

Feedback Form Responses

Fairview Avenue Mill and Overlay & Pedestrian Improvements Project
City of Saint Paul Department of Public Works
July 2023

This document includes unformatted and exported responses collected by a Feedback Form during public engagement. The Feedback Form was available to the public on the project webpage between mid-April and the end of May 2023.



SAINT PAUL
MINNESOTA

With all of the concern about pedestrian convenience and safety, this would be a perfect time to install sidewalks along Fairview where they are missing. I do not appreciate having to cross Fairview to walk my dog, especially in the winter

My husband and I own a home on the 1700 block of Scheffer Ave., and we frequently cross Fairview at Eleanor and Bayard. We are so pleased that bump outs and medians are being planned on Fairview as we feel like we often have to walk onto Fairview to get driver's attention to stop so that we can cross. We wait as many, many cars drive through the intersection without knowledge or regard for pedestrian right of way.

Concerned about biking along this stretch of Fairview with the addition of medians. My husband bikes this daily to get to work. Currently, vehicles move into the middle turn lane when passing a bicyclist. Concerns around plowing at intersections with medians. Concerned about boxing in residents and visitors with these medians plus those along Snelling and medians in place on St Paul Ave. It's going to make for a frustrating experience. Concerns around traffic flow/impact for the several schools that are in this immediate area--only one of which is a community school (Horace Mann) with a high number of kids that walk to it. This area of Highland has a lot of homes with driveways to the street vs. alleys. Concerned about medians doubling traffic on streets where people are backing out of driveways. I already have a difficult time getting out of my driveway. Also, why is this info only being shared now--6 months from the project date? Looking for historical data on pedestrian vs. car accidents and other data this decision is being based on.

Has there been any considerations or research around the likelihood of u-turns along Fairview or cross streets to avoid the medians - and any traffic or accident-related impacts?

Have there been any studies or analysis of how it will impact traffic on neighboring roads (cars will be forced to take different routes to get on/off Fairview)? Will the medians cause issues in the winter with snow removal and narrowing of the road? How will it impact emergency vehicles ability to get through? It seems like Pedestrian crossing signals (like on Jefferson and Cretin) is all that is needed to improve safety. Are there studies showing the safety impact of this type of medians in other areas?

1) I want to know more about the median island planned for Fairview @ Saunders. Can you explain how having the island will help pedestrians cross Fairview Ave? There will still be traffic traveling freely on Fairview, so I'm not seeing the benefit of the island. I am concerned that restricting left-turning traffic on (and onto) Fairview and Saunders, plus restricting straight-traveling on Saunders through the Fairview intersection, will cause motorists to be making many more turns to get to their destinations, and thus be more of a traffic hazard than the current situation. Drivers get impatient when they have to make a circuitous route to their destinations.

2) Is it possible to have a safer bike lane on Fairview? The current lane is narrow, and the sidewalks parallel to Fairview have drop-off (instead of sloped) curbs, which makes biking on them impossible.

As a homeowner on Fairview, how much money am I going to have to put aside to cover the cost for the mill and overlay portion of this project?

I do not support the idea of adding Medians or Bumpouts. As a actual pedestrian and someone that uses the infrastructure, I find that these proposed infrastructures do not increase my perceived safety but in fact severely less my safety.

This is the first I am hearing about this project, but yet the plan seems already set. I am not in support of the proposed plan. Why is this only the first we are hearing about this? I had no say, neither did my neighbors. Why are the people that this will impact the most not allowed to make this decision or have primary say? Where is the decision coming from that this is best for this community? Clearly, not from the actual community members, or if it is, a significantly biased sample.

We read the the recent mailing about mill/overlay/curb extensions and medians and have numerous concerns. The first of which is - You say work will commence this summer? That's only a few weeks away! So why are we just hearing about this now? We've already made plans with neighbors for a summer yard sale.

Next, how are we supposed to get in and out of our driveway during this mess? Not only do we need to be able to get in and out but our family members and delivery people need access to our home. We can't be isolated in our house all summer and into the fall.

Another concern - we live a half block north of Eleanor. I certainly hope the median planned will not prevent us from turning left into our driveway.

1. Are you planning to remove the original crosswalk at Bayard now that a second one has been added at that intersection?

2. Will you be adding sidewalk to the west side of Fairview between Randolph and Ford Parkway? It is hard for this area to be pedestrian friendly and safe without sidewalk on that side of the busy street. There is still a need for pedestrians to walk to the crosswalks, so they are either walking on the shoulder of the road or on the lawns of homes on the west side of Fairview.

3. Have you considered adding crossing lights at Bayard and/or Eleanor? (the kind that are on Cretin and are initiated by pedestrians wanting to cross.) I have requested these lights before, as I have children who cross Fairview when they walk to school, but I was told that there was not money in the budget to support them. This road project sounds like it is a larger investment than adding crossing lights at the existing crosswalk at Bayard.

4. Have you studied or will you plan to study the impact of this change on the level of traffic on Bayard, once cars are not able to turn left onto or from Eleanor? Bayard only has sidewalk on the south side of the street, so residents on the north either walk on the road or need to cross the street to get to a sidewalk. Adding traffic will have impacts on the pedestrian-friendliness of Bayard (not to mention on the wear and tear and pollution on the street). Also, do you know if bus routes, such as those to Horace Mann School, that were on Eleanor will need to be redirected onto Bayard as the result of this project?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not necessary on our street. How many pedestrians actually cross our street? What are the current crash rates and injury severity for pedestrians on our street?

Comments/questions regarding the project's objectives:

1. Improve safety for people walking.

Question: Will the project include installing a sidewalk on Fairview (the west side) between Randolph and Highland Parkway? Currently, I walk on the street or onto people's lawns. In the winter the street is the only option. Very dangerous.

Will a pedestrian crossing signs be put up at designated crossings or will pedestrian crossing lights be installed?

2. Improve pavement surface. " The crews will mill or remove apps two inches of roadway and then overlay/repave the street with new asphalt."

Question: ONLY TWO INCHES removed! (Todays potholes are five plus inches deep in many, many areas) How much asphalt (Inches) will be put on the street after two inches of roadway is removed? Is the road resurfacing engineered to hold up to our winters? What is the life of the resurfacing work?

3. Installing Bumpouts.

Question: Will you guarantee that they will not obstruct or impede emergency vehicles, delivery trucks, garbage trucks, recycle trucks, school buses, and snow plows?

Please post answers.

GWW

I love the improvements that are planned for Fairview Ave. As someone who regularly crosses Fairview on foot and bicycle, often with a young child, these improvements are much needed. Vehicle traffic speeds are too fast on that section and I believe these traffic calming improvements will help make it safer for everyone and more usable for everybody. Please continue to implement these traffic calming projects throughout Saint Paul. Thank you,

I do not support the supposed pedestrian improvements. I am most concerned with the median at the intersection of Eleanor Avenue and Fairview Avenue. With Eleanor Avenue being such a long street, the proposal will add significant mileage over the course of one's residency in this area (I could explain the increase, but if you are unwilling to look for it yourself, you will be unwilling to hear the viewpoint of another, hence, I will not waste my time). Increased mileage translates to increased potential for vehicular and pedestrian accidents; now transferred to streets that are more residential versus arterial, where children and residents are not accustomed to the level of traffic. The increased mileage will also translate to increased pollution, whether it be from the gas vehicles or the pollution formed from the generation of electricity or the manufacturing of solar panels or other renewables energy components needed to power the electric vehicles on the streets. How is increased vehicular manslaughter and global pollution preferential for Saint Paul's 2040 plan?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will make it harder for emergency vehicles to access our street. How will this impact the safety and response time for people who need urgent help?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the risk and difficulty of driving on slippery and steep slopes in winter. The city does not do an adequate job of plowing as it is, and the rerouting requires those residing on my block to navigate hills - while currently there is a flat route to Fairview. I am particularly opposed to the median at Eleanor and Fairview

For the median islands planned on Fairview at Eleanor, Bohland, and Saunders...will these median islands change traffic patterns for the two adjacent alleys? Or will it just impact the traffic patterns at the main street intersections of Fairview with Eleanor, Bohland, and Saunders?

Median islands are not suitable for our climate and weather conditions. How will they withstand snow plowing and how will they be cleared and maintained during winter?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will change the character and appearance of our street. How will this affect the property values and aesthetics of our neighborhood? Who was consulted in the design process? What I have seen throughout the city is that pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are a collection place for sand and debris with weeds growing up between cracks and cement seams. There is always litter on these islands that street maintenance can't get with their sweepers to. This will become an eye sore. I feel that public works has enough work that they can't keep up with, without adding to their list and slowing them down on right of ways. I oppose this idea.

Overall, I'm very excited about this project but I do have two questions:

1. Does Saint Paul's assessment policy take into account that Fairview Avenue is a major road that serves the entire area and is built accordingly? Houses on Fairview don't get any special benefit from the street beyond what we would get if our houses were on a local road. Are our assessments adjusted to be the same as what they would be if we were living on a standard 32-36 foot wide local road in a 60 foot right-of-way?
2. Is it possible to fill some or all of the sidewalk gaps on the west side of Fairview Avenue as part of this project? There are some sections such as Bayard to Highland Parkway that would be easy to implement as the boulevards are relatively free of encroachments.

I live on Saunders Ave. between Fairview and Davern. I regularly need to make a left turn from south bound Fairview onto east bound Saunders. I especially need to do this when it is snowing. Yes it would make crossing Fairview one direction at a time easier but aren't cars suppose to stop for people in cross walks. I am apposed to putting an island at Fairview and Saunders.

I am extremely concerned about the shortsightedness and improper planning involved with the proposed addition of pedestrian bumpouts and pedestrian median islands. Has there been any thought or concern giving to the impact that this additional infrastructure will have on emergency vehicles? It seems evident that there will be some increased time needed to navigate these new unneeded obstacles, for my own resident, I am anticipating at least an additional 30 seconds will be needed to maneuver these obstacles, likely more. These 30 seconds could have been all it would have taken to save a life that will now be forfeited because of unneeded and unwanted pedestrian infrastructure.

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will cost a lot of money to install and maintain. How will this affect our taxes and budget priorities? Who will pay for the upkeep of the infrastructure?

Median islands and Pedestrian bumpouts will make it harder for delivery trucks and the occasional use of buses to maneuver on our street. How will this affect the service and reliability of these vehicles? How will the turning radii and curb extensions be designed?

Median islands will create more challenges for winter maintenance of plantings and street trees if there will be some. How will this affect the survival and growth of these plants? How will the plantings and trees be protected and cared for? Most of the time the plants and trees on the islands look dead with weeds that have taken over. This is just another stupid idea from city planners!

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will disrupt the traffic flow in our neighborhood. Vehicles will reroute and drive on streets that are unaccustomed to traffic and create an increased danger for the children living on those streets. Specifically Josephine where the sidewalks do not have a boulevard.

