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Urban Corridors

Suburban Corridors
Perceptions & Preferences
PERCEPTIONS: NEIGHBORHOOD

- Most don’t see much overall change in recent past.
- More positives/fewer negatives for Central Corridor and Hiawatha.
- Overwhelmingly “better” for both LRT corridors.
- Hiawatha especially striking.
- Most Cedar and Northstar respondents expect no overall change.

**Past**

- Much Worse
- Somewhat Worse
- About the Same
- Somewhat Better
- Much Better

**Future**
**PERCEPTIONS: TRANSITWAY**

- Quite positive for Hiawatha and Northstar.
- Only slightly less so for Central Corridor and Cedar Ave.
- Urban LRT lines get most positives.
- Cedar has as many negatives as CCRLT, but fewer positives.
- Completed corridors have lowest negatives.
- Future outlook more positive than past view.

**Graphs:**

- **Past**: Hiawatha is quite positive, followed by Northstar, Cedar Ave, and CCRLT.
- **Future**: Northstar shows the highest positive ratings, followed by Hiawatha, Cedar Ave, and CCRLT.
**Racial Differences in Perceptions**

---

**Central Corridor**

- **Negative past view**
  - LRT: 24% White, 25% Black, 33% Asian
  - Nbhd: 12% White, 7% Black, 19% Asian
- **Negative future outlook**
  - LRT: 24% White, 20% Black, 41% Asian
  - Nbhd: 13% White, 13% Black, 24% Asian

• Asian respondents much more likely to have negative views and outlooks.

• Black and white respondents: little difference.

---

**Hiawatha**

- **Negative past view**
  - LRT: 5% White, 13% Black
  - Nbhd: 15% White, 13% Black
- **Negative future outlook**
  - LRT: 6% White, 5% Black
  - Nbhd: 15% White, 10% Black

• Black and white mostly similar—

• Except past view of LRT.

(Too few Asian respondents for Hiawatha. Too few non-whites for other corridors.)
**PREFERENCES: HOUSING TYPES**

- Agreement: Single family homes good, high-density apartments bad, townhomes OK.

- Small apartments acceptable to most CCLRT & Hiawatha respondents, but few from Cedar and Northstar.

**PREFERENCES: BUSINESS TYPES**

- Storefronts popular along LRT lines, unpopular in suburbs.

- Vice-versa for auto-oriented.

- High-density mixed-use highly popular everywhere. (!)
**Racial Differences: Housing Types**

Significant racial/cultural divide.

More tolerance for multifamily among minorities.

**Racial Differences: Business Types**

Less tolerance of auto-oriented among whites.

Minority residents like both auto-oriented and high-density mixed-use.
SPECIFIC NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGES:

Importance—Change—Relevance
Observed/Expected by Respondents
PAST
All changes very small.
Transitway not seen as relevant to most changes, except Hiawatha.

FUTURE
Expect bigger changes.
Transitway relevant to more changes.
Transitway relevant to physical and transportation changes, not much to social changes.
Expected, Negative, Transitway-Related Future Changes to Concentrate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Hiawatha</th>
<th>Cedar Ave</th>
<th>Northstar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security/Crime</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street quietness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future neighborhood changes expected to be most related to BRT.
Future neighborhood changes expected to be most related to commuter rail.
TRANSIT USE AND SERVICE:
Importance—Satisfaction
TRANSPORT USE FREQUENCY

All corridors: significant number of occasional riders. Hiawatha stands out.

Central Corridor and Hiawatha: high numbers of frequent riders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occasional Riders</th>
<th>Frequent Riders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Corridor</td>
<td>(Up to 4 times a month)</td>
<td>(At least twice a week)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Central Corridor
- Hiawatha
- Cedar Avenue
- Northstar

Percent of respondents
Respondents’ Experience with the Mode in Their Neighborhood

- CCLRT
- Hiawatha
- Cedar Ave
- Northstar

Percent of respondents:
- Strongly Positive
- Somewhat Positive
- Neutral
- Somewhat Negative
- Strongly Negative
- Never used mode
**CENTRAL CORRIDOR**

Route and schedule factors dominate important-less satisfied quadrant.

Cost and comfort factors less important and mostly satisfying.
Areas to Concentrate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Hiawatha</th>
<th>Cedar Ave</th>
<th>Northstar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service to more destinations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On time performance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster speed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent services</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For transit to be a better option for you...
Key Messages

- Majority expect positive effects of transitways, except Cedar.
- Urban (completed) corridors more positively perceived than suburban (incompleted) corridors.
- Residents expect changes beyond transit dimensions.
- Larger inter-neighborhood variations.
- Significant racial divide & cultural difference in perceptions of neighborhood change/transitway impacts and preferences of housing/business development.
Key Messages

• Significant inter-corridor and inter-neighborhood variation in transit use and barriers to transit use

• The absolute majority had positive experience with urban corridors

• Out of those who used suburban corridors, the absolute majority had positive experience

• Culturally-appropriate, community-specific engagement and TOD planning are needed

• Attention needed on concerns about traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, and transit service coverage.
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