

66th Street Corridor Plan

Subject: Present Revised Land Use & Opportunity Sites Concepts

Date: 01/31/2011 Time: 6-8pm Location: Mt. Calvary Lutheran Church

Attendees: City of Richfield, Hennepin County, Damon Farber Associates, Wenck Associates, GVA Marquette Advisors, 30 residents, business owner's, and stakeholders (see attached sign-in sheets).

This was the fourth public meeting for the project following the visioning session held on September 15th, and the final session to present revised land use plans and opportunity sites concepts. The meeting started with a brief overview of the revised land use diagram, street sections, and district concepts, and concluded with visitors forming small groups and filling out the comment sheets provided. The following is a summary of the comments provided by the attendees.

Transportation

1. Single lane will significantly impact how buses flow and needs to be looked at further.
2. If there is no on street parking, business lots will continue to restrict occupancy.
3. Plowing will need to improve in single lane model.
4. Will narrowing road to only 2-3 lanes cause frustration for traffic flow?
5. Bike trail needs to be off the roadway.
6. On 66' R.O.W. having single lane in each direction and no bike lane looks too tight for emergency vehicles.
7. Would rather see the same road configuration for entire corridor regardless of changing R.O.W.
8. It's more important to keep the amount of lanes that we have for cars on 66th street. Keep bike path off 66th street and keep this road open for the purpose of people driving and getting to and from where they need to go – don't bottle neck with extras.
9. Keep the leisurely bike trails out of the busy traffic areas.
10. The 83' R.O.W. would best be served with on street parking.
11. With approximately six months out of the year with snow, it seems the best use of 66th street would be parking on street which is lacking now.
12. The 83' R.O.W. with parking makes the most sense in an area that is trying to accommodate commercial expansion.
13. The two lane configuration with a turn lane is a good idea, but show sufficient room for snow stacking.
14. The focus for 66th street should be for accommodating motorized traffic, not biking.
15. Bike trail should be on a quiet street, such as 65th, and have somehow the streets blocked so it is a green bike parkway, no cars, with less traffic intersections.
16. Appreciate bike paths with serious attention to safety – we need to guarantee safe bikeways for our kids.
17. Taking 66th street from four lanes down to two lanes will put additional traffic on the residential side streets.
18. Bicycle access would be wonderful if it can be separated from the roadway.
19. Don't replace lanes for cars with lanes for bikes. Do bring bikes a block off of 66th street.
20. Keep roundabouts out of Richfield, The residents don't like them.
21. Keep residents back from the 66th Street corridor.

22. One lane east and west is not enough, we need 5 lanes, 2 east & west with one turn lane.
23. We like the boulevards, provides a place for snow, and keeps pedestrians safe from traffic.
24. Not sure about reducing the amount of lanes on 66th Street, cars are using the street to avoid crosstown.
25. A park and ride is needed on 66th Street.

Open Space

1. I like the idea of a community center in the park.
2. Crossings to Veteran's park should not just align with bus stops
3. The crossing by Park Ave needs a button to cross the street.
4. The bike path shown from Taft Park to Veterans Park on 63rd street would be ideal because it provides access without obstructing the roadway.
5. What is the cost associated with boulevard trees? 6' wide seems too narrow.

Land Use

1. As a business owner along 66th street I have concerns with either business or all residential along the corridor. I believe you will lose business along the corridor if all housing goes in.
2. Until redevelopment occurs please try to get existing businesses to improve the appearance of their exteriors. More landscaping, paint, etc. would greatly improve their appearance.
3. Business cannot have "economic viability" if signage is hidden by trees and parking is inadequate.
4. Senior housing would be a nice idea for the park.
5. We don't need high-density, low-income housing across from Veteran's park, don't want loitering in the park.
6. I don't know about the plans to build higher density housing closer toward the airport.
7. Many of the parcels under consideration for redevelopment are very small or not very deep, this presents a challenge for future use.
8. High density housing usually decreases in value over the long term.
9. Redevelopment area #2: it would be impractical to redevelop the Montessori School, I would exclude that from the plan.
10. Multi unit, medium density around Veteran's park makes a lot of sense.

66th Street Corridor

31 January 2011

Sign In

Name	Address	Email
Tom Fitching	6737 Adel	Tom.fitching@adl.com
TED & Jill LeVine	6737 Adel 516 E 66th St	TED@THELEVINSPOT.COM
Sue Sandahl	7601 Bryant	SUE@SANDPHLLAW.COM
Jack & Nellie	6620 11th Ave S.	
Sandy + Jon Clay	6600 Columbus	clay@ties2.net
Duane Helm	Mt. Calvary Church	
Marzena Melby	6900 Morgan	marzena@marzenamelby.com
CARY OLSON	6633 Columbus S.	
Tom Carter	405 W. 78th St. Rainfield	tcarter@rbhonda.com
Morris Niben	6527 Portland Ave Richfield	manilsen2@aol.com
RON WILSON	6644 CHICAGO	RONWILSON906@GMAIL.COM
Jama Keller	1537 66th	
Paula Cathy Lever	6607 18th Ave. S. + 1300 W 66th St	
Tom Ruble	206 W 64th St Richd	
Rick Jabs	6905 KOOP	
GAIL COND	6621 UPTON	
Jeff Hong	6637 Upton	
Amy Rutledge	6637 Upton Ave. S.	
Josh Rost	7120 Blount	stromail@comcast.net
MARTY KIRSCH	6725 PENN AVE S.	
Mike Franklin	1236 E Lantz St. Somerville	
Steve & Lois Quam	6421 James S.	
Muriel & Cecilia	6410 Washburn S.	masculina@comcast.net
Bob Roos	6604 12th Ave S.	bobroos@earthlink.net