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Introduction

Public transportation is becoming a top priority around the country, particularly in the Twin Cities metropolitan region. The overwhelming success of the Hiawatha light rail, near completion of the Central Corridor light rail, and struggle to raise funding for the Southwest light rail have impacted thousands of residents and businesses over the past decade. These three projects, combined with other mass transit modes combine to form the Twin Cities’ 2030 Transitway System.\(^1\)

The Gateway Corridor, running along Interstate 94 from downtown Saint Paul to Eau Claire, Wisconsin, is one of two priority transitways for future LRT, BRT, or Express Service development. The Gateway Commission is currently working with consultants to complete a Transit Alternative Analysis Study; the study will help address issues of congestion, potential economic development, revitalization, and social and environmental impacts along the entire corridor. Currently, five build alternatives include: (1, 2) a BRT or LRT line along Hudson Road and the I-94 median; (3, 4) a BRT or LRT line along East 7th Street, White Bear Avenue, and Hudson Road, and (5) a BRT managed lane along I-94.\(^2\) The Commission has little capacity to canvas East Saint Paul residents, businesses, and neighborhoods for their input; therefore the East Side Prosperity Campaign has organized a seven-member task force to develop an outreach campaign and advocate on behalf of East Saint Paul. Only two alternatives travel through the heart of East Saint Paul, yet all five alternatives significantly impact the future vitality of the community.

This paper explores two main issues, environmental justice and transit dependency, as they relate to the planning and development processes of the Gateway Corridor. The following five sections include quantitative and qualitative analysis to determine how environmental justice and transit dependency relate to East Saint Paul and may benefit residents as they advocate for their preferences in the Gateway Corridor process. (1) Background information is provided to better understand the Environmental Protection Agency’s Environmental Justice definition and the Federal Transit Administration New Starts’ funding process for capital projects. (2) Four case studies explore other metropolitan regions using qualitative and quantitative data to ensure environmental justice issues are addressed in mass transit projects. (3) A community profile using 2010 Census and American Survey data establishes that environmental justice issues are of particular concern to East Saint Paul. (4) A mobility analysis combines 2010 American Community Survey information, Metro Transit data, and other mobility studies to present East Saint Paul’s transit dependency. (5) Lastly, results from the East Side Prosperity Campaign’s 600-respondent survey are presented. This survey helps compile street-level data on current and future transit use.

Instead of presenting hard conclusions about Gateway Corridor alternatives, modes, or routes, this paper focuses on quantitative and qualitative data to explore environmental and mobility issues as they relate to the inner-city portion of the project. Additional research and outreach efforts are still necessary to better understand land use and economic development concerns along the Gateway Corridor study area in East Saint Paul.

Background

In order to understand Gateway Corridor issues at hand, it is important to understand basic Federal rules, regulations, and processes as they relate to mass transportation projects and environmental justice issues.

Environmental Justice

President Clinton introduced ‘Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations’ as an Executive Order on February 11, 1994. After fifteen years, the Obama administration renewed commitment to environmental justice issues by creating a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with all Federal Agencies. The MOA most importantly requires each agency to “make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human, health, or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations”. Furthermore, the MOA requires each agency to create an environmental justice strategy, submit the strategy to the Interagency Working Group, conduct internal reviews, and monitor compliance.

In addition to Clinton’s Executive Order and Obama’s Memorandum of Understanding, the Department of Transportation is subject to environmental justice considerations embodied in transportation laws and regulations such as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Section 109(h) of Title 23, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (URA), and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). These policies, particularly Title VI, prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, and nation origin including Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, American Indians, Alaskan Natives, and low-income persons. By definition, low-income persons include “those whose household income (or in the case of a community or group, whose median household income) is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines”.

The Department of Transportation provides several ways the general public can protect environmental justice concerns, stating:

“the active participation of well-informed, empowered individuals, community groups, and other nongovernmental organizations such as businesses and academic institutions advance the letter, spirit, and intent of Title VI and environmental justice in transportation when they (1) participate in public involvement activities (meeting, hearings, advisory groups, and task forces) to help responsible State and local agencies understand community needs, perceptions, and goals and (2) get involved with State and local agencies to link TEA-21 programs with other Federal, State, and local resources to fund projects that support community goals.”

In 2011, the Department of Transportation took a fresh look at the environmental justice process and revised the Environmental Justice Strategy. The strategy restates the agency’s commitment to (1) avoid minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects on minority populations and low-income populations, (2) to ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially

---
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affected communities in the transportation decision-making process, and (3) to prevent the
denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income
populations. The new Environmental Justice Strategy emphasizes training for Federal
employees, grants to community groups, enhanced public outreach, place-based efforts to
connect with local community leaders, and new mode-specific tools and guidance for achieving
these goals. Most important, the Federal New Starts process proposed several new guidelines
that address many environmental justice principles.

**Federal New Starts**

The Federal New Starts program began in the 1970s to provide Federal funding for
public transportation, including major capital investments in fixed public transit systems; the
Federal Transit Administration (FTA), an agency of the U.S. Department of Transportation
(USDOT), administers the program. The program has grown significantly over the past four
decades, both in terms of Federal funds available and complexity of its requirements. Today,
the FTA annually makes available $1 billion for “new or expanded fixed guideway New Start
transit projects”. As a result, the nation’s 6,000 plus transit agencies compete for funding;
however money is typically disbursed to large metropolitan regions because each project must
be at least $250 million. The New Starts process is extremely lengthy and contains many
moving parts.