We interact with this corridor, Fairview Avenue, on a daily basis. We drive daily and use the corridor as a bikers or pedestrians with our family and dogs 6-7 times per week. We are extremely excited about the improvements to pedestrian safety, especially the use of medians to restrict where cars can turn and as a place for pedestrians to land as they cross Fairview. We are also very excited that this work will be coordinated with the improvements on Snelling Avenue. We use both of these corridors on a daily basis. Each of these projects will require us to adjust our driving patterns, but this minor inconvenience is small compared to the overall benefit us and the thousands who interact with the corridors will receive in terms of creating a livable community. For Fairview, we will be much safer walking and biking as a family, something we do 6-7 times per week. We will feel much safer letting our kid cross this corridor to visit friends, use the library/community center and travel to the Highland Bridge Development. Thank you for your thoughtful planning. The only area I hope you consider adjusting is to include trees or planted grasses in the medians.

I have questions about the median island at Fairview Avenue and Saunders Avenue. There is currently not a turn lane on Fairview Avenue and thus I am concerned about the medians placement and what this means for the location of the driving lanes. I live on this corner and observe traffic flow on a daily basis. The risk to pedestrians is not cars turning on and off Saunders but speeding on Fairview. Moving the driving lanes closer to the sidewalks to make room for a center median in my opinion would cause a greater risk to pedestrians than the current set-up. Moving the driving lanes closer to the sidewalk will also make biking nearly impossible on Fairview and will greatly impact snow plowing and sidewalk management in the winter. I walk across Fairview on a daily basis alone as an adult and with children. I do agree something needs to be done to make crossing safer but feel this solution is going from zero to hero. As of now there is not even a painted zebra crossing on these roads, nor any signage. Could we not start there first to save tax payer dollars and not overcomplicated things? From there could we track and monitor the situation to decide if more would in fact need to be done?

Same goes for Bohland, I think we can start smaller. There is a turn lane already so in place so the issues I have for Saunders differ, but I am curious to why we are choosing to prevent turning down the wider Bohland Ave. I feel that diverting traffic to the narrower roads of Beechwood and Rome will not only create more of a risk to pedestrians (including my children whom walk to school down these routes) but will also cause traffic disruption and make winter driving more difficult.

We are STRONGLY IN FAVOR of the proposed medians as planned by the city. In the past couple of weeks I have visited with a half dozen of my neighbors and they share my support for the proposed median at Fairview and Bohland.

Our support for the medians are based on three things:

1. Pedestrian safety. We have lived two houses away from the Bohland/Fairview intersection for over 15 years and have repeatedly witnessed the struggle students going to and from schools have getting safely across the intersection, and the struggle of adults, many of whom are seniors, safely crossing Fairview to go to the library or the village. I have worked from home for the entire period we have lived here and I have watched this dangerous situation on a weekly basis. Just a couple of weeks ago I saw a student start to cross the intersection, because a car had stopped for him, only to be nearly hit by a vehicle coming from the opposite direction when the student was in the middle of Fairview. It's a highly dangerous situation I have seen play out over and over again.
2. Traffic calming. Fairview has gotten incredibly busy, due, in part, to the fact that it has become a commuter route. With the popularity of the neighborhood on the increase, the Highland Bridge development, etc. that traffic flow will likely increase. Many of these drivers travel down Fairview at a high speed, are distracted, etc. Medians are a proven traffic-calming device and their presence would help to improve safety in our neighborhoods.
3. Through traffic I know the upcoming Snelling Avenue redo will allow cross traffic in both directions to drive east onto Bohland Avenue. Without the proposed median, Bohland Avenue will become a thoroughfare from Snelling to St. Paul Avenue and the village. (This is an issue many of my neighbors are most concerned about.)

I am very concerned with this plan for pedestrians and drivers. The medians will create more confusion and issues than solve for kids crossing the street, specifically at Bohland Ave. What else was considered? What are the other options, I hope this was not the go to solution. This will cause major traffic issues and rerouting issues specifically on Bohland Ave. I am more concerned with the U-turns and this will have no impact on the speeds on Fairview, but will also impact traffic on other side streets. As someone who walks and crosses Fairview, I would not want my children waiting on the median. This seems like a lazy solution and I sincerely hope you CAN and WILL do better. I am also concerned that the real issue with the walkability of Fairview is not being considered as the side walks are very rough.

Thanks for taking questions during today's meeting. Jimmy represented the project well. I am in favor of medians and bump-outs in the intended locations. Driving on Fairview is too fast. Walking along Fairview is too dangerous. I sense this project will improve safety for walking, biking and driving. A note for you, I only had today's meeting on my radar by reading the HDC enews. I did not receive the letter at XXXX Ford. I will share the PDF w/ residents at [other properties] on Ford.

The median at Bohland will likely redirect families dropping off and picking up at Highland Catholic to now turn left onto Beechwood to follow to the curve where it meets with Bohland. Beechwood is a much narrower street that is already an issue when there isn't snow and adding additional traffic on a narrow street is very concerning. There is also not a stop sign at Beechwood and Howell which is a cause for pedestrian and vehicle safety concerns with the additional volume of traffic going to Highland Catholic. What mitigations will be taken to alleviate this additional traffic and safety concerns?

Why city engineers want to put a median on Fairview blocking access to Eleanor is confounding. This median will disrupt the flow of traffic and cause more congestion on Highland Parkway by cutting off Eleanor.

I avoid driving east or west on Highland Parkway through Fairview because it's very difficult to cross at that intersection. In my years here, I have seen 5-6 accidents at this intersection and many more near misses. I've never seen an accident going east or west on Eleanor crossing Fairview. The Highland/Fairview intersection is difficult to monitor with the larger separation between lanes. So much going on here especially when you add bikes and pedestrians. By blocking Eleanor, more traffic will be directed to Highland whereas Eleanor is a 'release valve' for the congestion. When Highland gets backed up with more cars trying to cross Fairview because they can't cross at Eleanor, drivers will take more chances because of the wait. Then we'll see more accidents. It is also an inconvenience for those of us parking on Eleanor. For example, traveling from US Bank on Cleveland & Eleanor to our houses east of Fairview, we will need to turn right onto Fairview, head south to Highland Parkway, and wait in the left turn lane to head east on Highland, adding congestion to an already busy intersection.

I spoke to Jimmy Shoemaker, project staff member noted in the pedestrian improvement letter. He told me it will be easier for pedestrians to cross at Eleanor if they have a place to stop in the median "to rest." How many people are even crossing here? Also, the west side of Fairview north of Highland Parkway has no sidewalk. To direct pedestrians to walk in the street to the Eleanor median and expect them to walk on someone's lawn is inconvenient and dangerous. People will still cross at the congested Highland Parkway/Fairview intersection.

Why the median is not being constructed at Scheffer or Bayard? Where is the traffic study that makes sense for this decision? What are the facts that city engineers know about the dynamics of car and pedestrian traffic on Highland Parkway/Fairview/Eleanor?

1. I walk a lot and am all for pedestrian safety, however I wonder whether you've done counts of students using the Bohland and Saunders intersections. A small island would suffice. There never will be such a crowd that the full width of the median island is populated with crossing pedestrians.
2. The street is not wide like Snelling so a large median island is not needed.
3. Traffic flow to/from Highland Catholic will be routed on adjoining streets, including Howell/Beechwood which has a Stop sign that people generally roll through. The line for student pickup will spread to Beechwood for those coming from the south, adding to traffic and possibly idling cars. Have you worked with the school on routing options? It's very well orchestrated now.
4. The current turn lane on Fairview is needed for cars to safely pass bicycles (I am also a rider), for bikes to avoid potholes, and for getting around snow drifts in the winter. Big medians will eliminate that space and reduce overall safety.
5. Bumpouts at Bayard and Highland may result in narrower bike lanes.

I heard during the May 9 info meeting that the medians will allow homeowners access to their alleys. However, south of Ford, there are no alleys, so medians will block homeowner's access to their street-facing driveways. They will also add additional traffic to streets where children play and people are backing out of their driveways onto the residential streets. Please reconsider medians south of Ford. Can you please consider smaller islands that don't block left turns in this area? We are a 1-car family. As someone who regularly crosses Fairview in the project area and walks along Fairview between Montreal and Ford to access the A-line bus, walk to the library, etc. I am appreciative of attention by the city to improve pedestrian safety. However, I'm already more nervous about walking along Fairview than I am about crossing it. These expansive medians will bring cars closer to me as I walk to the bus stop...and there no longer will be a middle lane for cars to move into to pass by. My husband bikes to work on Fairview from south of Ford to Randolph Ave. and has said he will no longer use this route if cars get closer to him. Can you consider other traffic calming and pedestrian safety options? What about making more painted crosswalks, flashing lights, etc.? Smaller medians? I heard that these options were not considered due to ongoing maintenance costs for painting, yet also heard that the medians will require ongoing maintenance (shoveling in the winter, which is already an ongoing pain point for the city). Your example of other places in the city where this exact solution has been implemented shows a school/field at one of the four corners. This is not an appropriate comparison. In that situation, an entire block of houses is replaced by a field--the impact to residents is less because there are *less homes*.

As an avid neighborhood walker and bicyclist, alone, with friends, and with my children, I am very excited for these improvements. The resurfacing is a no-brainer and the traffic calming impact of the bumpouts and median safe havens are significant benefits to our neighborhood, especially as our children get older and venture out on their own. I look forward to eventual further improvements like adding a sidewalk on the west side of Fairview and appreciate that those are on the city's radar too. Thanks for your research, diligence, and effort to get this done. I strongly believe more people support this project than are opposed.

I am opposed to the concept of pedestrian bumpouts and pedestrian median islands, they are ugly, unsightly, and do not belong in our neighborhood. I can speak best to the proposed one at Eleanor Avenue, and although it is unfortunate that the desires of the taxpayers will have no affect, I would still like to share my feedback and would appreciate someone to truly research the matter more. At Eleanor Avenue, on the west side of Fairview Avenue, there is a utility pole that occasionally inhibits the viewing on oncoming traffic; as a result, cars creep out in an attempt to view the traffic and determine when it is safe to proceed with a turn or continue straight, this behavior was particularly exacerbated during the winter when a huge snow pile was also placed at the edge of the Fairview Avenue curb by the city, not from normal plowing but from cleaning up after the main snow trucks. As drivers display this behavior of creeping out, there is currently no issue and the risk for accident is low; however, with the addition of the byproduct of wasteful spending, a pedestrian median island, the driver's ability to circumvent and avoid this accident will be severely hindered without the center lane and the addition of elevated concrete. If the median island gets constructed, this accident-prone behavior will be especially true in winter, when conditionals are slippery and cars edge out even more to avoid getting stuck; this has the potential to lead to far more crashes and more dangerous situations for both drivers. I suspect this will shift a very low risk from pedestrians and intensify it towards motorists. Additionally, if a pedestrian is in proximity to cars, it is in everyone's best interest for the drivers to maintain control of their vehicles and the city to plane according to prevent crashes, a crash at such speed could easily harm the pedestrian at the scene. It is disheartening that pedestrian safety, when considered holistically, has no impact on the decision for the remodel of Fairview Avenue, but instead the priorities are controlling traffic and making cars less efficient.

