

ID	Should business districts prioritize space for people over space for cars by removing parking minimums?	Why?
3		If parking is not provide, I will avoid
5		They are business owners that will/should let the market guide their decision. If business depends on parking, they will provide. If biz can thrive without parking, then why be forced to have it?
8		It's not the public responsibility to figure out storage for private property (e.g. cars). Let the private sector figure it out
9		Business should be able to determine how much parking is required without government or planning getting involved
10		The market will determine how many parking spaces a business or business district should provide.
11		Requiring parking minimums enforces an arbitrary cost to new and expanding businesses. Parking is already a benefit to a business so they should only have to purchase as much parking space as they think they need.
12		There should be an even split of parking to accommodate local businesses and the people who live in the neighborhood.
13		My concern with this question is that currently in my neighborhood we have no agreements between businesses that do have parking to share that parking for people to Park and walk and in places like on Leonard where there's only two City parking lots are farther away from the busier stores in the business district. If places like Leonard and Bridge Street continued to develop there will be need for more City parking lots to provide visitors parking in order not to have that parking overflow on the residential neighborhoods which are already seeing a huge increase of parking from multi-unit homes or apartments. Unless we start to get grandfathered and businesses with parking lots and newer businesses to agree in business districts to share their parking that is their currently I feel that parking minimums being erased for new housing and businesses is going to create an even bigger crunch when our society is not ready to quit being car centered I would love to see our Community become more for alternate transportation but I do not believe we're there yet.
53		Businesses should not be forced to provide parking if they don't think they need it. More density makes space for a wider variety of business and more amenities for residents. It also encourages people to walk and allows more green space and less heat island effects.
72		Need some minimums but could be less than current
77		I think free parking is necessary but only correlated with the business capacity
87		So much space is wasted in this city for parking that most of the time goes unused. Let the market determine how much parking is required
209		I generally disagree with parking minimums so long as businesses are making responsible decisions. If no parking makes sense, it's fine to have no parking. However I don't have businesses not making parking and relying on taxpayers to fund public parking lots.
219		Let them decide what works for them
224		If somebody decides to open a business, they should be allowed to determine what sort of parking that business requires (and what they can afford). If it is a small boutique store downtown, with robust public transit nearby and good foot traffic, the business owner may conclude that parking is wholly unnecessary. Forcing that owner to build parking would create additional costs, which would inevitably get passed along to customers, and would generate minimal utility. If the business truly does need parking, a legal minimum would be redundant: the owner would "choose" to build parking, as they would recognize that it is necessary for their business to thrive.
225		depends, how do you force them to prioritize what they believe is best for their business? theres so many factors that would differentiate needs for people vs. car space, its not a one size fits all. Also there could be encouragement from the zoning to build OVER parking and accomplish both.
226		As long as parking is available somewhere nearby, space for people should be prioritized. However, you want to make sure that the lack of parking won't impact businesses. Churches have a lot of wasted parking lots, and they're all over the city. If there's a way to leverage their spaces that would be ideal and solve a lot of problems.
227		Zoning requirements for vehicle parking generally exceeds the reality of actual normal business parking needs. Required parking generally is based on retail square footage, which typically exceeds actual use.
228		There needs to be a happy medium here. Businesses still need spaces for people who drive into the neighborhood to access them.
229		In order for businesses to stay in business they need to be allowed to provide non-frustrating parking situations for patrons. People will literally not patronize some businesses bc "parking is hard let's go somewhere else" In the diagram below it shows two cars for a 675 ft apartment. I would expect as a lifelong renter that this size space would only merit a single parking space and I believe this is a fairly common expectation
1		Generally I support this, but I put "4" because the truth is, parking is still required in mid-sized cities. We aren't nearly big enough to create an urban space without parking.
178		Grand Rapids has a poor public transit system. Until that drastically improves, I think parking is necessary for homes.
179		Need to plan for both.
180		the idea of reduced parking is to soon, this city is an automotive city, time will change that to a less auto centered city, but it to soon too change now.
181		Michigan is such a vehicle/driving heavy culture, people get to places by cars (we don't have the infrastructure yet to allow freedom to travel without cars). So if people cannot park safely near their home or get to business districts easily, it just causes a pain for both people living and businesses trying to get traffic to their location. I'm speaking as an individual who struggled to safely get to my car in a low income apartment (did not offer parking for me), and now as a business owner in the city who hears the complaints about lack of parking nearly every day.
182		Because we have a housing crisis. We also have a lackluster transit system and limited parking may just be the catalyst we need to address so that it is robust and functional.
183		Cars and the parking they require are very inefficient uses of land. In the housing crisis we find ourselves in, all barriers from building housing should be removed.
184		Although we are in Michigan a car is a privilege but safe housing is a necessity. We should increase and boost public transit to ensure everyone can't get around without having to drive and make more room for housing.
185		Housing is more important than space for parking.
17		Yes, need more neighborhood hubs
25		Yes. Parking minimums are a net negative for busy economic centers. It incentivizes driving rather than alternative and more climate conscious modes of transportation. Additionally, parking minimums create a space dedicated for one use only - cars. At scale, parking lots create vast spaces in cities, commercial zones and more that create a heat sink with it being a large square of asphalt.