As displayed below, the green squares represent the four major steps, the blue squares
represent Federal actions, and the yellow squares represent local processes. Notably, there is
only one local decision point; the Gateway Corridor is currently in the Alternative Analysis stage
and the Gateway Commission is working to decide on a locally preferred alternative (Figure 1).
Therefore, if East Saint Paul residents, businesses, and stakeholders want to be involved in the
locally preferred alternative, immediate action and input is necessary.

![Figure 1: FTA New Starts Process Project Development Process](image)
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8 U.S., Department of Transportation Website, *Environmental Justice Strategy*.
10 Mark Fuhrman, “Central Corridor: New Starts Process” lecture, Transit Planning and Management, University of Minnesota, 15,
2011, 9.
Aside from collecting community input, the Gateway Commission’s priority goal is to pass each step of the New Starts process in order to be awarded Federal funding. Currently, the New Starts process is undergoing major changes in its decision-making criteria; these changes particularly affect East Saint Paul. As displayed below, the overall project rating is based on project justification and local financial commitment. Six main criteria are evaluated within project justification. Currently, four categories receive 20% weighting and two categories receive 10% weighting. Under current proposal, each category will be equally weighted, therefore greater emphasis will be placed on environmental benefits and operating efficiencies (Figure 2). Although these proposals are not yet official, they may become effective within the next year.

![Figure 2: FTA New Starts Evaluation Process](image)

Under these proposals: (1) cost effectiveness will compare build to no build options for the current year and over a 10-year horizon and the ‘travel time saved’ concept will be eliminated; (2) economic development will enhance transit-oriented development (TOD) and favor affordable housing, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reductions, and number of jobs created by project design; (3) land use will continue to evaluate station area population and parking within one-half mile; (4) environmental benefits will abolish its simplistic rating system and focus on reduced greenhouse gas emissions, increased safety, and increased public health; (5) mobility improvements will abolish the baseline alternative and instead count each transit-dependent trip twice by focusing on zero car households and lowest income bracket households; and (6) operating efficiencies will abolish the per passenger mile operating cost and focus on ‘place mile’ operating costs.

Nearly all of the proposed changes will benefit East Saint Paul throughout the Gateway Corridor decision-making process because the new Federal guidelines emphasize ridership, affordable housing, station area development, transit dependent trips, and environmental benefits. To demonstrate that East Saint Paul stations can boost these categories, quantitative and qualitative information is necessary for Federal documentation purposes. More importantly, this information can help assist residents, business owners, and policy makers how each potential route will affect various part of East Saint Paul.

---

Fuhrman, 10.
Case Studies

The Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Transportation published *Transportation and Environmental Justice Case Studies* in 2000, featuring ten national examples of effective practices for achieving environmental justice. The studies profile transportation agencies that have integrated issues of race, income, and culture into state, county, and especially local decision-making processes; they focus on both analytical and procedural issues. The following synapses focus on the four case studies that feature mass transit projects at the planning and/or public involvement stages; the other six case studies were not included because they featured interstate and highway infrastructure projects.\(^\text{12}\)

**Fruitvale Transit Village**  
**Oakland, California**

The Fruitvale Transit Village, located near a Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) stop, has become a national success story for many reasons. The transit-oriented development (TOD) combines affordable housing, market-rate housing, small business retail space, and parking; most importantly, this project avoided local resident turnover and gentrification. Oakland is already a diverse city, but the Fruitvale neighborhood is 90 percent minority, with Hispanics and Asians serving as the largest population groups. The neighborhood began to decline when several canneries and factories left the area; this eroded the small businesses and left many parcels vacant. During the 1990s, BART announced its plans to build a multi-level parking facility on a vacant parcel of land directly adjacent to the station; the community immediately retaliated. Led by the Unity Council, a local community development corporation, the neighborhood was awarded several grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Department of Transportation (DOT). After several years of planning, the Unity Council, the City of Oakland, BART, and several Federal Agencies broke ground on the Fruitvale Transit Village.

This project highlights environmental justice issues for its use of partnerships, public involvement, and flexibility. Most importantly though, the Unity Council and the Fruitvale neighborhood viewed the BART station as a neighborhood asset and believed that the new transit village would stimulate economic development and promote environmental improvements in their low-income, urban community.\(^\text{13}\)


Regional Job Access and Reverse Commute Solutions
Northern New Jersey

The North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority and the New Jersey WorkFirst Program collaborated to fix inadequate transportation services that welfare recipients faced. The premise of this coordination derived from the Transportation Equity Act (TEA-21) that included the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program to address the mobility issues facing low-income persons. Like other metropolitan regions, employment growth moved to Northern New Jersey’s suburban corridors and greenfield developments; as a result residents of urban centers and inner suburbs faced longer commutes that were oftentimes not served by public transportation. The region used Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to analyze factors such as job locations held and/or appropriate for WorkFirst participants, childcare facilities, job training centers, and bus routes. This study identified which counties were best served by public transportation, childcare, and potential employers. These counties offered one month of free public transportation if welfare residents got a job. Counties poorly served by public transportation applied for Federal grants to receive increased operational transit funds to serve low-income residents.

Although this study had many limitations, it effectively targets environmental justice issues thru the use of census data to provide both simple and complex solutions. Additionally, the study demonstrates that cooperative relationships between federal, state, and local labor departments and social service agencies solve problems.  

South Park Avenue Improvements
Tucson, Arizona

The City of Tuscan received a $1.5 million Livable Communities Initiative grant from the Federal Transit Administration for the purpose of creating transportation enhancements along a one-mile stretch of South Park Avenue. The South Park neighborhood, a federally designated Enterprise Community, is a historically African-American, low-income community. While small in scale, this case study is noted for (1) effective partnerships to leverage financial and technical resources, (2) context-sensitive design tools to celebrate the neighborhoods history and spirit, and (3) highly effective public involvement that allowed residents to vote on each projects’ design before the improvements were finalized.