Please also consider changing the sidewalks on Fairview so that there is a buffer strip of grass between the sidewalk and street. Cars drive very fast and it's an unpleasant experience being so close. Having some separation from the road would help.

These comments pertain specifically to Fairview between Ford and Montreal:(You implies the City)* Where are the traffic studies? * You stated that inserting medians is to improve pedestrian safety and calm traffic. Please inform us of any accidents that have occurred in this area with pedestrians.* You stated that you have had complaints about the safety of crossing Fairview. Did you take a survey so that you would hear the voices of those who do not have any problem with that? Please provide that or the statistics of your logged complaints. Folks with no problems typically do not notify you that there is "no problem."* You are proposing blocking a left onto Bohland where Highland Catholic School is located and funneling that traffic down Beechwood Ave which is: - the narrowest street - there is a group home on this block which has many calls for assistance from the fire department. I am sure they would be happy to provide you with those numbers. The narrowness of Beechwood if there are cars parked on both sides makes this almost impassable for them especially in the winter. - There are houses on Beechwood that have no garages so they must park in the street - Howell has no stop sign which will prove very dangerous with increased traffic. - Highland Catholic's carline is on the north of side of Bohland to provide safety so children do not have to cross the street. - You suggested going down Ford and taking a left on Kenneth. There is no left tun signal at that light. Kenneth is again a narrow street that both school and city buses use. - Cars already park on both sides of that street. - Redirected traffic from Bohland will not use Hillcrest as it is a dead end.* There is another school involved here that has even a higher number of younger children - Highland Park Elementary. When I drove by there the other day they too have a large car line that wraps around the block that should be considered.*Parents on both sides of Fairview have always taught their children not to go near or cross a busy street at a young age. So to the best of my knowledge no child has been hurt crossing. *Snow issues: - you stated that you would clear the medians for pedestrians. I hate to say that I find that very comical given the poor performance of your snow clearing efforts over the last few years and that has only gotten worse. - the narrowness of Fairview in this section will make snowplowing and where that snow goes untenable. - Rounding corners with large snowplow equipment in reality will leave streets in worse conditions and your new curbing destroyed.***Suggestions or Potential Options if pedestrian safety really is the main issue:* Honestly involve the principals and local parent groups of both schools that are affected.* Fix the streets surface and sidewalks so you do not fall in potholes and trip on uneven sidewalks.* Install sidewalks where there are none.* Make all curbing ADA compliant.* Enforce the speed limits* Install a check your speed blinking light.* Install a crossing blinker that people activate with a button.Unfortunately I believe that this project is going forward no matter what we the community says. Your comment that if you find that this project was a mistake you can take it out --is not how the city should be run and my tax dollars spent.As a taxpayer and member of this community I do not want this. I believe you really fell short on letting the "we the people" have a say in this.

Pedestrian islands, bump outs, and new bike lane paint will be very important for me to continue to use this route. I know its just an mill over but if there is anyway to include pedestrian leading signaling at intersections while this is done, it would really improve safety for folks. I have found that biking when the pedestrian leading signal changes protects me from left turning cars that don't "see" me as I bike. Full support for new improvements. Thank you for your time.

Hi, I live at the corner of Highland and Fairview and will be definitely impacted by this project. I do feel there is a need for pedestrian improvements across the board, however my concern is related to the assessment. Based on the letter I received, it stated assessments would only go to properties abutting Fairview. If this is the case, I find this extremely unfair to those of us on Fairview. This road is one of the busiest in St Paul with direct access to Highway 5 that nearly all people who live on surrounding streets use. I would almost guarantee my neighbor or the people on Wheeler are using Fairview just as much as me so to only assess those of us on Fairview is just punitive, not to mention that by already living on such a busy street, my property value is 5-10% lower per my realtor. I don't have a problem paying an assessment to improve the pedestrian safety (again, usage that SIGNIFICANTLY improves way of life for many people not living directly on Fairview), but I do want to ensure that the assessment is equitable to the value being derived by local homeowners and businesses. Someone told me 13,000 cars a day use Fairview. The road to Hwy 5 being resurfaced currently is a pothole mess every year because of traffic and weather. We have two schools in our immediate area - Horace Mann and St Paul Academy - using Fairview every day. Yet only the few select of us abutting Fairview get to pay to improve the roads all these families and business travelers use? I support the project in general but I don't think Fairview is a typical city road that probably gets 1/10th the traffic, if that, and I believe the assessment should reflect that. Thank you.

I'm happy to see some pedestrian-friendly improvements included in this project. The very wide and straight nature of the current design encourages high-speed driving and makes it unpleasant and even dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists to travel along or across. I hope the pedestrian islands will discourage drivers from using the center turn lanes as passing lanes!

I have several comments and questions about the changes to Fairview:1. Why is this necessary. I live on Bohland Ave and cross at fairview and do not think that this is going to make crossing significantly easier or safer especially in relation the cost related.2. I do not believe that this is going to encourage anymore students to walk to school (Bohland Ave). Highland Catholic is the only school this would effect and I wonder how many students attend that school that live between Ford and Montreal? Anyone living outside that area could cross at the lights at either of those streets.3. I questions whether anymore students would walk to Highland Elementary (Saunders Ave). 4. The choice of Bohland and Saunders will likely divert a lot of traffic to Beechwood which in I ideal conditions can rarely allow for two vehicles to meet each other. How will all of the Highland Catholic parents navigate their drop off then they can not turn left from Fairview to Bohland.5. For neighbors this will create many u-turns or many circles around the block to go the direction they desire on Fairview.6. What research and surveys were done prior to creating this plan. Is seems like a huge expense to accomplish a small if any advantage for pedestrians.7. How will snow removal be handled? Fairview already becomes narrow in the winter, especially given that there are not boulevards between Ford and Montreal. The center islands will make the road too narrow without perfect curb to curb plowing. How will the islands be cleared of snow? I fear they will be giant snow piles which will make crossing more dangerous.8. What will the narrowing streets effect on the bike lanes be? With the Islands vehicles will have no ability to give bicyclists room when they pass.9. Pushing the cars closer to the sidewalk will also create an unsafe environment for pedestrians on the sidewalk (No boulevards between Ford and Montreal)I intend to come to the meeting on the 17th but wanted some of my thoughts recorded.

I'm submitting feedback in favor of these improvements as a homeowner at XXX Kenneth St., and a father of an 11 & 9 year olds.

I hold the opinion based on research from similar enhancements that they will calm traffic speeds and improve pedestrian safety.

My boys having a safer crossing option at Fairview near Bayard would be wonderful.

My only proposal would be to add a median along with curb bump-outs at Bayard and Fairview.

Thank you

I am so excited about this project and am glad it's happening. I love the pedestrian improvements. If anything, I'd like to see a protected bike lane and a sidewalk on the western (southbound) side. This could be accomplished by removing parking, which I'm in favor of doing!

Please don't add median islands to Fairview. My biggest concerns are:

1. Snow removal - Median will make it hard to plow Fairview so the street won't be cleared well. On the streets with the median it is more difficult to turn resulting in less cleared streets.
2. The bike lane and sidewalk on Fairview are very narrow and the areas with medians will have a tight squeeze and more likely to have an accident.
3. This makes it very difficult for emergency vehicles and trucks to get around. Let's not make that harder.

A better pedestrian improvement is to add a blinking light that a person can use when crossing the street.

I support improving the pedestrian crossing of Fairview at these intersections but I do NOT support the median islands at the intersections that will alter the traffic flows there. As a neighbor who uses the Eleanor/Fairview intersection frequently, the elimination of the left turns and access across Fairview is very disruptive. I believe that there are several other alternatives that could be used instead of a median island. For example, painted crosswalks with lighted signs able to be triggered by pedestrians (examples on Cretin) or a 4 way stop sign.

Fairview and Saunders, or any other proposed median

Fairview/Saunders, any other intersection with the proposed medians

I was wondering about plowing. Will the plows be able to cross through the medians to continue plowing East/West? If it is only North and South, what is the plan to clear the medians that are facing East/West? I can see already the snow piled up in the medians (and they are not even built) and want to know how that will be addressed.

Also, can you clarify if the area of road between Ford Parkway and St. Paul Avenue is classified as a truck route?

If not, how do the semi and delivery trucks that are currently using Fairview as a truck route affect this plan? If you do not believe me, I have video evidence of semi trucks driving down this stretch of road with no intention of stopping for pedestrians. If it is not a truck route, when does enforcement of that begin? When semi or heavy duty trucks drive down this stretch, does this plan make it safer when these trucks are essentially driving up against the sidewalk?

I am unsure about getting to the meeting this evening but would like to know the answer to these questions. Will they be posted anywhere?

John Jordan

Many issues I can think of as to why this is a bad idea and a complete waste of tax payer's money:

- 1.) I would like to see that data of studies that support that this is a good use of money meaning, show me the studies that the city has completed of other "like" cities.
- 2.) We already have very poor plowing service in the city. The plows never plow to the corners and are usually 2-3 days past major snow storms. With these so called "bump-outs", how will the plows be able to ensure that these corners are plowed properly?
- 3.) Why are you wanting to spend all this money and time when proven "Pedestrian crossing lights" are more effective? The city of MPLS has been using these for years and adding more every year because they work.
- 4.) If you review the National Roadways documentation you find many articles that prove what you are planning is doomed to failure because they do not work.
- 5.) With the new routing of traffic, it will increase traffic in the neighborhoods effected. We already have an issue of high speed traffic on our streets and this will only increase which could cause more accidents and pedestrian issues.
- 6.) With the bump-outs, how will school buses be able to make the turns they need to make?

I believe that this is not a well thought plan that has many unanswered questions. I believe the best and least costly approach is to add PROVEN pedestrian crossing lights with well indicated cross walks. This is a huge waste of our tax payers dollars on a NOT well thought out plan.

I am concerned that the proposed medians on Fairview will provide minimal improvements to pedestrian safety while diverting excessive neighborhood traffic to Davern, which is closer to the actual school. I would think something like a flashing light pedestrian crossing would be a good safety improvement without causing this additional vehicle traffic near the elementary school.

I not opposed to medians on Fairview but ones that block turning opportunities seems like a bad idea. Not only is this inconvenient, this will route traffic down roads that were not designed for heavier traffic (like Beechwood). Please reconsider this design.

I think the islands adjacent to Bohland and Saunders will be problematic and unsafe as children will still cross Fairview without pedestrian lights similar to those on Cretin and Jefferson. This will also force traffic to adjacent streets like Beechwood Ave which is already jammed due to the reduced width and number of cars parked due to lack of garages. Additionally snowplowing which is already a challenge will only be more challenging. Please eliminate the islands for the safety of the neighborhood.

