Cleveland Avenue rebuild

Four general alignments have been developed, based on input from the public info sessions that were held in fall 2018. Generally, addition of bike facilities and trees were the top two ranked priorities with parking lowest ranked, but parking was more highly rated by people who live on Cleveland.

60 percent of the trees on the west side of the street will be lost in all scenarios because the water main needs to be replaced (cast iron, brittle) and it is on the west side of the street. If parking is kept, then more trees are lost on the east side because the overall build space is larger. The difference is 20–29 trees.

Almost all of the trees that would be lost on the east side are in the boulevard; there are also trees to the east of the ROW which would not be affected. The only area where trees are in the ROW and are east of the current sidewalk is on the curve at the south end of the project area.

The four alignments all include a 6’ sidewalk on the west side, and otherwise vary in these ways:

A. In-street bike lanes with parking on the west side between Dudley and Scudder (as currently), with bumpouts at intersections. 11’ driving, 8’ parking, 6’ biking. West-side boulevards: 6’ wide adjacent to parking, 14’ at bumpouts.

B. In-street bike lanes with no parking. 11’ driving, 6’ biking. West-side boulevards: 7.5’.

C. Off-street bike path along the east side with parking on the west side of the street between Dudley and Scudder (as currently), with bumpouts at intersections. 11’ driving, 8’ parking. Off-street path: 8’ biking, 5’ pedestrian not separated. West-side boulevards: 5–5.5’ wide adjacent to parking, 13.5’ at bumpouts.

D. Off-street bike path on the east side with no parking. 13’ driving. Off-street path: 8’ biking, 5’ pedestrian not separated. West-side bumpouts: 10’ wide.

In the parking scenarios, bumpouts at the intersections will help with sight lines both for pedestrian visibility and for drivers trying to enter intersections from the side streets. The bumpouts technically do not result in loss of parking because there should already be 20’ of clear space at the intersections (though this is not always maintained by people parking cars).

They have not yet determined what kind of controls will be at any intersections because they need to do pedestrian counts at some of the intersections once the weather warms up. Buford will have three crosswalks (two across Cleveland, one across Buford on the west side of Cleveland), stop lines on Cleveland, three light phases instead of two (one on Cleveland, two on Buford). The signal will be a cross arm over the intersection. No turn on red. They have simulated the bus turns. Vehicles can still go E-W through the intersection, but E and W move separately.

Storm water must be treated in the area of the project. Underground storage has been located along some of the adjacent sides trees already, there will also be at least one on Cleveland. Also the possibility of instead doing a rain garden at Cleveland and Raymond on the St. Paul Regional Water property. Does the community want a
rain garden there? The committee asked what the maintenance plan would be. Baseline maintenance vs. later upkeep. How many square feet is the area? Garden Club is a possible partner.

Ava raised the idea, on behalf of a neighbor, on whether adding metered parking on the east side of the street had been considered. (Partly this is a concern about enforcement and how many permits are given to Greek housing residents, some of whom are storing cars for the week so they can drive to their homes on the weekends.) Adding another 8’ of street width for more parking has not been raised as a request until this moment. Can’t have both trees and parking. U of M parkers don’t use paid parking if they can help it, so adding this parking (if it is enforced) doesn’t necessarily help.

Biggest change for homeowners on west side of street is decrease in boulevard width, from current 10–13’ to 6. Parking provides “vertical friction” to car drivers in scenarios A and C.

Pat said that after attending the open house, her main takeaway was that she was opposed to scenario A, in-street bike lanes with parking. The door zone danger with the likely increased speed of vehicle traffic (because of the widened driving lanes and improved pavement) seems like asking for a tragedy. “If we go through all of this process and come out of it with this solution, I will be very disappointed.” Planners asked if that would be true if the specific design could add some kind of buffer of the door zone. The answer: maybe? But ROW constrains make that seem unlikely. More loss of boulevard, tree space.

We discussed the reality of winter bike lanes in street vs. off-street. Likely, the in-street lanes will disappear (at least adjacent to the parking). The off-street path may narrow, but it will not disappear.

Cleveland Ave. is marked for an off-road path in the St. Paul Bike Plan, though Reuben said that decision was based on less information than has been elicited in the Cleveland planning process. The biking community is not in full agreement on whether in-street or off-street is best, different types of bikers want different things, but the 8–80 idea of bringing more people to biking tends toward off-street. The connection at the end of the path (to in-street lanes) is not ideal but if you never start, it never will change. The new lanes on Como to the east will connect directly. Regardless of which scenario is selected, someone will be mad.

We then discussed traffic speed. Bill said that one design cue he has seen decrease traffic speed is use of a concrete bike lane with asphalt vehicle lanes. Andrew said pedestrian crossing enforcement around the Minneapolis campus in the first weeks of each semester have helped there.

If the Transportation Committee and the Community Council want to offer an official endorsement of any particular scenarios, it should be done at the April committee/May board meeting.

2019 Transportation Committee goals

- Territorial/Seal safety: Pat will follow up with Elizabeth Stiffler on the cost of adding sidewalk to the north side of Territorial between Seal and Carleton. Scott said the homeowners association was not opposed to adding it (losing tree buffer, doing snow clearing) if they weren’t carrying the construction cost. There will be sidewalk at the new Union Flats building once that opens, meaning the north side of Territorial will have sidewalk all the way to Hampden. A REIT has bought the green-top buildings, so the Carleton extension idea is in no worse shape than it was before.
- No new info on the Midtown Greenway extension; the drone inspection didn’t pan out as well as they had hoped.
- We still need to build a communication pipeline to MnDOT, and also need to create one to Ramsey County. On that front, info: Energy Park Drive will have a mill and overlay this summer from 280 to east of Raymond. Also Larpenteur from 280 to Snelling.
- Wabash bike connection to the new park and housing: no news. The park budget is low, only part will be developed at first.

- District parking: Pat will check with Kathryn to see if it has been discussed with Mitra’s office and/or if it is being looked at by PED.
- We removed some other items from our goals as having been overly ambitious, though still part of our 10-year plan.

**Walking tour of reopening the grid in South St. Anthony Park**

After looking at a couple of possible dates, we decided on Sunday, June 9, early afternoon – probably about 1:00–3:00 p.m. Put it on your calendar now! We will meet with Bill Lindeke, urban geographer, and walk the neighborhood to see the private streets of SSAP and areas that should be streets or bike/ped connections but are currently buildings or private areas, ending up at either Bang Brewing or Urban Growler for a debriefing. This will be open to other people, but is focused on informing the committee.

Adjourned at 9:10 p.m.