This case study emphasizes that transportation improvements, even small in scale, can serve a broader purpose to revitalize distressed communities and still remain sensitive to neighborhoods’ historic pride. Furthermore, it establishes that a well-planned and adequately funded public involvement process for the design and implementation phases creates community ‘buy-in’.

---

After the introduction of environmental justice federal guidelines and the amplification of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) around the country began developing methods to address transportation planning for low-income and minority populations. Federal regulations emphasized the need for MPOs to create self-certification processes for Title VI compliance, but gave little guidance for the establishment of such system. The Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission created a noteworthy four-step model to (1) identify and map locations of low-income and minority populations, (2) identify transportation needs of target populations, (3) document and evaluate the agency’s public involvement process, and (4) quantitatively assess benefits and burdens of transportation plans with respect to target populations.

Although this case study focuses on a regional system, it demonstrates that environmental justice issues should be embedded into the public mission and fully integrated into transportation planning and programming processes. Mid-Ohio RPC emphasized the importance of using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to map census data sets and Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs). The evaluation cautioned that low-income and minority residents typically become involved in regional transportation planning only when issues arise that threaten or concern them directly; therefore Mid-Ohio RPC institutionalized public involvement by creating the Public Involvement Process (PIP) and the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) that involve under-served populations during the initial planning processes.16

Community Profile

East Saint Paul is a diverse, working class community that spans four Saint Paul District Councils, two Saint Paul Council Wards, and three Ramsey County Commission Districts. Demographic and socio-economic characteristics vary significantly within the community’s borders; however, environmental justice issues collectively affect the ‘East Side’ because it is more racially diverse and economically impoverished than the City of Saint Paul, Ramsey County, and the Twin Cities’ metropolitan region.

Notably, some reports have updated East Saint Paul data using 2010 Census and American Community Survey data. The Wilder Foundation highlights Saint Paul’s District Council neighborhoods on the ‘Minnesota Compass’ website and Twin Cities LISC reports focus on various census track trends between 2000 and 2010. Unlike these reports, this data compares the four collective neighborhoods of East Saint Paul (Payne-Phalen, Dayton’s Bluff, Greater East Side, and Battle Creek) to the City of Saint Paul and the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan region. Because the Gateway Planning Commission has not yet chosen a route or mode of transit, this methodology was used to represent the East Saint Paul community as a whole. This analysis outlines demographic and socio-economic characteristics and concludes by highlighting variations within the East Side.

Demographics

East Saint Paul has a history of housing immigrant groups; today 20.5% residents are foreign-born. Minorities in East Saint Paul make up a majority of the population; however, the White population continues to be the largest racial group. Significantly increasing over the past two decades, Asians now make up 25% of the population, followed by Blacks at 16% and Hispanics at 13% (Figure 3). Within East Saint Paul, census tracts range from 38% minority to 80% minority. Even the least diverse census tract on the East Side is more diverse than the Twin Cities’ average. All but three census tracts are more diverse than the Saint Paul average (Figure 4).

---

East Saint Paul is a young community with a median age of 26 years. Nearly 35% of the population is under 20 years old; this is a significantly higher percentage of youth than Saint Paul and the Twin Cities (Figure 5). Furthermore, 40% of East Saint Paul’s households have children and 17% of the community’s households are single-parent households. Comparatively, the City of Paul has 30% households with children and 12% single-parent households; the Twin Cities has 33% households with children and 9% single-parent households. As a result, East Saint Paul’s household size is much larger than the metropolitan average (Figure 6), making its income per capita, $17,651, nearly half of the Twin Cities’ average, $33,431. As a result, many youth and young adults lack access to a car, limiting job and other opportunities.

---
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Socio-Economics

East Saint Paul is a low-income, working class community that relies on low-paying jobs for the majority of its economic activity. East Saint Paul’s median household income is $41,708, nearly half of the Twin Cities’ median household income (Figure 7). Furthermore, 25% of its population lives in poverty, as compared to 8% in the Twin Cities; 35% of the community’s children live in poverty, as compared to 11% in the Twin Cities (Figure 8). East Saint Paul’s median household income is also lower than the City of Saint Paul and its poverty rate is higher.

---
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East Saint Paul has a higher unemployment rate than the City of Saint Paul and the Twin Cities (Figure 8), with an estimated 5,395 unemployed residents in the current labor force. Interestingly, 86% of East Saint Paul households rely on work paychecks as a source of income; this figure is higher than the City of Saint Paul at 82% and the Twin Cities at 85%. Still, 5.6% of households rely on supplemental security income, 8.6% rely on cash public assistance, and 15.7% rely on food stamps. Therefore, a greater majority of households are working, but they cannot make enough money to rise above the poverty line.

A greater proportion of East Side residents are employed in service occupations (21%), production, transportation, and material moving occupations (18.4%), and natural resources, construction and maintenance occupations (8.3%) than the metropolitan region. Saint Paul and Twin Cities’ residents rely on management, business, sales, office, science, and arts occupations to a greater degree; in general these ‘creative class’ occupations pay more, helping to increase the median household income. There is a large gap in education attainment between residents of East Saint Paul and the greater metropolitan region. Only 80% of East Saint Paul residents over 25 years have a high school degree, as compared to 87% for the City of Saint Paul and 86% for the Twin Cities.