Concerns:

1. Pedestrian safety going north/south on fairview (cars closer to sidewalk by medians)
2. Median false sense of safety (cars still not stopping)
3. Rerouting traffic: blocking Bohland and Saunders from left turns, traffic will be rerouted to Hillcrest, Saunders and Rome--much narrower streets for more traffic (especially in winter) than Bohland
4. The 1700 block of these streets are longer than the average block--therefore more neighborhoods get more traffic diverted
5. Also several involved blocks have no alley--so really limits access to homes
6. Traffic being diverted does not only include neighborhood, but emergency vehicles, garbage trucks, recycling trucks, mailtrucks, fed ex, amazon, and other delivery trucks. Again--rerouting these large vehicles onto narrower streets.
7. Traffic diverted will impact children playing on these residential streets--they will have faster, more traffic on their street in front of their house where they may be playing.

Comments:

1. As an active running, walking, biking, and rollerskiing family, Fairview is NOT a street we have had difficulty crossing (and we go often do so to head to the river). My children have walked/biked/patrolled to school their entire school careers and crossing Montreal is much more difficult than fairview

In conclusion, I believe that adding pedestrian medians do not offer any additional benefits for the neighborhood, but may impact the safety of pedestrians going north/south and adding more traffic to the side streets that are narrower.

This is not the proper solution as it will absolutely cause more safety issues than what it is purported to solve, a few reasons:

Beechwood Ave is not able to handle more traffic. It is extremely narrow with a lot of parked cars and room for only one moving vehicle. With additional traffic forced onto the the street there will be backups which will likely back up onto Fairview, while causing confusion, tense situations and rash judgement on Beechwood.

The intersection (one block west of Fairview) of Beechwood and Howell is dangerous even with the relatively moderate traffic it currently receives, specifically for the following reasons:

The incline east-bound on Beechwood right before it intersects with Howell creates a blind intersection with many near-misses over the 25 years we've lived here.

There is a significant curve heading down the hill on westbound Beechwood as it comes up to intersect with Bohland. Already narrow and blind, more traffic will of course make the curve more hazardous.

Howell has one sidewalk south of Beechwood and zero north of Bohland. Because of that there are many kids and families who walk and bike in the street from Montreal to Ford Parkway. Because traffic will be diverted off Bohland from Fairview, more traffic will be on this pedestrian-heavy stretch of Howell, again with hardly any sidewalks. The proposed plan just doesn't make sense.

If you need a way to better get pedestrians across Fairview, why can't those blinking ped-controlled lights be installed? This seems like a reasonable solution instead of disrupting the lives and routines of everyone on the surrounding blocks. Especially since there's no reason to think this plan won't make things more dangerous and much worse for more people. Thank you-

The medians are very bad and will cause congestion, accidents, and more dangerous traffic also around the schools as detour routes as well. Instead there are many basic road necessities that go undone year after year. How about a sturdier road material with decent pothole prevention and management, better road workers, and hearing and actually heeding the needs of the people who are trying to live here?

I don't believe this best way to get traffic to slow down and pedestrians across Fairview is to put a median in the crosswalk.

If traffic would slow down there wouldn't be an issue to cross the street. How can we fix the cause of this issue rather than a band aid fix?

Put a traffic cop on Fairview and give out speeding tickets. I suspect the city would collect a large amount of fines and maybe people will start to slow down. Use the funds to fix sidewalks and pull them out from the street so we are not walking so close to cars.

How about some four way stop signs to start with and see if this helps. It's got to be less expensive.

Concerns with medians is no left turn will divert traffic to side street and cause unnecessary congestion.

Snow removal in St Paul does not have a good reputation and can't believe these will get shoveled properly. Can't do the streets very well and why would we think these medians will be snow free.

Please reconsider this idea. Thanks

Hello Jim, Randy & City Team, I live at XXXX Beechwood Ave (40 Years) and at XXXX Highland Parkway for 22 years and am firmly opposed to the addition to the island medians proposed at Saunders and Boland Ave. Reasons being:

1) It will needlessly increase the residential traffic on Beechwood. Which is currently a quiet residential street not designed to handle double the local traffic, double the truck traffic from delivery vans, and more than double the pass-through traffic.

* Beechwood is the narrowest of all streets between Ford Parkway & Montreal, 6-8 feet narrower than Saunders or Boland, plus Boland resident have a 12-15-foot grass median when Beechwood is only 6-8 feet. Putting us much closer to traffic.

* The curve at the bottom of the hill narrows posing special challenges, especially in WINTER

* Many residents on Beechwood Park their cars on the street narrowing the street

* The City is already challenged with Snow Plowing, winter will only make travel here worse.

2) It will force many drivers to use our ally as a short cut.

I am all for safety, but in I do not believe that accident reports show that Fairview between Montreal and Ford has had a unusual number of accidents. I do not believe that any kind of study has been done in along Fairview.

Medians do not slow traffic as your team claims, all you need to do is drive Snelling, Grand, Maryland or other St. Paul Streets where the city has installed medians to witness that speeds do not decrease.

If SAFETY is a factor, I propose the city install a flashing light system on Boland or Beechwood that would allow school children to cross to and from school. There are two systems in place on Jefferson at Cleveland and Cretin which along with the added signage seem to be much more effective than a medium. Young school children will still be encouraged to make a crossing decision themselves which can now be much more dangerous s they will be given a false sense of security.

"I can Dash half was and stop in the middle."

If flashing crossing signs are not a option, please respond to the neighborhood taxpayers as to why.

I would like to also know publicly why the neighborhood was given a very short notice of these changes and never consulted or was Highland District Council traffic committee given a preview.

Call if you like to respond or discuss.

Cc: Melvin Carter, Mayor

As residents of the 1800 block of Saunders, we appreciate the improvement plans for Fairview, including slowing the traffic and adding pedestrian improvements. We have an 11-year-old that frequently crosses Fairview and we walk our dog through this area daily. However, we think that a median blocking all left turns is not needed and will create more issues than it could solve. We welcome a pair of pedestrian islands if that could be an option. Some of the concerns that we see:

1. For every left turn that is blocked by the new medians at Fairview, it adds on average, an extra block or more of driving on the residential streets per trip (particularly for the residents of 180 homes within one block of Fairview on Bohland, Eleanor and Saunders)
2. During the May 9th project meeting, the City said that they want to keep traffic off the residential street and "on streets intended for higher volumes". But then they followed up with a contradictory statement that the added traffic on the residential streets is a "trade-off they are willing to take." More traffic on the residential streets is not a reasonable trade-off.
3. Residents of Saunders, Beechwood & Elanor on the blocks nearest Fairview would need to make U-turns at some point in order to park in front of their own homes. This is simply unsafe, unnecessary, an irritation and decreases our quality of life.
4. Traffic on Davern and Howell WILL increase as drivers find alternate routes in and out. Howell currently has at least 4 school-bus pickups in the morning.
5. Currently, when it snows, residents with Fairview sidewalks have little room to put both the sidewalk snow and the snow from the plows. This typically results in a narrowing of the street shoulder/bike lanes. The new plan would make the median sections of Fairview very narrow. Currently, the crosswalks are plowed when Fairview is plowed.
6. Adding an 8' median sidewalk will require additional plowing/shoveling that would certainly take longer than the current process. This would likely be needed each time a plow passes, which would make travel across the new medians difficult.
7. Highland Catholic School has no bus service with most parents driving their children to school. Many arrive from northbound Fairview, turning left onto Bohland. With this intersection blocked, the likely alternative would be a left turn onto Beechwood and following that down the curve to where it meets Bohland. Though desired, parents would not go up to Ford, then left to Kenneth as two left turns at lights would take much longer. So this will create a less safe Howell/Beechwood (no stop sign) and Beechwood/Bohland intersections during the morning/afternoon drop-offs. Also, note that Beechwood is much narrower than the current Bohland route. The morning drop-off sees 60-80 cars.
8. Although the City stated otherwise during the in-person meeting, the Highland Catholic Principal is opposed to this plan.
9. The City mentioned that these medians would prevent "cut-through" traffic from east/west, and west to east. However, this has not been an issue or concern as it so rarely happens.
10. This would present difficulty for many that visit our homes on Saunders, Bohland and Eleanor.
 - Police/Fire/Ambulance - When seconds count, any delay is unwise.
 - Delivery drivers - FedEx, UPS, USPS, Amazon, Uber, Food Delivery, etc.
 - Guests, contractors (some with trailers and unable to make U-turns), and garbage trucks.
11. This would create the opportunity for dangerous U-turns on Fairview to get around the new medians.
12. This could also promote increased traffic (and speeds) in our alleys.

While we all agree that pedestrian safety is important, it is the culmination of these 12 issues that suggest that the full medians are just not the right tool for this project. We respectfully ask that you reconsider and look for other options that increase safety while maintaining our access.

Thank you,

I'm someone who uses Fairview as a pedestrian and as a bicyclist on a frequent basis and I think based on what I'm seeing in the plans that I'll probably stop using it. The stretch from Ford to Randolph has always felt safe, but the proposed changes between Montreal and Ford will make it significantly more dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists. Crossing the road has never been an issue for me, but adding a median will push traffic close to the sidewalks. The sidewalks themselves are already dangerous feeling because traffic comes so close them and they don't have any buffer. If you push car traffic closer to the sidewalks, bicycles won't have anyplace to go, and it's unsafe (and maybe illegal?) to ride them on the sidewalks.

If the goal is to make crossing safer, can't we just put some crosswalks with flashing lights in? That would be easier and cheaper. Then we can use money to fix up the sidewalks (which are not ADA compliant) and make the road safer for bikes by just resurfacing it.

I'm frustrated that the goal of the city's plan is to make the city safer for pedestrians and encourage non-motorized transportation, but this plan would make Fairview more dangerous to walk on, and would likely push extra traffic onto the neighborhood streets and alternative streets making THOSE ones more dangerous. This plan seems expensive and counterproductive. There doesn't seem to be any actual data to support the decisions and it feels like these medians are being built to make something look good on paper without taking into account the actual effect they will have. I'm worried about my streets being MORE dangerous than they were before. I'm worried that emergency vehicles will not be able to get to my house. I'm worried that I will be hit by a car on Davern where there will be extra traffic, where there's a blind approach, where drivers go too fast already, and where there's no sidewalk on one side.

Please think this through. These are our lives you're affecting. I've crossed Fairview many times and felt safe. A crosswalk would be great! Your plan will make my neighborhood more dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists. It's not progressive.

I am absolutely against this proposal. I live on Beechwood Ave and already traffic on S. Snelling is too heavy in that area. This will make it even more congested. The roads in St Paul should be fixed, that's where the tax payers' money should go and not into creating unnecessary medians or bike lanes.

The median islands will drive traffic down other streets. For example, people already speed on beechwood between Snelling and Fairview. The medians will exacerbate this problem. Please don't block the intersections!

I'm all for road surface improvements, but if pedestrian safety is a priority, could the flashing yellow signs be an option? I see them around the city and feel they do a great job of alerting drivers when a pedestrian wants to enter crosswalk. These could be installed at the most used pedestrian crossings without disrupting traffic routes.

