



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

MAIN STREET OPPORTUNITIES (BOARDS 1-4)

The downtown core along Main Street generally is in great shape and expected to remain intact. The primary opportunities, then, are using the redevelopment of the former Shopko site to strengthen the east end of the core and connecting the core to the riverfront, including enhancements to Pfiffner Pioneer Park.

Riverfront Connection/West Downtown Opportunities (Board #1)

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg
A. Level of support for Redevelopment of WPS Site/Parking Lot.	13	3	1	1	3.56
B. Level of support for Mosses Creek Daylighting.	20	1			3.95
C. Level of support for Improving the Main Street Crossing.	19	1			3.95
D. Level of support for “Main Street Extension” - West.	14	4			3.78
E. Level of support for Rerouting the Green Circle Trail.	16	4	1		3.71
F. Level of support for Connecting to the River.	19	1			3.95

What would you add/subtract/change about the **Riverfront Connection/West Downtown Opportunities?**

- WPS needs to have development sooner than later (not 3 years). Do change traffic on Main/2nd/etc. Clark should be 2-ways again too. Right now, it lets people avoid downtown. Support connecting to the river as long as it isn't a boat launch or yearly rental spots like on Franklin.
- Mosses Creek daylighting is one of the most exciting things I've seen proposed in recent years. Creates exciting potential
- Nothing – great plan and vision...do it all.
- Possible pedestrian bridge over Water Street?
- Would a pedestrian/bike bridge be feasible at Main Street crossing?
- B. pending EPA grant, etc. could Main Street and Main Street expansion be walk/bike only? No cars? No on-street (Main) parking? It'd be great! Safe! Accessible!
- Kayak business off of Mosses Creek daylighting – Rowing on River, non-motor area. Expand Pfiffner Park as much as possible.
- The WPS site has been mentioned as an example of abundant downtown parking and now it's gone?
- WPS/parking lot should be converted to park land. Increased demand for park space with increased housing in the downtown area.
- C. I think this is the most important feature of this target area. Providing a safer and more comfortable crossing of Water St. for the most vulnerable users (pedestrians/bicyclists) will be most effective for improving activity/tourism and should be priority. Since an RRFB can be confusing and only partly effective, it's more important to narrow the travel lanes, provide a pedestrian island, post yield signs for cars to automatically prioritize people over cars, and treat the crosswalk with a mix of brick pavers/artistic designs. A pedestrian table would be effective too as long as its grade is gradual enough not to impede plowing. It would also be a good idea to position a robust transit stop very close to this Main St. crossing along Water. A. & D. Replacing the oversupply of off-street parking with development that doesn't require parking (or only a minimal amount) is critical to the vibrancy of downtown. F. With the activity I already see from visitors parking in the Crosby/M&I/municipal lots and unloading their bikes it's a key indicator that this sit would be an excellent Green Circle Trail "hub" or "trailhead" with a fix-it station, mapping, historical signage/art, to-go maps, etc.



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Riverfront Connection/West Downtown Concept (Board #2)

The current site of the Chase Bank branch and adjoining riverfront provide an exciting opportunity to create a “destination” that connects Main Street to the river with an attractive promenade and mixed-use redevelopment. The concept is shown in both an overhead and perspective view.

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
G. Level of support for Riverfront /West Downtown Concept.	16	3		1	3.70
<p>What would you add/subtract/change about the Riverfront Connection/West Downtown Concept?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it a restaurant that closes at 11:00pm like the parks. Don't pave, you wont be able to use it as a skate rink and it takes away green space. • Chase Bank needs to go! Great place for a hotel or wharf. • Move the focus on PRTS. This is easy to understand the “Destination location” concept. Vibrant design!! • A great vision and use of the waterfront into commerce at the Point. • Love the energy this plan would inherently create. • It'd be good to connect them, especially without cars. • The idea of creating year-round activity opportunities around the river is great. Boating, ice skating. • Too much housing! • It's good except for the parking lots. The only change I'd recommend is to reduce the off-street parking. Cutting out one of those new lots would actually allow the focus to be on people (pedestrians) instead of cars. Since street parking will become more effectively utilized as the City rides the learning curve, this planned concept's supply of off-street parking makes walking more difficult and reduces the taxable land downtown. There are literally 1,500+ free parking spots within a 1/2 mile of this node. Plus, supplying this much off-street parking right next to the most important (cross walk/downtown connection) is antithetical to its safety. Why induce demand for cars when we should be reducing traffic flow and increasing pedestrian/bicyclist usage? Further, having an off-street parking lot abutting a pedestrian plaza is not a good idea in this area where density is most important. This parking lot concept is a suburb-style corridor model that reminds me of the ever failing strip malls around the country. 					