25 2006-2010 American Community Survey Five Year Summary File
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Saint Paul and 93% for the Twin Cities. Only 20% of East Saint Paul residents have a four-year college degree, as compared to 37% for the City of Saint Paul and 40% for the Twin Cities.\textsuperscript{29}

Housing costs and characteristics, specifically as a percentage of household income, are an important economic consideration. It is also important to consider housing characteristics and costs because they have increasingly been comprised of a significant share of households’ income, leaving less money for food, transportation, and education expenses. East Saint Paul is comprised of 55% owner-occupied units and 45% renter-occupied units (Figure 9); the community is 15 percentage points below the metropolitan homeownership rate but still higher than the City of Saint Paul. Notably, the homeownership rate was much higher five years ago, but the housing collapse and foreclosure crisis significantly affected East Saint Paul. The 2010 census estimated 9% of all housing units to be vacant in East Saint Paul; this is probably an underestimate.\textsuperscript{30}

While East Saint Paul’s median household income is 57% of the Twin Cities’ median, its median home value is 68% of the Twin Cities’ median. Without controlling unit size, the median rent in East Saint Paul is $757; this is higher than the City of Saint Paul ($756) and only slightly less than the Twin Cities ($870).\textsuperscript{31} East Side residents spend a greater percentage of their income on housing costs, such as mortgage, rent, taxes, and/or utilities. Therefore the amount of cost-burdened homeowners and renters, those spending over 30% of household income on housing expenses, is alarmingly high (Figure 9).

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Housing_Tenure_Costs.png}
\caption{2010 Comparative Housing Statistics\textsuperscript{32}}
\end{figure}
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Variation in East Saint Paul

Thus far, data has represented the collective East Side; however significant variation exists throughout the community. The following maps present three important environmental justice figures at the census track level: minority population, median income, and poverty rate. These maps demonstrate that socio-economic indicators vary, but are not necessarily clustered in the same East Saint Paul neighborhoods. Notably, three census tracts have poverty rates over 40%; this is the threshold for concentrated poverty and an indicator of exponential increases in social problems such as violent crime, drug use, teenage pregnancies, and high school drop-outs.  

Additionally, these maps present the two proposed Bus Rapid Transit and/or Light Rail Transit routes. The station stops and half-mile radius lines have not been drawn because exact data is not yet public. Considering environmental justice issues, it is important to consider each routes’ proximity to the most racially diverse, low-income, and high poverty census tracks. New mass transit routes could serve these households by increasing their access to jobs and reducing their transportation costs; however a large-scale transit project could also harm these populations if it requires property acquisitions, residential relocation, and small business disruption.

---

Mobility Analysis

If proposed changes to the Federal New Starts program are approved, environmental benefits and mobility issues will be equally weighted, each accounting for 20% of the rating formula. Mobility is particularly more difficult to analyze because census data only accounts for a portion of the information needed to fully understand commute patterns and transportation needs. The following analysis will provide an overview of East Saint Paul’s mobility issues using Census data, Metropolitan Transit data, and relevant information from Professor Yingling Fan’s Spatial Mismatch report.

Census Data

The 2010 American Community Survey estimates that approximately 3,155 East Saint Paul residents, or 7.9% of the working population, take public transportation to work. This figure is three percentage points higher than the Twin Cities region, but still two percentage points lower than the City of Saint Paul. However, an estimated 5,062 East Saint Paul households, or 15.5%, do not have access to a vehicle (Figure 10). This number is slightly higher than the City of Saint Paul, and seven percentage points higher than the Twin Cities’ metro. It appears that a number of East Saint Paul households without access to a car do not use public transportation, but may use other modes. For instance, 14% of workers carpool, 5% telecommute, and 4% walk or bike to work (Figure 11).

![Figure 10: Comparative Household Automobile Statistics](image)
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The percentage of East Saint Paul households without cars dramatically varies by census tract. Generally, households living closer to downtown Saint Paul are less likely to own a car, but most households in the Greater East Side have cars. For instance, only one to nine percent of households living near Beaver Lake, in the Northeast portion of the community, do not own a vehicle. Meanwhile, 37% of households in Railroad Island and 38% in Dayton’s Bluff, both in the Southwest corner of the community, do not own a vehicle. Notably, 38% of the residents living near Phalen Village, located in the central part of the community near Maryland Avenue and Johnson Parkway, do not own vehicles. This is the second largest and most densely populated census tract in the community (Map 4).

Housing affordability is primarily measured by housing costs relative to household income, but urban sprawl and rising gas prices have given way to a new ‘Affordability Index’ that measures housing plus transportation costs relative to household income.

“...the Housing and Transportation Affordability Index is a groundbreaking innovation because it prices the trade-offs that households make between housing and transportation costs and the savings that derive from living in communities that are near shopping, schools, and work, and that boast a transit-rich environment.”

The study found that many households chose to live in inner city neighborhoods to attain cheaper housing, but chose to spend their cost savings on vehicle expenses instead of using public transit. Many households living in the inner city experienced similar housing and transportation cost-burdens as those living in exurban areas because of these transportation costs. Despite lower incomes, households living in the inner city could significantly reduce cost-burden by using available public transit. These findings are very relevant to East Saint Paul. Despite higher median household incomes in the Northern and Eastern portions of the community, housing cost burdens are not reduced. Although, high poverty census tracts do experience the largest housing cost burdens, nearly 30% to 40% of all homeowners living in the wealthier portions of East Saint Paul are experiencing cost-burden (Maps 5 & 6). The American Community Survey does not include transportation costs in its cost-burden analysis, but if gas prices continue to rise, households solely relying on automobiles will be greatly affected.