Hi there, I live on Beechwood Ave between Fairview and Davern. I greatly appreciate the plan to make Fairview easier to cross, me and my family often have a difficult time getting cars to stop for us when attempting to cross.

I do have concerns about traffic increasing on side streets, particularly Beechwood. The road is the length of two city blocks, and seems to maybe be slightly wider already than other city roads. This causes traffic to move fast down Beechwood already. There are currently numerous families with young children that live in this stretch, and if traffic increases and drivers habits don't change, I would be increasingly concerned about their safety.

If you care to discuss this further with me, my email is itsme.jmc@gmail.com. Again, thank you for the work you do to make our communities better.

I'm very concerned about increased traffic on Beechwood Ave and Fairview. There are many families with small children who play in the front yards. Wherever the cross streets are that don't have the median should probably have speed bumps added to slow traffic down.

I support these changes to improve pedestrian safety. My child attends Horace Mann. Thank you.

Thank you for having the community meeting about this project. I was very disappointed at the format, and feel it should have been a panel presentation so we could hear all the questions and all the replies. It was VERY hard to hear what was being discussed due to the separate conversations taking place in the back of the room.

I appreciate that you're taking residents ideas and concerns into consideration before moving ahead with the project. I'm very glad Fairview will re re-milled for a longer lasting solution, instead of continued pothole patches.

I like the idea of having the pedestrian bumpouts to make it easier to cross Fairview, as the current situation is a deterrent from me exploring more of my neighborhood.

I DO NOT like the idea of the medians that prevent traffic from turning onto adjacent streets. Please DO NOT do this. We shouldn't have access restricted to our homes, nor increase traffic down our neighbors' peaceful streets where children are playing in their yards.

Instead, I think a hybrid approach to these two scenarios is best, where there are bumpouts that lead to a pedestrian median that people can stand on and wait to cross the other lane of traffic.

I also don't think residents should have to pay an assessment for this project. The property taxes in Highland Park are exorbitant, and this is exactly what our taxes pay for--improvements in infrastructure.

Thank you for listening.

I am concerned about the break in Snelling Ave sending more traffic west on to Bohland Ave and then that traffic expecting to be able to go south on Fairview, not be able to. Cars already go over the speed limit on Bohland Ave.

I am concerned that the additional Bohland Ave traffic will not be aware of the new medium on Fairview, will want to turn left but can't, then be upset trying to get to MSP, 494 or 62 or just caught up in neighborhood road blocks.

Let's avoid the 'surprise no left turn' from Bohland to Fairview with signage at Snelling! The sign could notify those using the break at Snelling that there is no left turn at Fairview.

This signage is also needed on other streets.

Signage is good communication. Let's help it support the changes. Can you add signage to facilitate the changes?

I am not in favor of the median islands being proposed at Eleanor, Bohland, and Saunders. While I understand the goal of improving pedestrian safety, I feel that this should ultimately be addressed with a reconstruction project vs. what is being proposed. With the median islands traffic will be rerouted to narrower streets, streets with longer than typical block length, and is limiting to homeowners who don't have alleys to reach their homes. Winter will bring additional challenges with even narrower streets and snow covered medians. I also anticipate the drivers will be attempt to do u-turns after the medians creating for opportunities for accidents. As there is low number of pedestrian crossing at these intersections and there hasn't been issues, I feel the proposal of medians is providing a solution when there isn't a problem. Thank you.

The proposed medians on Fairview will likely reduce pedestrian safety, by routing car traffic onto Davern and Howell. Note there are currently sections of those streets without sidewalks on one side or the other.

Fairview currently has sidewalks on both sides with a bike lane buffer. Davern in particular has a long history of high foot traffic. The current shutdown of Fairview south of Montreal has routed heavy auto traffic onto Davern, making it much less safe. Dropping in medians on Fairview will continue much of this undesirable traffic on Davern. Note for some time now, on school days, there has been much congestion on the Elementary School sides of Davern and Saunders when school let's out. (We believe this happens at Highland Catholic too). Auto traffic lines up at the school and wraps onto Davern, with vehicles (and school busses) coming from every which way to get in line. You will force an additional 50% of the local traffic to this intersection, including delivery vans and lawn services with trailers. Many vehicles (e.g. traveling west on Saunders towards Fairview and who wish to go south on Fairview) will choose to make u-turns at various points on the street (e.g. Saunders) using the driveways to do so, increasing the potential for a child on a bike or foot traffic on the sidewalks to be hit. Those that choose not to make a u-turn will be forced north onto Fairview and then take a left or right at the next intersection to route back through the neighborhoods, instead of just being on their way like they can do now without the medians. We have many other concerns and issues, but hopefully you'll understand that we are speaking on behalf of others, and they, us. Two final comments. You are greatly overestimating the pedestrian traffic crossing Fairview vs. crossing (and on) Davern. Facilitating safe pedestrian crossings on Fairview can easily be accomplished by one or two crosswalks with pushbutton yellow flashing lights like you see on Snelling Ave at Macalester College. In conclusion, it seems that very little consideration has been given to the consequences of these changes. We urge you to delay this, and at least actually spend some time on sight at various times of the day before you act, or better yet, cancel it all together. That way, you'll save budget while making it safer for all, pedestrians, bikers, and vehicles.

Sincerely, 35- Year Residents of the 1700 block of Saunders Ave.

I live on Beechwood and very much against installing islands as planned. I believe this will increase traffic on side streets, even if a very small amount, and reduce safety. There are over 15 children under the age of 10, more on the way as well, on the eastern side of Fairview in the first half block who ride bikes and recapture errant balls crossing the street. Fairview is a known commodity and people are cautious. Making this change is not an acceptable trade off or sacrifice as was noted at the on line meeting by City Officials that do not live on these streets.

It does concern me that your stated goal is safety when sidewalks bordering Fairview are filled with tripping hazards and unpassable to the disabled and you are not planning to address. This is another example why I and neighbors, who have spoken to me, have no trust in your motives and question your ethical approach to resolving real safety problems. Not being aware of the sidewalk issues clearly demonstrates that the City Engineers did not familiarize themselves with the area and put no effort in planning the project and working with residents. Be aware that the sidewalks along Fairview are heavily used by residents of all ages who walk to Synagogue, church, school, and why they are important. Crossing Fairview at a signalized intersection is very safe and and less than 300 steps from Beechwood, the furthest intersecting street.

As I have followed the widely publicized Summit Avenue project, and the court findings of questionable ethical behavior by the City Engineers, it is clear to residents that we need to question everything this department puts forward. At the virtual meeting it was mentioned that the City was addressing resident complaints but could not produce a single documented complaint. Another questionable statement. The City could not produce any pedestrian accident data to suggest this change is appropriate, suggesting questionable decision making judgement.

It would be great if you could repave the roadway and eliminate the poorly planned islands, please make no change to the roadway.

I would like to see comments published and recommend asking for names. Anonymous surveys encourage misinformation.

I love the idea of pedestrian improvements, but it does seem like the proposed refuges might be a bit overkill for such a small road. And while I don't think I'd mind them overall, I do think neighbors have a point about it limiting the flow for Eleanor since it's already a bit cutoff. It would be nice if the city compared pros/cons with other options, like lighted crossings, and showed the results to the neighborhood.

1. I think the need for pedestrian medians is overstated and NOT BASED ON DATA. Data shows there have been no pedestrian accidents in the last ten years on the stretch of Fairview from Montreal to Randolph. Yet there are other parts of the city that have MULTIPLE ACCIDENTS and that is where the money should be spent to improve pedestrian safety. West 7th St, University Ave, Rice St. for example. I am all for safety but there is NO DATA TO SUGGEST IT IS NEEDED HERE.
2. Left turn restrictions will greatly inconvenience the neighborhood and increase the traffic load on the streets between Montreal and Ford Parkway, making them less safe because residents will be forced to drive up to 3 times farther to reach their homes. OTHER OPTIONS SHOULD BE TRIED FIRST.
3. MEDIANS WILL BE A PROBLEM IN THE WINTER, we can't even get the streets plowed in a timely fashion, how can we expect crews to come and clear the medians. The medians will become a huge mess of snow windrows, they will freeze in place by the time any crew can come around and will totally block pedestrians from crossing. Last winter the full width of the street was never plowed, there was barely one lane in each direction, the bike lane was where the windrow was deposited and stayed most of the year. Snow is a huge problem and will be made worse by pedestrian medians!
4. What data has been collected recently on the traffic speed on Fairview. It was said that you want to slow the traffic on Fairview, the current speed limit is 25 mph. HOW SLOW DO YOU WANT THE TRAFFIC TO FLOW?
5. Have you considered traffic patterns will change when the Highland Bridge development is complete? MAYBE A BETTER IDEA WOULD BE TO TRY A LESS INVASIVE PEDESTRIAN SAFETY SIGN AND SEE HOW THAT WORKS AND REEVALUATE WHEN HIGHLAND BRIDGE IS COMPLETELY OCCUPIED.

Hi, I was looking for some pedestrian and/or bike accidents data on South Fairview Avenue where the proposed medians will be. I came across this web site <https://information.stpaul.gov/datasets/pedestrian-and-bike-crash-dataset-/explore?location=44.980628%2C-93.136510%2C16.86> which lists police reports and after looking through the 967 entries I found one pedestrian incident on South Fairview 3 years ago on 2/27/20 at 6:30am, and whose home zip code was 55105, which is Macalester Groveland. If this was the only incident in 4 years, does that constitute putting in medians making driving, and especially winter driving around to get out of our neighborhoods and back to our homes?

Today I was driving north on Fairview, where there were a couple of bikers. I was able to drive a bit into the middle area of the street to give the bikers more room (there was no oncoming traffic at the time as well). With medians, there is no room to do this. If the bikers came out of their driving lane there would be no where for cars to give bikers that space anymore. Please take a look at your proposed plans. A better way for all would be flashing lights at a couple corners and also better markings on Fairview. Thank you.

I'm very excited for the street surface improvements and the pedestrian improvements. I'm glad our city is taking pedestrian safety seriously, especially when speeding and reckless passing in the center turn lane is so common. It's really important to reduce crossing distances and this looks to be accomplishing that at logical places. I don't consider the center medians a serious burden on adjoining residents. As a Fairview resident I consider these improvements life-changing.

Public Works' priorities are misplaced. In light of budgetary constraints, the additional funds required to build bumpouts and medians etc. would be better directed towards rebuilding the plethora of other Saint Paul streets that are in a state of disrepair. We've managed without the bumpouts and medians here for decades, but I've never seen Saint Paul streets that are as dangerous to drive on as they are today. Cars weave right and left into turning lanes and bike lanes in attempt to avoid the endless sea of potholes. The fact is we all rely on city streets through buses, cars, ambulances, school buses, fire engines trucks etc. and it isn't safe out there. I have lived in a number of cities and towns across the country including, Seattle, New York, Missoula Montana, Boston, and Dallas and I have never seen anything approaching the kind of dysfunctional roads we have here. One other point: This section of Fairview would be better served by a complete road reconstruction rather than a mill and overlay that kicks the can down the road.