Pfiffner Pioneer Park Concept (Board #2)

Also shown on Board #2 is a concept for improvements to Pfiffner Park, which includes the removal of Crosby Street and enhancements to the Pfiffner and Central Company Buildings to create opportunities for additional, year-round uses for public and private events, such as weddings.

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
H. Level of support for Creating a Paved Parking Lot.	7	4	6	3	2.75
I. Level of support for Expanded Use of Pfiffner Building.	17	3			3.85
J. Level of support for Year-round Activity/Recreation Center.	17	3			3.85
K. Level of support for Expanded use of Central Company Building.	10	5	3		3.39
L. Level of support for Long-term Park Expansion.	15	3	1	1	3.60
M. Level of support for Vacating Crosby Avenue.	16	2	1		3.79



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

What would you add/subtract/change about the **Pfiffner Pioneer Park Concept**?

- Anything/planning to get people out in Point with year-round activities is great for us as a community. I think to take away housing when you are in turn creating housing is strange. Try to use parking that already exists.
- I. Have two high end or one apartment above. Money to go towards the parks.
- Major revamp of bandshell. Hell, just paint the sucker.
- Nice to see multiple uses for buildings
- All the development would be great and to bring people to the area. Get rid of Crosby!
- H. Less parking/paved spaces.
- Ice rink outside Central County building in winter – again outdoor activities are important.
- Usually not a fan of removing residential for parking.
- Larger rec center with ability to host indoor basketball, volleyball, and soccer events – bring youth tournament to downtown. Pfiffner building new waterfront restaurant/bar. Provide parking adjacent to event center.
- Access to park internal is limited. No Crosby may clog surrounding streets.
- H. Why not keep the same pervious surface instead of paving (this is better for reducing convection and maintaining better stormwater mitigation)? Paving is an unnecessary expense and adds to the City's infrastructure liability. I think the rest of these goals can be achieved without paving a parking lot.

Northeast Gateway/Shopko Block Opportunities (Board #3)

		4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
N.	Level of support for Redevelopment of the Shopko Block.	15	4			3.79
O.	Level of support for Enhancing the Transit Hub.	14	6	1		3.62
P.	Level of support for Redevelopment along Briggs Street.	12	4	1	1	3.50
Q.	Level of support for “Main Street” Extension - East.	14	5	1		3.65

What would you add/subtract/change about the **Northeast Gateway/Shopko Block Opportunities**?

- Keep Main one-way.
- Continue Union Street southward to Main Street. Eliminate Strongs Avenue dogleg all together.
- I like the idea of a parking ramp.
- Have Main Street become the focus going west again. Yes, extend Church Street and close Briggs.
- Watch hidden costs for parking ramps.
- O. especially to include/promote regional transit also.
- Make access to Main Street business easy even in winter.
- N. All of this is good except for the parking ramp concept. Parking management for the downtown should not be based on the SEH parking study since it inadequately presents management level objectives. This parking study failed to recommend action based on the relationship of supply and demand. Instead recommendations were only temporal and took a stab at what might be best practice. Based on the large vacancies of parking in municipal lots during most days an extremely expensive parking ramp is not justified and thus the parking supply should be reduced (not expanded or even maintained). Since all of these concepts point to expecting higher bike/ped demand/usage, then building more off-street parking is the opposite of what should be done. Once parking demand actually becomes an issue then the City can implement performance (dynamic) parking pricing to reduce demand. This then also realizes the goal of people walking more.



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Northeast Gateway/Shopko Block Concepts (Board #4)

The loss of Shopko provides an exciting opportunity for multi-story redevelopment of office and/or residential along Center Point Drive and restoring the 2-3 story character of Main Street across the front of the site while retaining parking in the middle of the block.