---
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East Saint Paul: Households Without a Car

Percent of Households Without a Car Per Census Tract
- 1% - 9%
- 10% - 14%
- 15% - 19%
- 20% - 24%
- 25% - 40%

- I-94 BRT/LRT Route
- East 7th BRT/LRT Route
- Arterial Roads

Source:
2010 American Community Survey
MetroGIS Transitways

Saint Paul
East Saint Paul: Cost-Burdened Owner Households

Percent of Households Spending More than 30% of Household Income on Mortgage, Utilities, and/or Taxes Per Census Tract

- 21% - 24%
- 25% - 29%
- 30% - 34%
- 35% - 39%
- 40% - 50%

- I-94 BRT/LRT Route
- East 7th BRT/LRT Route
- Arterial Roads

Source:
2010 American Community Survey, MetroGIS Transitways

Saint Paul
East Saint Paul: Cost-Burdened Renter Households

Percent of Households Spending More than 30% of Household Income on Rent and Utilities Per Census Tract

- 38% - 30%
- 40% - 49%
- 50% - 59%
- 60% - 69%
- 70% - 79%

- I-94 BRT/LRT Route
- East 7th BRT/LRT Route
- Arterial Roads

Source:
2010 American Community Survey, MetroGIS Transitways
Metro Transit

East Saint Paul relies on Metro Transit buses for public transportation; seven local bus routes serve the East Saint Paul community (Figures 10 & 11). Although several express buses travel along Highway 94 into downtown Saint Paul, these buses primarily serve suburban residents. Currently, ‘Nice Ride’ bike sharing or automobile sharing services such as ‘Hour Car’ do not serve the community.

Figure 12: Metro Transit Routes 61, 63, 64

Figure 13: Metro Transit Bus Routes 70, 71, 74, 80

It is difficult to estimate daily bus ridership of East Saint Paul residents because the majority of local bus routes travel thru the community while connecting inner-ring suburbs to downtown Saint Paul. Therefore, daily ridership by bus route would capture suburban residents and reverse-commuters living in downtown Saint Paul. The daily maximum load into downtown Saint Paul is the best estimate of East Saint Paul bus ridership. These figures derive from Metro Transit’s Automatic Passenger Counter data; the numbers are averages of averages so they are not precise, but they accurately identify the most popular routes. The counts slightly overestimate capacity by including passengers boarding each route outside of Saint Paul.

40 Interactive Map
(Maplewood or Little Canada); however the counts also leave out passengers disembarking within East Saint Paul. Nevertheless, the counts estimate that nearly 4,900 East Saint Paul residents use six bus routes daily; this roughly compares to American Community Survey data that estimated 3,155 East Saint Paul residents use public transportation to travel to work.

### Bus Transit in East Saint Paul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Route</th>
<th>Origin - Destination</th>
<th>East Saint Paul Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Daily Maximum Load into Downtown St. Paul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Downtown Minneapolis - Downtown Saint Paul</td>
<td>Larpenteur, Arcade, East 7th</td>
<td>Mon - Sat; 1/2 hour; hour</td>
<td>359 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>St. Thomas University - Indian Mounds Park</td>
<td>East 3rd, Sunray, McKnight</td>
<td>Mon-Sun; 15 min; 1/2 hour; hour</td>
<td>978 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Downtown Saint Paul - Maplewood Mall</td>
<td>Payne, Maryland, White Bear, McKnight</td>
<td>Mon - Sun; 15 min; 1/2 hour</td>
<td>1640 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Ford Plant - Eastern Maplewood</td>
<td>Burns, Upper Afton, Sun Ray</td>
<td>Mon-Sun; 30 min; hour</td>
<td>325 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Little Canada - Iver Grove Heights</td>
<td>Westminster, Arkwright</td>
<td>Mon-Sun; 15 min; 1/2 hour; hour</td>
<td>567 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>45th LRT Station - Sun Ray Center</td>
<td>East 7th, Minneahaha, Ruth</td>
<td>Mon-Sun; 15 min; 1/2 hour; hour</td>
<td>1025 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Maplewood Mall - Sun Ray Center</td>
<td>White Bear Ave</td>
<td>Mon-Sun; 30 min; hour</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4894 passengers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Metro Transit Website, Metro Transit Employee*

*Figure 74: Local Bus Routes in East Saint Paul*

### Spatial Mismatch

Spatial mismatch can be defined in several ways, but for the purposes of this report it relates to the geographic disconnect between low-wage workers and low-wage jobs. As evident in demographic and socio-economic data, East Saint Paul has a plethora of low-income households, but a higher rate of unemployment than the City of Saint Paul and the Twin Cities. Unfortunately, East Saint Paul does not offer enough jobs, particularly low-wage jobs suitable for residents lacking a high school diploma or college degree. Professor Yingling Fan, in partnership with the Center for Transportation Studies, produced an extensive report that concluded spatial mismatch is very prevalent in Minneapolis and Saint Paul. Public transportation systems must be improved to increase access for low-wage, inner city residents to jobs located in the suburbs. Professor Fan’s research found that low-wage residents living within half mile of each Hiawatha Light Rail station were able to access 14,000 additional jobs after project completion. Additionally, 5,000 new low-wage jobs were relocated within half mile of a Hiawatha station.

