City Council work session
April 24, 2018
What we heard

3 Open Houses
5 Transportation Commission Meetings
Chamber of Commerce Meeting
Business and Resident Meetings
Business Communication

- BP Gas Station
- Joy’s Pattaya Thai Restaurant
- DQ Grill & Chill Restaurant
- Barret Lawn Care
- Grocery of the Orient (KT Oriental Market)
- Metro Pawn & Gun
- Broadway Pizza
- Lynwood Commons Apartments
- Super America
- Richfield Transmission Center & Auto Repair
- Woodlawn Terrace
- Woodlake Chiropractic, Inc.
- Gramercy Park Cooperative
- McDonald’s
- City Bella
- Richfield High School
- Holy Angels Academy
- Fire Department
- Metro Transit
What we heard

Pedestrian Concerns (safety and accessibility)

• Sidewalks and crossings
• Pedestrian Fatality
• Speeding

Bicyclist’s Concerns (safety)

• Lack of facilities
What we heard

Motorist’s Concerns (operations)
• Lakeshore Drive intersection
• Holy Angels traffic
• Signal operations
• Sightlines
• 3-lane operations

General Concerns
• Corridor Appearance
• Parking
**Project Measures**

- **Pedestrian** Improve pedestrian experience both along & across the roadway
- **Recreational Bicycling** Provide space comfortable for recreational bicycling
- **Commuter Bicycling** Provide dedicated space for commuter bicyclists
- **Vehicle Safety** Provide left turn lanes, narrow lanes, consolidate accesses to minimize conflict & reduce speeds
- **Environment** Add green space
- **Maintenance** Add snow storage
- **Business/Residents** Add parking for better access to businesses & homes along the corridor
Corridor

**PEDESTRIAN** The goal of the pedestrian network is to provide for safe, secure and efficient movement along across the roadways. The following performance measures are used to evaluate the Pedestrian success of any alternative.

- ✔ Speed of traffic (slower)
- ✔ Offset to traffic (buffer zone)
- ✔ Crossing distances
- ✔ Median refuge
- ✔ Traffic controlled intersections
- ✔ Crosswalk visibility (i.e. pavement markings, signage)
- ✔ Number of conflict points with vehicles and bicycles
- ✔ Minimize circuitous routing
- ✔ Shade
- ✔ Lighting
- ✔ Resting areas (benches, short walls, drinking fountains)
Corridor

**TRANSIT**

The goal of the Transit network is to provide for a safe and efficient pedestrian movement along and across the roadways to the transit waiting areas and efficient transit operations. The following performance measures will be used to evaluate the Transit success of any alternative.

- ✔ Speed of traffic (slower)
- ✔ Space for waiting and proximity to boarding
- ✔ Offset to traffic (buffer zone)
- ✔ Bench or shelter (heated shelter)
- ✔ Shade
- ✔ Trash receptacle
- □ Bicycle parking (secure)
- □ Park and Ride
- □ Real-time transit information
- □ Corridor travel time
- □ Travel predictability
- Frequency of service
Corridor

**BICYCLE** The goal of the Bicycle network is to provide for a safe and efficient movement along and across the roadways. Considerations of the various bicycle skill level needs to be considered (i.e. commuter, recreational or young). The following performance measures will be used to evaluate the Bicycle success of any alternative.

- ✔ Speed of traffic (slower)
- ✔ Space allocated for bicycle lane or cycle-track
- □ Space allocated at intersections for left turning bicycles
- ✔ Buffer to traffic
- ✔ Signal “call button” access
- ✔ Conflict points reduced (vehicle, bus, pedestrian)
- ✔ Circuitous routing reduced
- ✔ Bicycle parking
Compact Roundabout
The goal of the Vehicle network is to provide for safe and efficient movement along and across the roadways. Critical issues include pavement condition, crash frequency and severity, accommodating the other modes along with operations along the corridor. The following performance measures will be used to evaluate the Vehicle success of any alternative.

- Reduce the frequency and severity of crashes
- Reduce speeds
- Reduce Conflict Points
- Corridor travel time
- Queue lengths (i.e. no impact to other arterials)
- Reduce delay at intersections
Next Steps

1 Public Open House
• Preferred Alternative
  – May 1, 2018
  – 4PM to 7PM
  – Oak Grove Lutheran Church

1 Transportation Commission Meeting
• Recommendation to Council
Purpose:
The purpose of this open house was to share the purpose of the Lyndale Avenue reconstruction project, project goals and objectives, project history, and solicit public input. This open house was geared toward building a common understanding of current conditions, opportunities, and potential impacts in the corridor and project area.

Staff Attendees:

**BOLTON & MENK** – Tim Lamkin, Sarah Rippke Lloyd, Haila Maze, Zachary Parsons.

**CITY OF RICHFIELD** – Jeff Pearson, Jack Broz, Kristin Asher, Liz Finnegan, Logan Vlasaty

**RICHFIELD TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEMBERS** – Wesley Dunser, Phil Chillman, Ken Severson, Gary Ness

Richfield Public Attendees:

There were approximately fifty (50) interested participants who attended the open house to review the materials and provide comments.