		4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
R.	Level of support for Northeast Gateway/Shopko Block Concept 1.	1	10	8	1	2.55
S.	Level of support for Northeast Gateway/Shopko Block Concept 2.	7	11	4		3.14
T.	Level of support for Northeast Gateway/Shopko Block Concept 3.	6	6	6	2	2.80

What would you add/subtract/change about the Northeast Gateway/Shopko Block Redevelopment Concepts?

- Main Street should be the focus, bring people to historic Stevens Point. I like the idea of the parking structure, but not sure of what concept I like better. I feel the roundabout would become the focal point. I do like the green space that it creates.
- Could the roundabout be located where Main and Ceterpoint split to better serve downtown?
- Do condos
- No roundabout, too difficult for pedestrians to cross. Cannot have apartments and parking ramp 1/2-1 block away. Too dangerous for night walking, winter walking conditions, or for carrying groceries, children, etc. Risk low occupancy without adjacent parking.
- #3, roundabout poses interesting/competing Downtown gateway with the “gateway” I would expect at Main/Clark and Division. Eliminate Strongs Avenue and reconsider this design.
- I really like the parking ramp. I like driving roundabout, but think these could be a frustration for walkers in this place.
- Nothing really works for me since Main Street should be the “main” focus and energy of coming downtown – these options take the energy “around” downtown again, especially Concept #3.
- I like the space that the residential area offers in #2. I like the green space with roundabout option in #3 and opening up Briggs Street - however, it takes focus off Main Street and brings the “gateway” to Centerpoint
- I don’t think roundabout encourage pedestrian and bike movement
- The size of the parking structure and appearance would be important. I wouldn’t want a massive structure taking the spotlight.
- Feel Centerpoint should continue two-way to at least Division, if not further out.
- Don’t like roundabout as biker; also encourages more speed for drivers. Concept 2 – more green
- All of these concepts remove what little parking that is available for food hub/farmshed
- What about a space for a regional transit hub? Connecting Stevens Point to other cities.
- Open green space, but possible winter use as well – skating in winter? It is only green 6 months, while the rest of time need some place for citizens to walk indoors in winter downtown.
- Concept 2 seems to have better flow.
- S. I gave this concept slightly more support since it had a smaller parking ramp. T. This is the best concept due to the roundabout. However again, there doesn't need to be a parking ramp. If the footprint of the parking ramp was replaced by any other development it would be a good decision for residents and visitors alike. The only reason so many people feel there needs to be more parking is because the City systematically induced demand with parking requirements in the zoning code (continuously building supply) and keeping it free. If supply was reduced and performance pricing initiated, I guarantee demand would go down!



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

CIVIC CAMPUS AND SOUTH RIVERFRONTS (BOARDS 5-8)

The potential relocation of the County courthouse and administrative offices out of the downtown opens the opportunity for new private office and/or residential redevelopment as well as new public spaces.

Civic Campus Opportunities (Board #5)

The potential relocation of the County courthouse and administrative offices out of the downtown opens the opportunity for new private office and/or residential redevelopment as well as new public spaces.

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
U. Level of support for Redevelopment of the Weber Block.	13	2	4		3.47
V. Level of support for Redevelopment of Ellis Street.	9	7	4		3.25
W. Level of support for Redevelopment of City/County Parking Lot.	10	5	4		3.32
X. Level of support for Redevelopment of the City/County Building.	7	3	4	3	2.82

What would you add/subtract/change about the **Civic Campus Target Area Opportunities?**

- V. City just remarked the lanes and parking for Sentry and now they have moved. Want to see what will happen with building.
- Add single family
- Keep City and County services clustered. Move LEC to an eastern campus.
- Difficult to respond to this board without knowing the future of government use. I strongly believe that City/County should use the same infrastructure supporting only 70,000 with dual campus (two different ones) is a poor use of long term tax dollars.
- Keeping City/County municipal building downtown is important – move jail and sheriff department out if reimaging the space – need more info on future of government in small cities.
- Switch the potential plaza with the potential employment
- City and County need to come to agreement before plan for a large portion of this board to proceed
- More campus/less residential use (depending on county/city plans)
- It's important to ensure the City/County is located in a place where everyone (not just people who drive) can access the services and expertise
- Tear down Weber building or remodel into new business space. Bring in a business with housing across the street so people can walk to work. Tear down jail, move it outside of downtown.
- Court house needs to stay downtown. Once that is resolved, then other ideas can be considered.
- I want to express firm support for keeping government services downtown and not relocating county government to the outer edge of the city.
- I don't support the relocation of County courthouse and offices out of downtown, but if this ends up happening: V. Overall, I support developing on top of parking lots to reduce parking supply, build tax base, reduce impermeable surface, and improve aesthetics. Building a parking structure somewhere else (or in this location) is unnecessary to redevelop this site. There is already a massive oversupply of off-street parking downtown. The recent SEH parking study did not do a good job assessing the massive supply and recommend the need to reduce supply greatly. The City needs to better utilize its streets for street parking. Vacating Ellis Street is also unnecessary and would make walking/biking more difficult. I would think that keeping Ellis non-vacated would be more appealing to a developer for better access and visibility of building, whether it's commercial, mixed use, or otherwise. W. This is a good idea, but I think a higher density style of residential is warranted. X. I think a retrofit and reuse of the building/space is much more sustainable/resilient than demolition to turn into green space