East Saint Paul residents have been experiencing similar job-access issues. Large-scale employers have vacated the East Side, taking away many convenient manufacturing jobs. Although education barriers and skill gaps do exist, job location and transportation costs are major issues that must be addressed. Many East Side residents do not always have access to vehicles. More importantly, many East Side residents cannot sustain rising gas prices and must reduce their transportation costs in order to pay for their housing. The following map displays concentrations of low-wage jobs. In East Saint Paul there are low-wage employment

---

41 Andrew Lee, Metro Transit Employee, e-mail to author, May 16, 2012.
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opportunities near Sun Ray Shopping Center and Phalen Village. Outside of the community there are low-wage employment concentrations in downtown Saint Paul, downtown Minneapolis, the Minneapolis Mid-City Industrial area, the Northeast portion of Saint Paul’s University Avenue, Maplewood, and Woodbury (Map 7). If the Gateway Corridor were built, East Saint Paul residents could access six of these seven locations using public transportation without having to transfer.

Map 7: Low-Wage Job Concentrations in Twin Cities

Yingling Fan et al., *Impact of Twin Cities Transitways on Regional Labor Market Accessibility: A Transportation Equity Perspective*, (Minneapolis: Center for Transportation Studies, 2010), 21.
Survey Analysis

The East Side Prosperity Campaign developed a short survey to gather information on East Saint Paul residents’ public transportation preferences and opinions on light rail development in their community. The survey consisted of four ‘yes-no’ questions, four ‘select all’ questions, and one open-ended question; a blank survey can be found in the Appendix. Thus far, 593 surveys have been collected from six East Saint Paul locations: the Cultural Wellness Center, Casa de Esperanza, Saint Paul District 4 Council office, Saint Paul District 5 Council office, and Hmong American Partnership. Respondents were asked to provide their age, but neither race nor sex. The respondents accurately represent East Saint Paul by age, race, and culture based on the agencies disseminating the surveys.

The survey was drafted and distributed between January and March 2012; therefore the Gateway Commission had not yet released detailed information on specific station locations, property acquisitions, and/or project costs for each alternative. Such information could have altered responses to questions six through eight; it will be discussed further in future outreach efforts. The following information presents a comprehensive overview of the survey responses. Notable responses, patterns, and correlations are provided in the following pages. An in-depth cross tabulation of survey responses in numeric table format can be found in the Appendix.

Public Transit Use

Overwhelmingly, 68% of the respondents ride public transit, while 32% do not. At least twice as many respondents under the age of 50 ride public transit; respondents older than 65 years are more likely to not use public transportation. Respondents from all agencies are more likely to use public transit, except for respondents from the Hmong American Partnership where only 42% use public transit. These findings are consistent with anecdotal evidence that the East Side Hmong population favors automobiles and carpooling.

![Transit Use by Age](image)

Figure 15: Public Transit Use & Age of Survey Respondents

Of respondents who use public transit, 51% uses it frequently, defined as two or more times per week; 48% uses it infrequently, defined as one to four times per month; and 3% did
not respond. Respondents under 35 years and between the ages of 51 and 65 are more likely to use public transit frequently, while respondents between 35 and 50 years and older than 65 years are more likely to use public transit infrequently (Figure 13).

A majority of frequent riders use transit for work. Infrequent riders typically use transit when a car is unavailable; however they also use it for entertainment, daily errands, and work. In total, 43% use transit for daily errands, 36% for entertainment purposes and/or when a car is unavailable, and 32% for work (Figure 14). More respondents would be expected to use transit for work purposes, but 23% of the overall respondents were under 20 years and may not have a job; unfortunately school was not a choice option. Additionally, more users would use public transit for work purposes; if more jobs were available within a 30-minute commute. The majority of jobs that can be reached from East Saint Paul routes are located in downtown Saint Paul, Sun Ray Shopping Center, and the Maplewood Mall; however it still necessary to live near a specific route in order to reach one of these destinations without transferring.

On this same note, the majority of respondents who do not use public transit believe it takes too much time and is inconvenient. Aside from this response, roughly one third of non-transit users have never considered using public transit, need a car to reach their job, and/or do not feel safe on public transportation. Few, but still 17 respondents believe driving is less expensive than taking public transit. If more East Side residents agree with this statement, it would be important to debunk these beliefs (Figure 15).

![Figure 16: Survey Respondents' Purpose of Public Transit Trip by User Frequency](image)
Light Rail Opinions

Nearly half of all respondents have had the opportunity to ride light rail; in total, 46% have used light rail, 53% have not used light rail; and 1% did not respond. Overwhelmingly, 79% of respondents believe the addition of light rail would change transit ridership on the East Side, while 17% of respondents believed that it would not create change; 21 respondents either did not answer the question or wrote ‘unsure’. Notably, the question did directly not ask residents which route they would prefer because when the survey was drafted the Gateway Commission had not yet released possible station locations and property takings.

When the light rail questions were cross-tabulated by age, there were no significant correlations. Notably, only 14% of respondents from Hmong American Partnership have been on light rail, but 92% believe it will change transit ridership. Typically, older adults and certain racial groups, particularly Whites and Asians, are much more likely to use light rail than bus service. Regardless of current transit use, these questions tell us that an overwhelming majority of East Side residents believe light rail will change transit ridership (Figure 16).
East Side residents believe there are a number of benefits to light rail development: 61% of all respondents believe it will increase access to jobs in other areas, 56% believe it will help connect East Saint Paul to the broader region, 55% believe it will help businesses attract more customers, and 53% believe light rail will make transit more convenient and safe. Benefits do not come without concerns: 29% of all respondents worry about construction disruptions, 26% worry about traffic interruptions, 19% worry about noise and vibration issues, 18% believe it is too costly to build, 9% believe they will not use light rail, and 8% have other concerns. When these responses were cross-tabulated by current transit use, key differences were revealed. Current transit users are primarily concerned with construction disruptions (34%) and less concerned with traffic interruptions (22%) and project cost (14%). Non-transit users are less concerned with construction disruptions (13%) and more concerned with traffic disruptions (26%) and project cost (23%). Both groups are equally concerned with noise and vibration issues (17%) and other concerns (8%). Notably, 14% of non-transit users are concerned they will not use the light rail; only 5% of current transit users believe they will not use the light rail.