Where is the data that points to the need of pedestrian medians and pedestrian bumpouts? I do not, nor do any of the many people I have spoken to support the addition of pedestrian medians and pedestrian bumpouts; they will be costly, unsightly, an inconvenience, and ultimately more dangerous, creating confusion for pedestrians and drivers alike, adding new visual obstacles, and limiting potential paths drivers can take to avoid collisions. As a long time resident near Fairview Avenue, and one of the proposed sections of a pedestrian median, I and neither do those around me know of any incident of pedestrian collision that would warrant the addition of such safety measures in a section of infrastructure primarily devoted to automobiles; furthermore, the speed limit was recently lowered for this section of road, we were told this was done for the safety of pedestrians. Where is the data that compares this new speed limit accident rate to the old speed limit accident rate for each section of road where this wasteful spending of unneeded and unwanted pedestrian infrastructure will be added? If this new infrastructure gets constructed—which to be very clear, it should not—will the speed limit be increased to its previous speed? Is the new speed limit working at reducing pedestrian fatalities? How has enough time possibly passed to for this sample period to be valid and demonstrate a false need for pedestrian medians and pedestrian bumpouts? As a user of multiple transportation modes on Fairview Avenue—biking, walking, driving—I do not feel inspired that the proposed infrastructure will create a greater sense of safety. I have been at the corner and watched children dart the wrong way to cross the street, drivers are responsive and they stop; furthermore, the root cause is not lack of infrastructure—of which additional infrastructure will do nothing to prevent the root cause—it is lack of pedestrian training or sense. What steps will be taken to address issues related to that? Allow me to preemptively answer that, nothing; why, because this project is not about pedestrian safety, it is about spending money to prove one's position inside a government construct. My neighbors, the primary stakeholders in this project, and other drivers I have spoken to, additional primary stakeholders in this project, do not support this wasteful and unnecessary spending. Just mill-and-overlay the road—if that is even enough—and forgo the pedestrian infrastructure. If pedestrian safety is really all that important, why is the government further propagating the combination of supposedly deadly vehicles and unprotected humans? Maybe the taxpayer's money would be better spent doing it right with pedestrian overpasses or underpasses. It would certainly make better sense not to add any pedestrian infrastructure if it is ultimately wrong and unsafe.

I am very opposed to the addition of pedestrian bumpouts and pedestrian median islands, especially the median island planned for Elanor Avenue on Fairview Avenue. The location was supposedly chosen because of the proximity to a school. As a long term resident near this intersection, I do not believe I have ever seen a school aged student cross this street in order to get to or from school. Additionally, with how far this intersection is from the school, the crossing guard does not even go this far, why has the decision been made to inconvenience many for the unlikely needs of one or two? Furthermore, pedestrian bumpouts and pedestrian median islands are not safer, they lessen and confuse the intentions of pedestrians and limit the reaction time of drivers by increasing pedestrian infrastructure into the street and decreasing the neutral space between safe pedestrian area and dangerous areas where car drives. Finally, how will this infrastructure function in the winter? The city is not going to clear the snow on these proposed pedestrian structures, it already cannot keep up with the snow it should be clearing; hence, large snow piles will accumulate from plowing, these piles will surely dwarf the size of a school aged child, hiding from the view of oncoming drivers and creating dangerous terrain for the children to maneuver. Conversely, if the city does plan to clear the snow on these structures, where will that extra money needed to do so come from? The city supposedly already does not have enough to properly manage snow, or even cover all parts of the city when it snows. For how long will this additional commitment last, for years, the city's response to snow has been dwindling, an embarrassment that leads many to believe the city only has one plow truck.

I am not in favor of the pedestrian bumpouts and pedestrian median islands. This proposed addition is completely one sided and ignorant; rather than traffic calming it will be traffic aggravating and create dangerous bottlenecks for bikers of Fairview Avenue. These pedestrian additions will encroach into the streets, an area not meant for pedestrians who already have sidewalks, and shrink the pathway for both bikers and drivers, limiting their ability to maneuver obstacles and each other safely. Minnesota laws maintain that drivers must give bikers 3 feet of clearance when passing, the addition of pedestrian median islands will hinder a driver's natural intuition to already provide this clearance and then some, but also make it impossible unless traffic stops. Many drivers on the road are already not aware of this law, there will be nothing done to educate or ensure this happens. With these additions, bikers and drivers will be in closer proximity to each other, and limit each one's ability to safely distance themselves from the other. This proposition is dangerous, shortsighted, and ignorant of how the infrastructure actually gets used.

I keep hearing that the city is doing this for pedestrian safety; however, pedestrian median islands have very little to do with pedestrian safety, even less so in 2 lane streets, (MNDOT suggest only 32 percent reduction in pedestrian crashes, why pedestrians are walking into each other, I DON'T KNOW) I will argue they worsen pedestrian safety, and more to do with reducing pedestrian delay. Under Minnesota law, a pedestrian has the right of way in a street at intersections, this encompasses the whole street. With the addition of a pedestrian median, or pedestrian refuge island as it keeps getting referred—I would like to take a moment to pontificate on that. Refuge implies safety, retreat, in this sense a pause from the right of way, the pedestrian is no longer on the street, a return to safe pedestrian infrastructure has occurred. When the pedestrian right of way is split in two like this, my observations are that cars continue to drive until the pedestrian steps off again. If an accident is going to happen, it is going to happen, but now, the pedestrian is right smack in the middle of it. A raised curb is no protection, cars jump those easily enough. In my opinion, and those I have spoken with, this false and misconstrued promise of safety is not worth the tradeoff to cross the street faster.

I do not support the planned addition of the pedestrian bumpouts and pedestrian median islands. I am particularly concerned about the planned pedestrian median island planned at Eleanor Avenue and Fairview Avenue. With this proposed addition, in order to compensate for the obstacle, traffic will now be unnecessarily forced to use routes that are much hillier. First of all, the hills will lead to more fuel consumption and thus more pollution. Secondly, in the winter, with the city's new commitment of never plowing or salting, this will lead to unnecessary difficulty traversing the roads and safely returning home or to one's destination in one piece. As a resident in this location, I have seen many cars become stuck or even wrecked in the routes that I would now have to take. Furthermore, with the route that emergency vehicles would also now need to take, I believe they would no longer be able to get through. I have witnessed similar sized vehicles need to turn around due to parked cars and the size of snowbanks, this could very well lead to a life lost or property destroyed all because someone wants to prove their importance at City Hall.

Based upon the virtual “briefing” held Tuesday May 9th, it seems the intent of the Fairview Avenue project is to move forward with the ill-thought-out pedestrian nuisance—for bicyclist, pedestrians, motorists, and most importantly the residents of the neighborhoods—without the consent of the public. The stakeholders in the project. In the meeting, it was stated that the people in charge of this project are looking for public input for a reason that makes these pedestrian nuisances unfeasible; from my end, I feel as though many logical issues were raised that provide this point. On the website for the Fairview Avenue project, it states that these comments and question, with responses will be posted, I believe it is well past time that this should have happen, there should at least be these responses before a public assembly happens—which it did on May 9th and it seemed none of the comments and questions were addressed—so the public can address misconceptions about the interpretation of the questions or comments and provide follow-up; but alas, it seems the decision has already been made and the project team’s biased thinking will not be swayed. Apparently, the increased potential of loss of human life and definite possibility of further property destruction from the increased time it will take emergency vehicles to reach their destination is not viewed as important, the stated goals of limiting traffic on streets—their intended purpose—is more important. What is the criteria for a catastrophic unforeseen consequence of the suggested pedestrian safety hazards; surely, as there are claims of thinking everything out so well, there must be a criteria already in place for what is deemed as important.

To reiterate my point, because I believe it is an exceptionally valid point that is being dismissed too quickly and overlooked to achieve a goal that many of the stakeholders do not want, it is not about that emergency vehicles will know the fastest route, it is the increased time that these unnecessary new routes will add, partly from the increased distance needed to travel, but other complications these new routes will add. For example, if a house on my block is used for this example, one where multiple emergency vehicles have needed to visit before, fire, ambulance, what have you, the existing route, the emergency vehicle would arrive at the house likely within 5 seconds from turning onto the street, the new unnecessary route would now see an emergency vehicle travel to the next street, proceed with one turn, then proceed to the next possible street to proceed with another turn, then the vehicle would have to manage to make it up a steep hill, a tight street where vehicles park on both sides, before turning yet once again, and essentially traveling down the entire block again before any potential lifesaving measures can be applied, or additional property damage prevented by eliminating an fire, hopefully before the fire spreads to any additional structures and destroys other people’s property as well. This utterly ridiculous and unnecessary route has surpassed a %500 increase in distance, taking what would be 300 ft and increasing that to at least 1584 feet—this figure even worse for the other streets. This alone does not account for the additional time needed for these vehicles to perform turns or avoid other obstacles, or blocked streets from delivery vehicles. This is likely already an additional 2 minutes in good conditions. Diverting quick response vehicles to having to traverse more residential streets, streets where children play and the infrastructure is already crumbling from lack of upkeep, is not an acceptable solution to a problem that does not fixing. When accounting for bad conditions, the response time can only get worse. In the winter, accompanied by the city’s new commitment of never plowing, these new routes will contain very steep hills and create very difficult situations to maneuver and maintain trac

traction. With regular traffic now also being diverted to this route, I anticipate a lot of ice at the bottom of this hill that an emergency vehicle will have to go up. This, also accompanied with encroaching snow banks, mind you, I have seen delivery trucks have to back up due to parked cars and limited street space, I would not be surprised if the emergency vehicle never reaches its destination. How is failure to respond to emergency situations an acceptable solution? Already talking about 2 minutes, more for other street, which will likely only go up, research shows that the fire will likely already be quite severe, the entire room of the house will likely be lost and additional floors and rooms may start to burn. In medical conditions, time can be vital, this additional time is unacceptable, and the taxpayers deserve an appropriate response that addresses why this is believed to be preferable by city planners.

There are many people voicing concern for this proposed plan, wanting just the street repaved, but yet there seems only commitment to proceed with the pedestrian nuisances. One would imagine the city would welcome the opportunity to presumably spend less money and maintain the street design as is. Why is there such a desire to ignore the desire of taxpayers and proceed with this wasteful and unwanted spending. There has been no data presented about why this is needed, specifically the percentage of stakeholders that are asking for this. How, if that information was even collected, was it determined what people want. I have seen other surveys pertaining to similar planning, and those surveys are extremely leading, not offering the opportunity to object, and seeking idealistic rationalizing versus one’s actual intended use case.

I have no confidence in the critical thinking that should have taken place here, it seems that everyone involved is more concerned with creating a nuisance for Highland Park residents and enjoying their struggle. As others have indicated, this is no way for a city to be run and decisions be made, there still is no detailed plan other than idealistic ideas, there has not been enough involvement from the residents in affected zones, and the communication with the taxpayers is completely lacking.