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

South Riverfront Opportunities (Board #6)

The potential relocation of the County courthouse and administrative offices out of the downtown opens the opportunity for new private office and/or residential redevelopment as well as new public spaces.

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
Y. Level of support for Redevelopment of Mixed-use Waterfront.	14	6	2		3.55
Z. Level of support for Enhancing Green Circle Trail & Waterfront.	17	5			3.77
AA. Level of support for Redevelopment of South Water Street.	12	10			3.55

What would you add/subtract/change about the **South Riverfront Opportunities?**

- Parking lots don't need water views.
- Maintain Edgewater Manor. It's already residential waterfront housing.
- Close Water and use the land for development
- May want to reexamine parking by Ruby's – not sure if “newness” surge or if this will be a long term thing.
- This area is in need of attention and could highlight entrance to downtown from the west.
- Water Street realignment to 3rd sounds interesting. Worth further consideration
- AA. Continue/increase use of elderly housing
- Tear down building north of Paper Mill along Water – turn into a park with urban housing opportunities. Build a new senior center double the current size – bring seniors downtown.
- Y. should be highest priority – too much blacktop, underused parking lots.
- I would like to see a commitment to enhancing the biodiversity of the riverfront.
- Y. A lot of the success of redeveloping this area is be slowing down Water St. and changing it to a more complete street. Or, it looks like the image suggests vacating and redeveloping on top of Water. This could be good as long as bike/ped connections and safety are improved. Z. With increasing access comes improving pedestrian safety with robust crosswalks and other treatments. AA. I think development on top of the parking lots would be most effective

Western Community Gateway (Board #7)

Environmental issues associated with past uses of the property on the west side of the river south of West Clark Street have been addressed creating the opportunity for new, riverfront residential development that can serve as an exciting new community gateway and help connect Slomann Park to the river.

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
BB. Level of support for Redevelopment of Riverfront Housing.	13	7	2		3.50
CC. Level of support for Connecting Slomann Park to the River.	20	2	1		3.83
DD. Level of support for Enhancing the Green Circle Trail.	21	2			3.91

What would you add/subtract/change about the **Western Community Gateway Opportunities?**

- I think it could be reworked in a different way so Slomann ark doesn't bottleneck down to the river.
- Slomann Park doesn't connect to anything important so it may be better served as housing in addition.
- Make safe way to cross river.
- Increased Slomann Park waterfront buffer
- This will be a low use area for a long time, but more green use for the future is good.
- Housing or housing/restaurant, tiny house community
- Possible walking bridge to connect the north and south sides of West Clark Street.



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

- Community arts building for theater performances. Lots of areas to rest and relax along the river – no boat marina – river can't handle tons of boats – too small an area.
- I am not interested in over building of rental units and I see a clear and compelling reason to develop low-income housing to encourage low income families to invest in a home.
- Slomann Park is terribly underused and underdeveloped. Can we add a walkway, or a ballpark, or other ways to encourage people and children to enjoy the park?
- BB. As long as the new buildings don't have any flood risk, I'm for housing infill here.

