city to implement our vision for our community) is not driving the development. That’s not how leadership is supposed to work. That’s not caring for a National Park. That’s selling to the highest bidder.

The Mayor has said, “frankly, developers are salivating” and “this will be a world-class development”. I believe him on the first part but the second will not come to pass with this plan.

Put your energy where your mouth is. Fight for public space.

See 4 above.

The Mayor has said the Ford site is a World-Class site. I agree. It deserves a world-class development.

IVP to turn St. Paul into MVP.

Imagination

Vision

Persistence

lead to

Most

Valuable

Places

Central Park in New York City. Millennium Park in Chicago. The Presidio in San Francisco. These are world-class sites that make the land around them more valuable.

New Orleans is on one end of the navigable Mighty Mississippi and we're on the other. We hold the banner for this, not that other city across the river to our west. Why are we not viewing this site as a tourist destination?

Eco-tourism is on the rise while the market for luxury apartments in the Twin Cities has peaked. Remember when the Mayor talked about Viking River Cruises coming to town?

The current plan needs more work. By its very definition, not all ideas are "Best Ideas". I am reminded of the decision to put a jail on the riverfront in downtown St. Paul. Turns out, not such a best idea. Indeed, I am told that immediately upon its completion, the inmates discovered all that shiny glass made for a great stage and the best idea needed a quick upgrade, at tax-payer expense, of course. Recently, Ramsey County residents paid \$19 million (and the writing is on the wall that we'll be dishing out more) to re-develop the site of that best idea.

Smart planning and smart design save us money in the long run.

The following is a response I penned to Bill Lindeke's written comments on the need for community space, among other things. In the interest of space, I will attach the link to our conversation here.

<http://tcsidewalks.blogspot.com/2017/09/an-open-letter-to-charles-hathaway.html?m=1>
<<http://tcsidewalks.blogspot.com/2017/09/an-open-letter-to-charles-hathaway.html?m=1>>

Full disclosure: I write this as my personal opinion. Within my rights as a private citizen, I serve on the Steering Committee of Saint Paul STRONG. In my professional life, I am the Executive Director of Friends of the Parks and Trails of St. Paul and Ramsey County.

Here is an editorial I co-wrote that was printed in the Pioneer Press on Thursday:

<http://www.twincities.com/2017/09/14/gemberling-erstad-just-ford-site-process-by-openness-and-accountability-not-just-by-number-of-meetings/>
<<http://www.twincities.com/2017/09/14/gemberling-erstad-just-ford-site-process-by-openness-and-accountability-not-just-by-number-of-meetings/>>

Today's Pioneer Press editorial also urges more time before the City Council votes. For some crazy reason, its not online yet, but read it in print or keeping looking for it at Twincities.com <<http://twincities.com/>>
The title is, "Take the time to move from antagonism toward agreement on Ford Site."

From: SGH comcast [mailto:sgheegaard@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 9:55 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: please vote yes on the Ford plan - it's a starting point

Dear Councilmember Prince,

My name is Susan Heegaard and I have lived in Highland for more than 20 years with my husband and 2 kids - we chose to live in St. Paul (I am from a many generation Minneapolis family) after moving back to MN. Please consider voting yes on the Ford site plan. I have concerns and worries (mostly about density and traffic) but am more for than against the plan. It is a starting point and we will be in a better bargaining position with a plan prior to the sale and prior to the election of the next mayor. I worry that a delay will open us up to a big stall. The criticism of Chris Tolbert and fuzzy facts presented by the opponents of the plan are troubling. I also think that there are a few opponents who behave as if their voice and view matters more than the rest of the neighborhood. We all live here and Councilmember speaks for me and my family as well as many neighbors and friends. We are not the island of Highland, we are part of the city and county too. I want a viable and welcoming city for years to come. Please vote yes.

Thank you, Respectfully, Susan Heegaard

651-324-0174

From: Pratik Joshi [mailto:jpratik@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 8:38 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Reconsider the Ford site redevelopment plan

Dear Councilmember Prince,

The city planners need to rethink the priorities as expressed in the draft Ford Site Zoning and Public Realm Master Plan, particularly related to the number of dwelling units and parking spaces.