Materials Presented:

The material was set in a format allowing attendees the opportunity to view and visit with project staff at their leisure. Materials included

- Several boards with information on project overview, goals and objectives, related plans and policies, and community context
- Two large layouts of the corridor, with the opportunity to discuss and provide comments
- Surveys and comment cards to solicit input from participants

Comments Received:

Public input was collected through discussions with staff and through surveys and comment cards. The following summarizes the most frequently mentioned themes in the public comments collected:

- Safe and improved pedestrian facilities, particularly sidewalks and crossings (19 mentions)
- Safe and dedicated bike lanes on corridor, with connections to other facilities (13 mentions, though 4 opposed)
- Address speeding, including via traffic calming (5 mentions)
- Maintain existing trees and green space (4 mentions)
- Improve signal at 73rd Street (4 mentions)
- Convert the road from 4 to 3 lanes (3 mentions, though 2 opposed)
- Safer pedestrian and auto access for apartments and businesses at southern end of corridor, particularly Lyndale Commons (3 mentions)
Purpose:
The purpose of this open house was to reflect back feedback received to date, present a draft problem statement and goals, provide information on the corridor's existing issues, and educate on safety tools design elements that will address the corridor's issues. Feedback was collected on whether the process has been responsive to feedback to date, and whether the safety tool and design elements would be preferred on the corridor.

Staff Attendees
BOLTON & MENK
• Tim Lamkin, Sarah Rippke Lloyd, Haila Maze, Zachary Parsons

CITY OF RICHLFIELD
• Jeff Pearson, Jack Broz, Kristin Asher, Liz Finnegan, Logan Vlasaty

RICHLFIELD TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEMBERS
• Ken Severson, Jeffrey Walz, Gary Ness, Jack Wold, Sean Heyford-Oleary, Art Felgate

RICHLFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
• Maria Regan Gonzalez

Meeting Notification
The following notifications were done regarding the November 26 Open House:
• Approximately 900 mailers were sent to residents within proximity of the project, advertising both open houses.
• An ad in the Sun Current paper was printed in the November 23, 2017 publication.
• An ad on Facebook was promoted from November 22 – November 29, targeted towards those in Richfield.
• Multiple Facebook posts were created on both the City Facebook page as well as the Sweet Streets Facebook page.

Richfield Public Attendees:
There were approximately sixty (60) interested participants who attended the open house to review the materials and provide comments.

Materials Presented:
The material was set in a format allowing attendees the opportunity to view and visit with project staff at their leisure. Materials included

• Several boards with information on project overview, goals and objectives, related plans and policies, community context, problem statement, work done to date, and feedback summary
• Series of boards with information on specific design elements and safety tools
• Large layout of the corridor, with the opportunity to discuss and provide comments
• Surveys and comment cards to solicit input from participants
**Comments Received:**

Public input was collected through discussions with staff and through surveys and comment cards. The following summarizes public comments collected:

- Address ways to accommodate bicycles safety, and make connections to other facilities; difference of opinion if needed on Lyndale
- Pedestrian and business access improvements south of 74th
- Need better pedestrian facilities – sidewalks and crosswalks
- Difference of opinion on need for on-street parking

![Survey Questions: Support For Concepts](image1)
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Purpose:

The purpose of this open house was to review what has been done to date to respond to community feedback and complete supporting technical analysis, and to provide input on potential design concepts for the corridor and for key intersections.

Staff Attendees:

BOLTON & MENK – Tim Lamkin, Sarah Lloyd, Zachary Parsons
CITY OF RICHFIELD – Jeff Pearson, Jack Broz, Logan Vlasaty
RICHFIELD TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEMBERS – Ken Severson, Paul Chillman, Jack Wold

Richfield Public Attendees:

There were approximately ninety (90) interested participants who attended the open house to review the materials and provide comments.

Materials Presented:

The material was set in a format allowing attendees the opportunity to view and visit with project staff at their leisure. Materials included:

- Several boards with information on project overview, goals and objectives, related plans and policies, community context, problem statement, work done to date, feedback summary, and evaluation process
- Boards outlining the different roadway, intersection, and bicycle alternatives
- Series of boards with information on specific design elements and safety tools
- Large layout of the corridor, with the opportunity to discuss and provide comments
- Surveys and comment cards to solicit input from participants
Comments Received:

Public input was collected through discussions with staff and through surveys and comment cards. In total, there were 65 comment cards and surveys submitted. The following summarizes public comments collected:

![Bar chart: Baseline Survey Questions]

### 76th Street to 74th Street

- **Concept 1:** Many supported this concept — those that commented opposing the concept seem to dislike 3-lane concept.
- **Concept 2:** Many supported the compact roundabout with median — Concern with business/driveway access if a median would be installed
- **Concept 3:** Decent support for the 4 lane concept—but many disliked it and did not see it as a change to what is there already.

### 70th Street

*Most people preferred the roundabout. There was an overall pedestrian crossing safety concern.*

- **Concept 1:** Most people preferred the compact roundabout as it would continue to move school traffic and reduce backups. The only worry here was pedestrian crossing safety.
- **Concept 2:** Most who supported this option requested faster signal times and generally said yes to this because they did not like the concept of a roundabout.

### Lakeshore Drive to 67th Street

- **Concept 1:** People tended to support the compact roundabout concept more frequently than the signal. The main concerns were driveway access if a median were to be installed and safety crossing the intersection.
• Concept 2: People who supported this generally did so because they did not prefer roundabouts.

Bicycle Facilities

*People liked the cycle track and moving the route to Aldrich the best.*

• Concept 1 Traditional Bike Lane: many thought this option is unsafe and hazardous to drivers and bikers
• Concept 2 Buffered Bike Lane: People who liked this option liked how it was out of the way a bit, and that the area would be plowed in the winter
• Concept 3 Cycle Track: Most preferred option
• Concept 4 Move Route: Many people preferred this option as well, but people who preferred it also answered with the “No need/desire” when asked if they bike on Lyndale.

Parking

*The concept of adding spaces was generally well received. Concerns were right of way issues, losing trees, and “not needing” it.*

• Concept 1 Pocket: People liked pocket parking
• Concept 2 Parallel: People were neutral on this one.
• Concept 3 Back In: Either they loved it or hated it. The main concern was the actual task of backing into a spot. They said that is not only difficult, but would hold up traffic.