Civic Campus and South Riverfronts Concepts (Board #8)

	4. Support strongly →		1. Do Not Support		Avg.
EE. Level of support for Civic Campus Concept.	9	6	1	1	3.35
<p>What would you add/subtract/change about the Civic Campus Concept?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Sentry re-rents to office space needs – as they are considering – where will the employees park if plaza goes in? • Raze LEC and redevelop as homes. Build courthouse next to Annex. City and County services within walking distance. • Law enforcement center needs to go away – connect this area with downtown • Interesting to add some green space between civic spaces to enhance beauty of it. • Yes, put City/County together – move sheriff out of city, but keep City/County offices downtown. • Need more info – don't feel informed enough to sway a vote. I believe City and County should stay together to not gut our downtown. • Relocate jail as well as County building • Not sure where civic offices would be located with new plan. • I think this decision needs to be based on serving the community (county and city) more than hopes for bringing in new things. If the City/County otherwise, based strongly on community feedback conclude they can serve the community better and vacate these spaces, I'd be on board. • Would rather see the county/city hall building get reused and not vacated. Could it be retrofitted? If it's beyond repair/blighted then I guess a plaza would be nice, but I don't think it's necessary at this point 					
FF. Level of support for South Riverfront Concept.	10	3	3		3.44
<p>What would you add/subtract/change about the South Riverfront Concept?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes sense • Anything that closes Water Street works. • The office space removes community access • Is there enough parking for businesses south of Clark (on Clark)? • As much senior housing as possible – some high end condos next to riverfront. • Reroute Water Street • I would emphasize a need to enhance biodiversity and elements that enhance our ability to be a sustainable community beyond 2010 when irreversible damage to ecosystems is predictable. • I'd recommend removing the potential on-site parking. I like this concept of bringing the green space out to meet 3rd for a GCT connection. This could turn into a mini-plaza with benches, art, gardens, and most importantly a very safe bike/ped connection (maybe the plaza widens to meet 3rd/Water and is protected by decorative bollards to indicate bike/ped only). Maybe this space could become another Green Circle trail hub with a fix-it station/map/etc. 					



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
GG. Level of support for Western Community Gateway Concept.	6	6	1		3.39
What would you add/subtract/change about the Western Community Gateway Concept ? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tiny home commune with kayak parking and clotheslines included. Would need to have synergy with upstream Moses Creek kayak parking complete with coffee and coop deliveries. • Beautiful reuse of currently underutilized space. • Hope that this could be unique housing, small lot/small house, something fresh that brings a new vibrancy. • Would be great to include a community/public space – tasting room, café to encourage public traffic • NO place to purchase groceries – as much larger apartments as possible with parking behind and not next to the river (1,500 sq foot minimum) • I like the trail connections. It would be ideal to only build one new street however, reducing long-term infrastructure liability. Maybe density can be increased with the focus on one street only and trails serving all units 					

TRANSPORTATION OPPORTUNITIES (BOARDS 9-12)

Transportation Opportunities (Board #9)

Conversion of the one-way pairs to two-way traffic will enhance circulation flow throughout the Downtown, and the excess right-of-way can be used for additional on-street parking and improved pedestrian and bicycle amenities.

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
HH. Level of support for Water Street North.	17	3			3.85
II. Level of support for Clark Street.	12	8			3.60
JJ. Level of support for Water Street South.	17	3			3.85
KK. Level of support for Center Point Drive.	17	4			3.81
LL. Level of support for Briggs Street and Church Street.	13	3	1	2	3.42
MM. Level of support for Ellis Street.	13	4	3		3.50
NN. Level of support for Strong's Street and Church Street.	16	4			3.80

What would you add/subtract/change about the Transportation Opportunities ? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It seems like focus will be taken away from Main Street. • I like the two-way and reducing the roads near the river and redeveloping the ones around old Shopko. • Support reducing pavement/road diets • I am concerned that restoring Main and Clark to two-way will make the Centerpoint/Clark/Water too complex. Poor visibility off the bridge. • Two-way traffic should continue all the way on Clark and Centerpoint – at the very least to Division... if not all the way to where they separate now (Main & Clark) • As it is, many visitors' (conference goers') memory of Stevens Point is not (yet) downtown, but the convention center. Emphasize transit/shuttle connections, including suitable drop-off/pick-up zones. Already important as some conference-goers carpool to hotels (east of 39). Will be more important if regional transit hub stays east of 39, better yet, downtown. 					
--	--	--	--	--	--



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

- Still concerned about parking for food hub
- Yes, to walking spaces and bike lanes and traffic calming
- Bring new medium size business downtown and match parking needs with transportation needs.
- Need to go all the way to Minnesota
- I am not able to drive so I support enhancement of pedestrian/bike traffic – again with a focus on reduction of carbon emissions.
- I love the whole thing!
- Great ideas!
- HH. Parking protected bike lanes would be best for this higher traffic corridor. II. There's no mention of bicycle facilities. Parking protected bike lanes would be best here too. KK. Parking protected bike lanes. MM. I'd recommend against street vacation. What's the purpose? NN. Yes, we need to remove as many one-ways as possible.