The planners tout this to be concentrated urban development where people live, work and play, yet they are open to the possibility of having more than 10,000 additional vehicles in the 122-acre site given the number of proposed dwelling units and the mixed use development on the parcel.

The draft document also states the possibility of developers suggesting amendments when drawing up the final plans.

The Multimodal Transportation Study and Report for the site also glosses over the potential problems of congestion in an already congested area. It downplays the external trips generated to and from the Ford site. People who live in condos/apartments and like to bike and hike do not necessarily give up their vehicles, particularly in areas known for sub-zero temperatures.

I wonder if the planners are expecting to have new jobs/offices move to the Ford site , or they are expecting jobs/offices to move from other parts of the Twin Cities? Chances of the latter being the case are disproportionately high, and in that case one can only surmise the number of workers who'll be driving back and forth.

The Highland Park area already suffers from a traffic congestion problem, which can only become much more acute given the proposed development at the Ford site. It'll also severely lower the quality of life in Highland Park. Also, the proposed density at the Ford site potentially can add to urban crime in our neighborhood. The incidence of violent crime per square mile rise rather than fall with population density. Imagine its impact on the property values in the neighborhood?

I've read in newspapers that the draft plan was approved in a rush and that the St. Paul City Council is only concerned about expanding its tax base, and lining the pockets of developers in the process with total disregard to the wishes of the people who call Highland Park home.

I ask the St. Paul City Council members to show this is not the case and that they not approve the Planning Commission's report. The council should ask the commission to rethink its position.

We are not against development, but it should take into account what's feasible and is in the long-term interest of the area and the city. If the neighborhood becomes unlivable, people aren't going to stay here. We should limit the number of dwellings to less than 2000.

I wonder if we can ask the Ford Co. to donate the land to the city and get a tax write-off, allowing the city to avoid the temptation to maximize density in the proposed development.

Let the development of the Ford site be an opportunity for this council to leave a lasting legacy.

Thanks

Regards

Pratik Joshi

1690 Beechwood Ave.

PRESS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
SEPTEMBER 18, 2017

CONTACT: Carl Kuhl
651.245.9313
carl@connollykuhlgroup.com

REPEATED LACK OF DUE PROCESS AND FAILURE TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW CALLED OUT BY NEIGHBORS FOR LIVABLE SAINT PAUL ON FORD SITE ZONING PROCESS

**Massive pollution, failure to follow established procedures and slow-walking of Data Practices
Request information may lead to effort to secure injunction to prevent final vote on Ford site zoning plan**

(Saint Paul, MN) Attorney Fritz Knaak called the repeated lack of due process and failure to respond to public's right to know by the City of St. Paul some of the most egregious failures he has seen in decades of practicing law.

"Misrepresenting the opposition of residents to the Ford site zoning plan, failing to follow established protocols by the Highland District Council in delivering nearly 1,000 voices of dissent to the plan to the City Council are just the tip of the iceberg of the City's failure to follow due process," said Knaak at a Saint Paul City Hall Press Conference. "Worse, the fact that the City Council is failing to hold Ford Motor Company's feet to the fire to clean up 100% of the pollution at the site before a zoning plan is passed is simply unacceptable."

Knaak cited a July 14th letter to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency in which Friends of the Mississippi River Executive Director Whitney Clark raises concerns over the failure of the Ford Area C Comprehensive Site History & Investigation Report II to deal with significant pollution issues:

"Overall, there is significant understated water quality contamination at the site and a significant risk of future contamination to groundwater and the Mississippi River that is not adequately addressed in the Report."

In one section of Clark's letter to MPCA entitled **"Thallium as an example Water Quality Parameter that is an Understated Risk in the Investigation Report"** Thallium is determined to be on the Ford site in significant amounts and its impact on public health is described this way:

"Thallium has been called the "poisoner's poison" since it is colorless, odorless, and tasteless."

Knaak addressed a series of failure on the part of the City to follow its own processes leading up to the planned final vote on September 27th and also slammed the City for failing to respond to his clients multiple requests for public data in a timely manner.

"Time and time again the people of this community have asked for information to understand why the City is hell bent on passing this zoning change to the Ford Plant Site without any publicly stated deadline," said Knaak. "Whats the rush? What's the hurry? Why is the City Council not doing its own due diligence in demanding Ford clean up the land they polluted?"