The last question of the survey asked respondents to think of other ways transit could be improved on the East Side; it was open-ended. Nearly half of all respondents provided a response. Of these responses, 38% stated that bus service should be improved by adding more buses and routes, increasing frequency on nights and weekends, and building more covered shelters; 25% stated they were in favor of light rail; 15% stated that safety issues should be addressed on buses and at bus stops; and 8% stated that bus fare should be decreased. Other comments provided can be found in the Appendix.
Conclusion

This paper does not promote a particular Gateway Corridor route or mode, but it does analyze East Saint Paul demographics, mobility patterns, and resident opinions. All presented information demonstrates that the majority of East Saint Paul residents would greatly benefit from a large-scale transportation project; it would be to the greatest benefit if the transit route traveled along East Seventh Street and White Bear Avenue in order to reach more transit-dependent and low-income residents. If the proposed New Starts regulations are implemented, this route will also benefit the Gateway Corridor project as a whole by raising ridership counts, reaching potential station-area developments, and providing environmental health benefits.

The survey results raise many important issues related to transit ridership and the Gateway Corridor. The large majority of respondents, over 80%, believe light rail would benefit East Saint Paul; however many residents already use the current Metro Transit bus system. Many current transit riders believe service routes, times, and safety need to be dramatically improved. At the time of the survey, important issues such as property takings and route alignment were not yet available for discussion. Additional research on economic development issues and future outreach to an even greater number of East Saint Paul residents is necessary. However, over the course of six months the East Side Prosperity Campaign and its six partner organizations have been extremely successful in canvassing residents and advocating on behalf of the community to the Gateway Commission.

East Saint Paul residents are excited about the Gateway Corridor because it would guarantee transportation improvements benefit their community. There are other methods to improve transportation in the community, but if a multi-million dollar project ignores the needs of East Saint Paul residents it raises important environmental justice concerns. Multiple case studies demonstrate that other metropolitan regions are designing transit programs and projects with the sole purpose of serving and revitalizing low-income and diverse communities; the Twin Cities’ East Metro should learn from these lessons and do the same.
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### Appendix I: Additional Census Results

#### Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percent of Population (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>38,603</td>
<td>159,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15,579</td>
<td>43,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>23,407</td>
<td>42,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12,552</td>
<td>27,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>2,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>9,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>94,793</td>
<td>285,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 U.S. Census

#### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percent of Population (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10 yrs.</td>
<td>17,436</td>
<td>41,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 yrs.</td>
<td>15,379</td>
<td>40,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34 yrs.</td>
<td>23,610</td>
<td>76,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49 yrs.</td>
<td>17,492</td>
<td>53,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64 yrs.</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>46,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 yrs. and older</td>
<td>7,376</td>
<td>25,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>94,793</td>
<td>285,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 U.S. Census

#### Household Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Characteristics</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Percent of Households (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>32,165</td>
<td>111,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>12,905</td>
<td>33,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Seniors</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>19,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td>20,534</td>
<td>59,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Father Head of Household</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>2,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Mother Head of Household</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>10,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Person Households</td>
<td>9,251</td>
<td>39,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Living Alone</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>9,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 U.S. Census
### Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>Percent of Employees (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>11,036</td>
<td>57,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>9,967</td>
<td>33,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>8,683</td>
<td>25,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>16,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>3,364</td>
<td>7,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Civilian Population in Labor Force</th>
<th>Percent of Civilian Population in Labor Force (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>13,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 ACS 5-y. estimates.

### Economic Characteristics

#### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Saint Paul</th>
<th>Saint Paul</th>
<th>Twin Cities Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 41,708</td>
<td>$ 45,439</td>
<td>$ 72,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Household Income</td>
<td>$ 49,823</td>
<td>$ 61,798</td>
<td>$ 87,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Per Capita</td>
<td>$ 17,651</td>
<td>$ 25,066</td>
<td>$ 33,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Saint Paul</th>
<th>Saint Paul</th>
<th>Twin Cities Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population Living in Poverty (%)</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Children Living in Poverty (%)</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Income Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Saint Paul</th>
<th>Saint Paul</th>
<th>Twin Cities Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Income</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Security Income</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Public Assistance</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 ACS 5-y. estimates.
## Housing Characteristics

### Stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Percent of Units (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Units</td>
<td>35,444</td>
<td>120,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Units</td>
<td>32,165</td>
<td>111,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>9,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Percent of Occupied Units (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>17,558</td>
<td>56,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>14,607</td>
<td>54,008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost-Burdened Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Percent of Households (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner households</td>
<td>6,487</td>
<td>19,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter households</td>
<td>8,173</td>
<td>26,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2010 ACS 5-yr. estimates*

## Housing Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Saint Paul</th>
<th>Saint Paul</th>
<th>Twin Cities Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
<td>$ 168,850</td>
<td>$ 205,400</td>
<td>$ 247,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Housing Costs with mortgage</td>
<td>$ 1,398</td>
<td>$ 1,552</td>
<td>$ 1,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Housing Costs without mortgage</td>
<td>$ 407</td>
<td>$ 471</td>
<td>$ 506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$ 757</td>
<td>$ 756</td>
<td>$ 870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2010 ACS 5-yr. estimates*
### Social Characteristics

#### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attained High School Diploma</th>
<th>Total Population over 25 years</th>
<th>Percent of Population over 25 years (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42,935</td>
<td>149,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,914</td>
<td>64,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Veteran Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population over 18 years</th>
<th>Percent of Population over 18 years (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>4,946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Immigrant Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>20,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US Citizens</td>
<td>12,576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population over 5 years</th>
<th>Percent of Population over 5 years (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>Saint Paul Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak language other than English at home</td>
<td>30,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>17,046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2010 ACS 5-yr. estimates*

### Vehicles per Household

#### Total Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No vehicles</th>
<th>1 vehicle</th>
<th>2 vehicles</th>
<th>3 or more vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>5,062</td>
<td>12,473</td>
<td>10,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>16,913</td>
<td>45,090</td>
<td>36,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities Metro</td>
<td>87,946</td>
<td>360,093</td>
<td>459,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percent of Households (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No vehicles</th>
<th>1 vehicle</th>
<th>2 vehicles</th>
<th>3 or more vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Saint Paul</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities Metro</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2010 ACS 5-yr. estimates*
Appendix II: Sample Transit Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey for Gateway Corridor Public Transit Planning

The Purpose of this survey is to gather information relating to the development of transit along the Gateway Corridor through the East Side of Saint Paul. No personal information will be made public and results will only be published as a portion of total responses.

If you are interested in receiving more information on this project, as well as notices of public meetings, please leave an email address, phone number or mailing address in the box to the left.

1. Do you use public transit?  
   Yes / No

2. If Yes, how often?  
   - Rarely (1-4 times/month)
   - Frequently (2-3 times per week)
   - Often (5 or more times per week)

3. For what purpose do you use public transit?  
   Other?
   - Going to work
   - Daily tasks/errands/appointments
   - Outings or special events
   - Only when a car is not available

4. If no, what are the reasons you do not use public transit?  
   Other?
   - Transit takes too much time and is inconvenient
   - I don’t feel safe on public transit
   - I need to drive for my job
   - I believe it costs less for me to drive
   - I have never considered transit

5. Have you ever had the opportunity to ride the light rail, like there is in Minneapolis?  
   Yes / No

6. If there was a possibility to have a similar system in the East Side do you think it would make a difference on how East Side residents use public transit?  
   Yes / No

7. Do you think that Light Rail Transit could benefit the East Side in any of the following ways?  
   Other?
   - Help businesses get more customers
   - Connect to the broader region
   - Increase access to jobs in other areas
   - Make transit more convenient and safe

8. Are there concerns you would have with Light Rail Transit on the East Side? If so, what are your concerns?  
   Other?
   - Construction disruptions
   - Noise/Vibration
   - Traffic Interruption
   - Too costly to build
   - I won’t use it
   - Other

9. Can you think of any other ways in which public transit could be improved on the East Side?  
   Please Explain:
Appendix III: Presented Survey Results

Do you use public transit?

How often do you use public transit?

How often do you ride public transit?
Have you used light rail?

- Yes: 1%
- No: 48%
- Blank: 51%

Do you believe light rail could change transit ridership on the East Side?

- Yes: 7%
- No: 92%
- Blank: 1%

How could light rail benefit East Side residents?

- Increase access to jobs in other areas: 60.7%
- Connect to the broader region: 56.0%
- Help businesses attract more customers: 54.9%
- Make transit more convenient and safe: 52.6%
What concerns would you have with light rail transit on the East Side?

- Construction disruptions: 29.3%
- Noise & vibration: 19.4%
- Traffic interruptions: 26.1%
- Too costly: 17.7%
- Will not use it: 9.3%
- Other concerns: 7.6%

Public Transit Users:
- Construction disruptions: 34%
- Noise/vibration: 14%
- Traffic interruptions: 12%
- Too costly to build: 10%
- Will not use: 22%
- Other concerns: 5%

Non-Public Transit Users:
- Construction disruptions: 13%
- Noise/vibration: 14%
- Traffic interruptions: 26%
- Too costly to build: 17%
- Will not use: 7%
- Other concerns: 13%
**Open-Ended Question:** Can you think of any other ways in which public transit could be improved on the East Side?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expand service: additional buses and routes, greater frequency on nights and weekends, more covered shelters</th>
<th>Percent of comments</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>How many of these respondents ride public transit?</th>
<th>How many of these respondents believe LRT will benefit the East Side?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build light rail</strong></td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve safety:</strong> buses, light rail, and stops</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease fare</strong></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open-Ended Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>How many of these respondents ride public transit?</th>
<th>How many of these respondents believe LRT will benefit the East Side?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern about LRT construction and effect on small businesses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not build LRT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-relevant comments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe LRT is too expensive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build streetcars</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market public transit better</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand bicycle &amp; pedestrian infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about children safety near light rail</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe current public transit is good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure LRT provides enough local stops</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor specific route</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about unfriendly bus drivers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide wheelchair accessibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about property acquisitions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about potential gentrification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that LRT will ruin historic neighborhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If light rail came to the East Side do you think it would make a difference how residents use transit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Total: 80% 16% 4%

Transit Use of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents that use public transit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT use public transit</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 20</th>
<th>21-34</th>
<th>35-50</th>
<th>51-65</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
<th>Undisclosed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there concerns you would have with Light Rail Transit on the East Side?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All respondents</th>
<th>n disruptions</th>
<th>Noise/vibration</th>
<th>Interruptions</th>
<th>Too costly to build</th>
<th>Will not use</th>
<th>Other concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit Use of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents that use public transit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT use public transit</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 20</th>
<th>21-34</th>
<th>35-50</th>
<th>51-65</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
<th>Undisclosed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>