Water Street Cross Section (Board #10)

The existing Water Street cross section was built for its previous function as part of US Hwy 10. Current and projected traffic volumes do not require two travel lanes in each direction, creating an opportunity to add on-street bicycle lanes and parking while also freeing up surplus right-of-way for redevelopment as shown in the two options.

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
OO. Level of support for Option 1.	10	4	2	4	3.00
PP. Level of support for Option2.	8	5	3	4	2.85

What would you add/subtract/change about the **Water Street Cross Sections?**

- I think all space in this section where the future redevelopment may go, should be reclaimed as green space (Chase Bank).
- Make Water Street safe again.
- I like the cycle track and the angled parking.
- Take away on-street parking and increase the grass terraces. (snow storage)
- Access to outdoor activities is vital for Point – we need to promote this everywhere possible
- Angled parking would waste potential bike lane/traffic
- I appreciate the designated space for bikes. Berms and separation between roads and bike lanes are best for safety and increased use.
- Angle parking next to large vehicles is a problem, especially when one needs to back into traffic.
- Not sure there is a need for parking on both sides of the street.
- I would endorse opportunities to enhance access to the river.
- Add cycle track to Option 1.
- PP. This is almost excellent! It's definitely better than Option 1 since it slows the cars down further with angled parking and the cycle track allows for much better protection for bicyclists and pedestrians on the West side. It would be very easy to add the needed cyclist protection on the East side as well by flip flopping the parking lane and the bike lane to make it a parking protected bike lane. The cost difference is negligible. Also, with all of this additional street parking added the off street lots placed in the Riverfront Connection/West Downtown Concept may be unnecessary and that space can be much more useful as mini-plazas, gardens, greenspace, additional building square footage, etc.



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Center Point Drive Cross Section (Board #11)

The Center Point/Clark Street one-way pair system is also overbuilt for existing and projected traffic. With a return to two-way traffic, either bicycle lanes or on-street parking can be accommodated, but not both as shown in the two options.

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
QQ. Level of support for Option 1.	11	5	2	2	3.25
RR. Level of support for Option 2.	7	6	4	4	2.76

What would you add/subtract/change about the **Center Point Drive Cross Sections**?

- Provides green space potential and street parking that may reduce need for other parking lots.
- I would prefer bike lanes on each side of the street
- I believe street parking is needed
- I love the bike lane with a buffer. A raised buffer would be great. Having no bike lane would maintain/increase confusion where bikes go – sidewalk? (no) road? (maybe...)
- Encourage walking, biking as much as possible
- QQ. This concept says, "Don't ride your bike here and walking is only slightly safer." This is barely an improvement from the current cross section. RR. This concept is better but 11 ft travel lanes aren't necessary since the goal is to slow the cars to build transportation equity. Due to the correlation between large lane widths and higher car speeds, NACTO's Urban Street Design Guide highlights that "Lane widths of 10 feet are appropriate in urban areas and have a positive impact on a street's safety without impacting traffic operations." The downtown is the most important place to empower people to walk, bike, and use transit and the City has and will further exemplify complete streets approaches. I'd recommend the following X-section within the 59ft ROW (from south to north): sidewalk (6'), curb&gutter (2'), bike lane (6'), travel lane (10'), travel lane (10'), parking lane (8'), buffer strip for doors (3'), bike lane (6'), curb&gutter (2'), sidewalk (6'). It's more efficient and safer to have one way bike lanes on each side as opposed to the two-way cycle track. Since the bike lanes would cover both sides in my proposal these act as a buffer to pedestrians from the travel lanes and thus the sidewalks don't need to be wide at all. Since the Lullaby site sees a need for potential street parking, I think a parking protected bike lane makes sense on the north side.

Clark Street Cross Section (Board #12)

Even with a return to two-way traffic, Clark St. can continue to support parking on both sides of the street.