Above all else, Knaak said the City Council should delay any final vote on the Ford zoning plan until citizen's concerns have been addressed, public information disgorged and the community can lead the conversation on a plan that is better suited to the future of Saint Paul.

"What possible reason could the City of Saint Paul have for not listening to its citizens," asked Knaak. "Unless there's some secret agreements or discussions that have taken place outside of the public space that would, in and of themselves, simply further the need to go to court to ask for an injunction to stop the City from moving forward."

From: Tom Traxler [mailto: @gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2017 3:11 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7
Cc: Harr, Stephanie (CI-StPaul); Heintz, Polly (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Opposition to The Ford Plan - Please Promote an Active Recreation Area, Low Density

Hello Jane:

Just thought I would send you a quick note concerning my opposition to the current plan for the Ford land.

Please read over the email below and let me know your thoughts on my comments concerning the current Ford Plan being pushed/forced on the Ward 3 constituents.

90% of the land should be dedicated to "Active" recreation. An "active" recreation area with an Amphitheater, fields for baseball, soccer, lacrosse, cross country skiing trails, bike trails, ice skating, ice hockey & sled hockey rinks, football, tennis courts, pickle ball, basketball courts, archery. There should be no multiple story buildings. No apartment buildings. No more than 50 Single family homes. The homes would consist of 3,500 or more square feet per home. These homes should be situated on the river bluff.

A minimum of 15 acres should be allocated/used for farming - local residents can grow vegetables, raise chickens.....

Plant many pine trees, maple trees, oak trees. The active recreation area would be a year round destination area. There are plenty of businesses in the area already. No need for more businesses.

The current plan is being forced on the people. The constituents will not accept the current Ford plan. It needs to be scaled to provide active recreation for young and the not so young minds and bodies. We need to build an area that will provide sustained healthy active life styles for all.

Thank you for your attention. Good luck in all your efforts to support the constituents. Not an easy job as you well know. I look forward to hearing from you.

Tom Traxler
1780 Scheffer Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55116

From: Sam Tsai [mailto: @gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2017 11:06 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: BIG concern about the development of Ford site in the current plan

Hi,

I am living in 2215 Scheffer Ave, Saint Paul, MN

I am serious concern about the development of ford site in current plan.

Please understand what the big concern the neighborhood has: Traffic and Culture.

By the way, the community is losing the trustee to City and the Council.

City and the Council need to earn the trustee back from the residences in this area in order to make the project moving forward. And this needs time.

Please postpone the timeline, rebuild the trustee, rethink the plan, and lower the density.

YU-MAO TSAI

From: Rachel Shands [mailto:info@actionnetwork.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2017 5:43 PM
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.

I affirm my support for the current Ford Site plan which proposes environmental, community and fiscal sustainability.

The current plan provides responsible protection of natural resources, adequate green space, and an opportunity to explore alternative forms of energy.

It also proposes medium and high density housing options which allow aging in place, equitable living opportunities, and expansion of a diverse population.

In addition, the current plan expands Ward 3 and St. Paul's tax base and will enhance commercial and economic opportunity in Ward 3 and the greater city of St. Paul.

Finally, the current plan has been available to the public over the past three years. It is a responsible plan that has been vetted and approved by the City of St. Paul.

Please #SayYesStPaul and vote to adopt the current St. Paul Ford Site plan.

Thank you.

#SayYesStPaul

Rachel Shands

rachel.shands@yahoo.com

1320 Lincoln Ave

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55105

From: Karen Hudson [mailto:k @gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, September 11, 2017 9:34 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward5 <Ward5@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward6 <Ward6@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul_Ward7 <Ward7@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: I live in the Highland area and I support the Ford Plan

Council Members, I live at 1962 Fairmount Avenue in the Mac Groveland neighborhood and do much of my shopping and errand running in Highland Village. I strongly SUPPORT the Ford Plan. We need more high density and affordable housing in St Paul. I also strongly support maximizing the use of renewable energy in the development.

On a personal note, the Stop the Ford Plan door hangers and lawn signs from my fellow citizens are disappointing and annoying.

Thank you for your public service.

Best Regards,

Karen Hudson

651-226-5482

From: Kevin Flynn [mailto:info@actionnetwork.org]
Sent: Friday, September 8, 2017 12:05 PM
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.

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