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will reduce the traffic speed and increase traffic congestion on our street. How will this affect the travel time and air quality for drivers and residents?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will make it harder for emergency vehicles to access our street. How will this impact the safety and response time for people who need urgent help?

Pedestrian bumpouts and pedestrian median islands are not safer, they lessen and confuse the intentions of pedestrians and limit the reaction time of drivers by increasing pedestrian infrastructure into the street and decreasing the neutral space between safe pedestrian area and dangerous areas where car drives.

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more conflicts between pedestrians and drivers. How will this improve the safety and comfort of both groups? How will the visibility and sight distance be ensured for all road users?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will take away traffic maneuvering on our street. How will this affect the convenience and accessibility for residents and visitors?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not necessary on our street. How many pedestrians actually cross our street? What are the current crash rates and injury severity for pedestrians on our street?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not effective in reducing pedestrian crashes. What is the evidence that they work? What are the trade-offs and unintended consequences of installing them?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not consistent with the functional classification of our street. How will this affect the mobility and connectivity of our street? How will this align with the regional transportation plan?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will reduce the flexibility and adaptability of our street. How will this affect the future changes and needs of our street? How will the street accommodate different modes and events?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will increase the liability and responsibility of the city on our street. How will this affect the legal and insurance issues for the city and residents? Who will be liable for any damages or injuries caused by them?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will require more coordination and cooperation among different agencies and stakeholders on our street. How will this affect the communication and decision-making process for our street? Who will have the authority and accountability for them?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will conflict with the existing infrastructure and utilities on our street. How will this affect the operation and maintenance of these facilities? How will the conflicts be resolved and minimized?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will encourage more pedestrians to cross our street. How will this affect the demand and capacity of our street? How will the pedestrian volume and behavior be managed and controlled?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will not address the root causes of pedestrian safety problems on our street. How will this affect the education and enforcement efforts for our street? How will the driver and pedestrian awareness and compliance be improved?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more snow accumulation and ice formation on our street. How will this affect the safety and accessibility of drivers and pedestrians? How will the snow and ice be removed and treated?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will make it harder for snow plows and salt trucks to clear our street. How will this affect the cost and efficiency of snow removal operations? How will the plows and trucks avoid damaging the bumpouts and islands?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will reduce the visibility and contrast of our street in snowy and foggy conditions. How will this affect the detection and recognition of drivers and pedestrians? How will the bumpouts and islands be marked and illuminated?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will increase the wear and tear of our street due to freeze-thaw cycles and deicing chemicals. How will this affect the durability and quality of the pavement and curb materials? How will the repairs and replacements be done?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will reduce the space and flexibility for snow storage on our street. How will this affect the availability and allocation of snow storage areas? How will the snow be disposed or relocated?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will affect the thermal performance and energy efficiency of our street. How will this affect the heating and cooling needs of residents and pedestrians? How will the thermal comfort and balance be maintained?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will require more coordination and communication among different winter service providers on our street. How will this affect the roles and responsibilities of these providers? How will the service standards and expectations be established and monitored?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will change the winter travel behavior and patterns of drivers and pedestrians on our street. How will this affect the demand and supply of winter transportation options? How will the travel choices and preferences be influenced?

Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will not address the winter-specific pedestrian safety issues on our street. How will this affect the winter education and enforcement efforts for our street? How will the winter driver and pedestrian awareness and compliance be improved?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the risk and difficulty of driving on slippery and steep slopes in winter. How will this affect the safety and confidence of drivers? How will the traction and braking be ensured?

Fairview Ave (at least between Ford Parkway and Montreal Ave) already has sidewalks on both sides of the street, aiding pedestrians while walking and by providing a safe waiting / starting point when crossing Fairview here.

Fairview also has bike lanes along the sides which narrow the road to single lane vehicle traffic in both directions. Adding center median islands and curb bump outs to an already narrowed road? Although bicyclists are kinda rare vs vehicle traffic, the bikers who do use the bike lane would need to veer out near or maybe into the vehicle lane to go around the bump outs? Imagine kids riding their bikes going around the bump outs near vehicle traffic. Seems like a very bad idea and less safe.

Davern, one block to the east of Fairview and with no sidewalks, would see a big increase in rerouted vehicle traffic as people are forced to drive around the quieter residential blocks to reach their homes if they are not able to turn off Fairview directly onto their road. This would be less safe.

Davern has a fair amount of pedestrian traffic with walkers and runners plus a great deal of all traffic before school and after school along Saunders and Rome and Davern. This proposed plan on Fairview would push even more vehicle traffic into the school area already heavily congested twice a day. This would be less safe for students, their parents, school staff, and everyone else navigating these roads during drop off and pick up times.

My suggestion:

I see one functional improvement to make and it would be way less expensive than the proposed plan. Install some crosswalk(s) with pedestrian button and flashing lights like Snelling Ave has near Macalaster College. When a pedestrian wants to cross Fairview, they push the button to light up the crosswalk for approaching vehicle drivers to stop and help make it safer to cross.

Thank you.

- A 26 yr resident on the 1700 block of Saunders Ave observing and being part of our neighborhood traffic.

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the fuel consumption and emissions of vehicles in winter. How will this affect the cost and environmental impact of driving? How will the fuel efficiency and emission reduction be achieved?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the noise and vibration of vehicles in winter. How will this affect the comfort and well-being of drivers and residents? How will the noise and vibration be reduced and mitigated?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the noise and vibration of vehicles. How will this affect the comfort and well-being of drivers and residents? How will the noise and vibration be reduced and mitigated?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the demand and pressure for snow removal and deicing on these streets in winter. How will this affect the availability and quality of these services? How will the service priorities and schedules be determined and coordinated?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the wear and tear of these streets due to more traffic volume and weight in winter. How will this affect the durability and maintenance of these streets? How will the repairs and improvements be funded and implemented?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the wear and tear of these streets due to more traffic volume and weight. How will this affect the durability and maintenance of these streets? How will the repairs and improvements be funded and implemented?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the travel time and distance for drivers in winter. How will this affect the convenience and satisfaction of drivers? How will the travel information and guidance be provided and updated?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the conflicts and congestion with other road users on these streets in winter. How will this affect the mobility and accessibility of drivers, pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, etc.? How will the traffic flow and safety be managed and optimized?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the exposure and vulnerability of drivers to winter weather conditions on these streets. How will this affect the preparedness and resilience of drivers? How will the emergency response and assistance be delivered and supported?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will increase the impact and disruption of winter events and incidents on these streets. How will this affect the reliability and continuity of driving? How will the contingency plans and alternatives be developed and communicated?

Rerouting traffic to hillier streets will not address the underlying causes of traffic problems on our street in winter. How will this affect the long-term planning and vision for our street? How will the traffic demand management and reduction be pursued?

A mill and overlay is not enough to fix the poor condition of our street. Our street needs a complete reconstruction to address the structural and functional problems. How can we trust the planner who is proposing a cheap and superficial solution, and also wants to install unnecessary pedestrian bumpouts and median islands?

A mill and overlay is not enough to improve the safety and comfort of our street. Our street needs a comprehensive redesign to address the traffic and pedestrian issues. How can we accept the planner who is proposing a quick and temporary solution, and also wants to install disruptive pedestrian bumpouts and median islands?

A mill and overlay is not enough to enhance the appearance and value of our street. Our street needs a beautification project to address the aesthetic and economic aspects. How can we support the planner who is proposing a bland and boring solution, and also wants to install ugly pedestrian bumpouts and median islands?

A mill and overlay is not enough to prepare our street for the future needs and changes. Our street needs a visionary plan to address the environmental and social challenges. How can we follow the planner who is proposing a short-sighted and outdated solution, and also wants to install irrelevant pedestrian bumpouts and median islands?

A mill and overlay is not enough to satisfy the residents and stakeholders of our street. Our street needs a participatory process to address the diverse and conflicting interests. How can we respect the planner who is proposing a unilateral and imposed solution, and also wants to install unwanted pedestrian bumpouts and median islands?

A mill and overlay is not enough to last for the long term on our street. Our street needs a durable and quality material to withstand the harsh weather conditions. How can we rely on the planner who is proposing a weak and prone solution, and also wants to install vulnerable pedestrian bumpouts and median islands?

A mill and overlay is not enough to reduce the maintenance costs on our street. Our street needs a preventive and proactive approach to avoid future problems. How can we afford the planner who is proposing a costly and reactive solution, and also wants to install expensive pedestrian bumpouts and median islands?

A mill and overlay is not enough to address the root causes of pavement deterioration on our street. Our street needs a holistic and systemic analysis to identify the sources of distress. How can we trust the planner who is proposing a symptomatic and superficial solution, and also wants to install ineffective pedestrian bumpouts and median islands?

A mill and overlay is not enough to restore the functionality and serviceability of our street. Our street needs a more comprehensive and long-lasting solution that can address the underlying issues and challenges. Why should we settle for a substandard and short-term solution that will not solve the problems?

A mill and overlay is not enough to enhance the livability and attractiveness of our street. Our street needs a more creative and visionary solution that can transform the space and experience. Why should we settle for a dull and ordinary solution that will not inspire the people?

A mill and overlay is not enough to meet the expectations and standards of our street. Our street needs a more quality and reliable solution that can deliver the results and outcomes. Why should we settle for a mediocre and inconsistent solution that will not satisfy the users?

The project should not be rushed to potentially explore better options or something else. Our street deserves a more thorough and careful process that can consider all the alternatives and implications. Why should we rush into a decision that may have negative and unintended consequences?

The project should not be rushed to potentially explore better options or something else. Our street deserves a more participatory and collaborative process that can involve all the stakeholders and interests. Why should we rush into a decision that may exclude and alienate some groups?

The project should not be rushed to potentially explore better options or something else. Our street deserves a more flexible and adaptive process that can respond to the changing needs and conditions. Why should we rush into a decision that may limit and constrain our options?

The addition of pedestrian bumpouts and median islands is not agreeable for our street. Our street does not need these features that will reduce the space and capacity for vehicles. Why should we add these features that will create more congestion and frustration for drivers?

The addition of pedestrian bumpouts and median islands is not agreeable for our street. Our street does not need these features that will increase the cost and complexity for maintenance. Why should we add these features that will create more burden and responsibility for the city?

The addition of pedestrian bumpouts and median islands is not agreeable for our street. Our street does not need these features that will change the character and identity of our street. Why should we add these features that will create more conflict and controversy for residents?

A mill and overlay and pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not the best solutions for our street. Our street needs solutions that can balance the needs and preferences of all road users, not just pedestrians. How will these solutions affect the mobility and accessibility of drivers, cyclists, transit users, etc.?

A mill and overlay and pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not the most cost-effective solutions for our street. Our street needs solutions that can optimize the use of resources and minimize the waste of money. How will these solutions affect the budget and funding of our street?