	4. Support strongly → 1. Do Not Support				Avg.
SS. Level of support for Option 1.	10	8	1		3.47

What would you add/subtract/change about the **Clark Street Cross Section**?

- Bike lane?
- Looks good to me.
- I would not have on-street parking, and would add bike lanes
- Where right-turn on red is available; parked cars block vision of oncoming cars
- How about a three-lane and bike lanes? Are we otherwise ensuring bike routes to the existing commercial?
- Good as long as it accommodates snow removal – perhaps parking on one side only.
- Make it two-way to Rogers Street
- Yes, this needs to become two-way. With 71ft of ROW why would bicycle facilities get left out in a full reconstruct? Further, 12ft travel lanes are unnecessary and 10ft should be used to slow cars and comfortably allow other uses. Here's the x-section I propose within the 71ft ROW (from south to north):



DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

sidewalk (6'), curb&gutter (2'), bike lane (5'), buffer with trees (4'), parking lane (8') travel lane (10'), travel lane (10'), parking lane (8'), buffer with trees (5), bike lane (5'), curb&gutter (2'), sidewalk (6'). Same as before, bike lanes provide a large buffer between travel lanes and pedestrians and thus sidewalks don't need to be wide. Since maximizing street parking is a good tool for transitioning away from wasting land/tax base with off street parking, building parking protected bike lanes would be best in this corridor. I'm guessing 4 and 5 ft are enough to plant trees but if not, I'd recommend shifting the width to 3 and 6ft so that at least one side has trees and the other could be a raised buffer with flowers or something decorative.

Additional Comments:

- Please lift the overnight parking restrictions. This no longer makes sense and can help so many, in many ways. Thank you!
- This information is very good and the fact of a vision is extremely important and refreshing. Change the roads and the rest will follow! Allow for on-street overnight parking, which will also create a higher density of use. The one missed discussion is the entry to downtown at The Castle apartment. That needs to be addressed in the plan, which is critical – the energy needs to flow to downtown. Remember the 1600 block of Main Street.
- Change roads is a must. Relax parking restrictions that are currently in place to encourage people to want to be downtown – develop downtown, etc. Change roads – rest will follow. Overnight on-street parking.
- Explore development models that enable existing landowners and other community members to participate (perhaps own a share of a development entity) and benefit from the upside of higher-value development projects. An overarching goal in any new development project should be state-of-the-art energy efficiency, and smart location and linkage (as will LEED-ND rating system). Connections (bike and transit/shuttle service) between downtown and east of 39 will be important as events continue at convention center. Fast transport between nodes of the region.
- Need physical activity center for people over 60. Definitely need downtown grocery market – Triggs on Main, etc. No more motorboats on river – channel too short and narrow north of park. Won't handle large volume of boats. Keep water level in the River the same if daylighting Mosses Creek – be sure it won't back up and flood downtown. Can't look like a ditch. Big need for comfortable/affordable condo for seniors. Get the jail out of downtown. Build a sports center combination arts building. Restaurant with multi-ethnic menu. Slim down the streets, but make snow removal easier. Perhaps one side parking alternate days – no parking after 11PM on some streets.
- Adding additional people and businesses to downtown is great, but there must be adequate parking for residents and employees. That does not appear to exist in the presented plans. The potential for (walking & driving) gridlock from large crowds looks great. Many people in small space. All these new residents and nowhere to shop for non-restaurant food and needs. If all of these come to pass, downtown is in danger of being overbuilt.
- I have extremely poor vision and for that reason I could not participate in the format set up to enhance informed engagement by the public.
- Less pavement, more walkability and bikeable spaces.
- It's evident that there's a greater focus on bicycle & pedestrian access and safety, which is great. However, increasing supply of off-street parking, which many of the concepts have proposed, is antithetical to improved bike/ped access and safety. The downtown is already oversupplied with parking and this has hurt us greatly, in many ways (financially, with stormwater loading, aesthetics, socially, increased convection, etc.). We have a lot of work to do as a city to manage parking correctly, so that more land is used to strengthen the tax base and create places that people want to frequent (instead of pass through). Also, I think that overall more of the buildings and properties in the concepts could be broken into smaller parcels to allow more incremental change instead of massive higher risk buildings/developments. This may leverage the need for less TIF incentives to developers as well.