A mill and overlay and pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not the most durable solutions for our street. Our street needs solutions that can withstand the harsh weather conditions and heavy traffic loads. How will these solutions affect the maintenance and repair of our street?

A mill and overlay and pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not the most attractive solutions for our street. Our street needs solutions that can enhance the aesthetic and economic value of our street. How will these solutions affect the property values and business opportunities on our street?

A mill and overlay and pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not the most innovative solutions for our street. Our street needs solutions that can leverage the latest technologies and best practices. How will these solutions affect the performance and efficiency of our street?

A mill and overlay and pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not the most sustainable solutions for our street. Our street needs solutions that can reduce the environmental impact and improve the stormwater management of our street. How will these solutions affect the green infrastructure and climate resilience of our street?

A mill and overlay and pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not the most equitable solutions for our street. Our street needs solutions that can reflect the diversity and inclusivity of our community. How will these solutions affect the participation and representation of our street?

A mill and overlay and pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not the most compatible solutions for our street. Our street needs solutions that can align with the regional transportation goals and networks. How will these solutions affect the connectivity and integration of our street?

A mill and overlay and pedestrian bumpouts and median islands are not the most optimal solutions for our street. Our street needs solutions that can address the root causes and challenges of our pavement deterioration. How will these solutions affect the analysis and diagnosis of our street?

Our street deserves a complete reconstruction that can address the structural and functional problems of our pavement. A mill and overlay will only cover up the symptoms and not solve the root causes of deterioration. A complete reconstruction will provide a more durable and long-lasting solution that will save money and time in the long run.

Our street deserves a comprehensive redesign that can enhance the livability and attractiveness of our space. A mill and overlay will only provide a quick and bland solution that will not transform the experience of our street. A comprehensive redesign will provide a more creative and visionary solution that will inspire the people and increase the value of our street.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will reduce the space and capacity for vehicles. Our street has a low volume and speed of traffic that does not warrant these features. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more congestion and frustration for drivers who rely on driving as their main mode of transportation.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will increase the cost and complexity of maintenance. Our street has a low demand and preference for these features. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more responsibility and liability for the residents and taxpayers who may not benefit from them.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will change the character and identity of our street. Our street has a unique history and culture that should be preserved and respected. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more conflict and controversy for residents who value their street's heritage and appearance.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will disrupt the traffic flow and signal timing on our street. Our street has a good efficiency and performance that should be maintained and improved. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more delay and inefficiency for drivers who depend on smooth and reliable travel on our street.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will require more signage and marking on our street. Our street has a clear and simple geometry that should be kept and followed. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more clutter and confusion on our street.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will increase the wear and tear of our pavement due to freeze-thaw cycles and deicing chemicals. Our street has a harsh and variable climate that should be considered and adapted. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more damage and deterioration on our pavement.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will reduce the visibility and contrast of our street in snowy and foggy conditions. Our street has a low and flat geometry that should be enhanced and illuminated. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more obstruction and danger on our street.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will make it harder for snow plows and salt trucks to clear our street. Our street has a high priority and frequency for snow removal and deicing that should be maintained and improved. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more difficulty and inefficiency for snow plows and salt trucks.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will increase the liability and responsibility of the city on our street. Our street has a high potential and risk of damages and injuries that should be avoided and minimized. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more legal and insurance issues for the city and residents on our street.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will require more coordination and communication among different winter service providers on our street. Our street has a complex and dynamic context that should be simplified and integrated. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more challenges and conflicts for different winter service providers on our street.

Our street does not need pedestrian bumpouts and median islands that will increase the damage and repair to the signage on our street from snow plows. Our street has a high cost and frequency of signage maintenance that should be reduced and minimized. Pedestrian bumpouts and median islands will create more exposure and vulnerability for the signage on our street from snow plows.

How will the installation of pedestrian median islands affect traffic flow and congestion in the area?

Will the limitation of left turns due to the installation of pedestrian median islands increase travel time for drivers?

How will emergency vehicles be able to navigate the area with limited left turns due to the installation of pedestrian median islands?

Have alternative solutions been considered to improve pedestrian safety without installing pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

Will the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns negatively impact local businesses that rely on left-turning traffic?

Has there been sufficient public consultation and input on the proposal to install pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

How will the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns affect the accessibility of the area for people with disabilities or mobility issues?

Will the limitation of left turns due to the installation of pedestrian median islands increase the risk of accidents as drivers attempt to make illegal left turns?

Have studies been conducted to assess the potential impact of installing pedestrian median islands that limit left turns on traffic flow and safety?

Is there sufficient evidence to support the claim that installing pedestrian median islands and limiting left turns will improve pedestrian safety?

Will the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns result in increased traffic on other roads as drivers seek alternative routes?

How will the installation of pedestrian median islands affect the ability of large vehicles, such as trucks and buses, to navigate the area?

Will the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns result in increased air pollution due to increased idling and congestion?

Have the potential impacts on emergency response times been considered in the proposal to install pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

Will the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns result in increased maintenance costs for the city?

Have the potential impacts on property values in the area been considered in the proposal to install pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

How will the installation of pedestrian median islands affect the ability of residents to access their homes and businesses?

Will the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns result in increased noise pollution due to increased traffic and congestion?

Is there a plan in place to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of installing pedestrian median islands that limit left turns in improving pedestrian safety?

How will the installation of pedestrian median islands affect snow removal and plowing operations during harsh winters?

Will the limitation of left turns due to the installation of pedestrian median islands result in increased difficulty for drivers navigating icy and snowy roads?

Have the potential impacts on road safety during harsh winter conditions been considered in the proposal to install pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

Will the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns result in increased costs for winter road maintenance?

How will the installation of pedestrian median islands affect the ability of residents to access essential services, such as grocery stores and medical facilities, during harsh winter conditions?

Will the limitation of left turns due to the installation of pedestrian median islands result in increased difficulty for emergency vehicles to respond to incidents during harsh winter conditions?

Will the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns result in increased difficulty for pedestrians to cross the street safely during harsh winter conditions?

Have measures been put in place to ensure that pedestrian median islands are properly maintained and kept free of snow and ice during harsh winters?

Is there a plan in place to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of installing pedestrian median islands that limit left turns in improving pedestrian safety during harsh winter conditions?

How will the city ensure that the concerns of residents and businesses are adequately addressed in the decision-making process regarding the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

Will there be additional opportunities for public input and feedback on the proposal to install pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

How will the city ensure transparency and accountability in the decision-making process regarding the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

Have the potential long-term impacts of installing pedestrian median islands that limit left turns been thoroughly evaluated and considered?

Will there be a process in place for residents and businesses to appeal the decision to install pedestrian median islands that limit left turns if they believe their concerns have not been adequately addressed?

How will the city ensure that the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns is carried out in a fair and equitable manner, taking into account the needs and concerns of all affected parties?

Will there be opportunities for ongoing dialogue and collaboration between the city and residents and businesses regarding the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

Will there be measures in place to mitigate any negative impacts on residents and businesses resulting from the installation of pedestrian median islands that limit left turns?

Have studies been conducted to assess the potential impact of installing pedestrian bumpouts on traffic flow and safety? If the city is also installing pedestrian median islands that limit left turns, how will the combined impact of these two measures on traffic flow and safety be evaluated?

Is there sufficient evidence to support the claim that installing pedestrian bumpouts will improve pedestrian safety?

How will the city measure the success of this project?

How will the voices of those who do not support this idea be heard and taken into consideration?

How will the combination of a road diet, pedestrian median islands, and pedestrian bumpouts interfere with snowplows and the width of their blades, or other large vehicles? Will Fairview Avenue be able to support the vehicles and tools needed to keep our streets safe?

I do not support the additional pedestrian island medians and pedestrian bumpouts. I also do not feel that my voice is being taken seriously. What is the city doing to convey that they are receptive to the input of others and that this input is taken seriously versus overlooked because it goes against what the city wants to do?

Will the city be supportive of mixed uses of the proposed pedestrian median islands? For example, in place of an ugly cement eyesore, will the city allow residents of nearby pedestrian median islands to place items on them to beautify them and/or increase their use cases.

Why is the city shutting down the comments and question form? This does not inspire confidence that the city is seriously taking into consideration the voices of the people who this project will impact. From my perspective, the overall reaction has been negative. How does the city categorize the response of this project and where did that data come from? Will the city be open with this information?

I do not support the proposed pedestrian median islands and pedestrian bumpouts. For the elderly still driving, the lack of turning that these additions will create will be jarring and discombobulating. Will alternative routes be clearly labeled with signage? Will this be sending drivers to streets they should not be on?

I really am hoping that the citizens of St. Paul have been listened to. Many comments have been made to look at alternatives to putting in Medians across Fairview. It is so very interesting that the sidewalk situations seems to propose more safety issues than crossing the street. It is interesting that at the Eleanor and Fairview there is no sidewalk on the West side of Fairview. At this point it seems that less drastic measures could be used Pedestrian light, half a Median, etc to allow access across all lanes of traffic. Much concern has been presented about traffic control especially in the winter. The streets are not plowed that well are you sure the Medians will be cleaned ? There is still a concern for Emergency Vehicles getting through Eleanor on both sides of Fairview. since there is no opening on Snelling and now limited access on Fairview There was a major concern about Bohland Ave and people dropping off students at Highland Catholic. There have never been any School Crossing people at Eleanor and Fairview to assist Horace Mann students. I have lived in this area for many years and there never has been a concern about getting students across Fairview. It was mentioned the Schools had been contacted but what school is not going to be concerned about safety? I have been to to the virtual meeting and the in-person meeting and I really hope you listened. It was obvious at the in-person meeting that you did not want the group to be together to share their concerns. I really hope you can keep an open mind to what the people have said . It did not seem that you and your group were open to alternatives. It seems you do not live in the area but we do and we pay high taxes (since the cost is not known for Medians and bump outs save the money correct the sidewalks) and actually pay your salary and we really deserve to be listened to and not have all the changes jammed down our throats. I do not think it is right to just say use other streets to gain access to Fairview and therefore increasing traffic on surrounding neighbors. Remember you may have some studies from books (it would have been nice to have local studies to see the need) but we live here and many many for numerous years. With limiting access is Davern going to become the next "safety" issue? NO MEDIANS Please present honestly what you heard as this project moves to the next level.

I have an additional comment about the medians that restrict turns at Saunders specifically. I also saw these turn restrictives on Robert Street in West St. Paul. I could see the purpose there for pedestrians since there are stores, restaurants, businesses galore on both sides of Robert. Again, by Macalester College on Snelling, students and spectators can get across there where the lights blink more safely. There is a pedestrian calming median on Hamline south of 96, but this one does not restrict residents turning where they need to go. Even though Highland Elementary is up the long block, almost all the students are bussed in and dropped off by parents. There aren't any patrols walking students to that school. I think those days are from years ago when my kids went to school. Very few families have the luxury of one parent working. Please reconsider the extreme measures you are considering for highland residents. Thank you.