29		More space is good - a flowy community with options helps community involvement

30	5	Yes, parking should be minimized so people can walk, bike, so we promote fitness. Also if we have less parking, we can have more housing. Business can sponsor community areas and better transport
33	5	Grand Rapids is having a major housing crisis and one of the best ways of tackling the issue is removing space for cars. Parking minimums are historically arbitrary and reduce the economic potential of the land. Parking reduces tax value on the land and encourages driving
37	5	Fewer autos, greater safety for the roads and the health benefit of being a pedestrian
38	5	Reduce surface parking. Eliminate parking subsidies, and separate housing build costs from each other (show real price of parking)\
40	5	Because it is pleasant to be in these spaces
41	5	Cities built for people encourage more people to live there which helps financially support the city and that density leads to walkable cities with amenities. Cities built for cars encourage people to live in the suburbs and commute which depletes the city's finances and leads to a less desirable city with fewer amenities.
42	5	When you build places for people they are more inviting, as well as the bonus of that land generating more revenue for the city.
43	5	Because this is a city, sufficient density can support business districts from the local population.
44	5	Businesses have been shown to make way more money when they are located in a pedestrian oriented spaces. Parking minimums are a failed tactic to promote economic growth.
45	5	I want to live in a vibrant city. That looks like business districts are highly walkable and bikeable which is in direct conflict with reserving space for automobiles. The more space reserved for automobiles, the more they will be used instead of other modes of transit. We should focus on improving public transit and creating safe corridors to bike and walk in.
46	5	Parking is bad for business
47	5	Cities are for people. Cars are just an accessory and damage spaces and people.
48	5	Parking minimums add undue burden on businesses, and detract from the neighborhood fabric. They also encourage car use over other modes of transit
49	5	Parking minimums wastes space that could be used for better alternatives such as green space, gathering areas, or space for more development.
50	5	More room for more stuff; a city should be allowed to become sufficiently dense to support commerce from the local population.
51	5	Parking can always be found, look at the farmers market on Fuller and Fulton. Massive number of people on weekends. No one stays home because of lack of parking.
52	5	Our city should be designed for people not cars. Communities thrive on density. Cars should not dictate our lives.
53	4	Lack of downtown parking sproval the downtown apartments
54	5	Cars take up too much space.
55	4	In the end, people will find parking to visit vibrant business districts whereas mass parking make it impossible for vibrant business districts to develop.
56	5	Yes, I think that parking near or in front of a business makes it not an inviting place to be.
57	5	- Downtown Grand rapids already dedicates 28% of the downtown core to parking. - New developments would be cheaper if they were not hindered by having to abide to parking minimums.
58	5	Increasing foot traffic in community spaces provides many benefits to the community. Reducing reliance of the city on cars makes Grand Rapids safer, cleaner, and quieter.
59	5	The entire point of a business district is to promote business. They should be places where people are gathering, spending time and money, and living. We do not need to make more space to park cars when we have underutilized resources like the DASH. The true answer is to expand the DASH program and advertise the heck out of it. A lot of people do not know that the DASH exists and that concept would resolve a LOT of parking issues in business districts.
60	5	Walking past parking lots kills the vibe of neighborhoods
61	5	Parking availability will not deter people
62	5	Walkable neighborhoods actually promote business and make neighborhoods desirable.
63	5	People generate economic growth. Cars don't. If we prioritize other ways of moving people we can get more people to the business districts.
64	5	People can park in designated lots and walk to businesses. Foot traffic is good.
65	4	Having space for more people give the opportunity for areas to become more diverse and thrive. Just having a parking lot does none of this.
66	5	Parking destroys existing buildings and prevents new building from existing there
56	5	Elimination of parking minimums supports more efficient use of land, the design of more walkable neighborhoods, and a greater variety of businesses
60	5	We need people, we don't "need" cars. Cars are a temporary solution and we can find other solutions
67	5	Yes, businesses should encourage walkable streets to create a more vibrant neighborhood. However, there also need to be investment in transportation that encourages people to walk and that is reliable
78	5	Yes it will help others engage with the community more
80	5	Cars will find their spaces - look at neighborhoods in Chicago. Parking is a challenge but people cope
85	3	Yes because it could allow for more access of the business district. But having a space to park is important for commuters
91	5	People are more important than parking spaces!
207	5	Parking minimums utilize space that could otherwise be utilized for communal gatherings that can bolster the atmosphere of a community. This does not mean that parking can not be made possible, it is just that the safety and experience of a space should be the priority. Street parking should be accessible along with access by bike, walking, and public transportation.
222	5	Cars are city-killers. Accommodating cars in urban retail districts demands too much dead-space for car storage, creates too many dangers for pedestrians and bicyclists, and is visually unappealing.
105	5	Removing parking minimums allows more independent business owners to own and operate without having to add extra overhead cost. It also allows more people to pass by and shop
107	5	Business districts should serve the local community who can walk, bike, bue to the district. Those who live too far outside the community to walk/bike should bus or simply go somewhere else
109	5	Cars don't spend mone, people spend money. If you replace car parking with housing, pedestrian amenities and bicycle infrastructure you can incnrease people's dwell time in the business district. Increasing the chance they will discover new places to spend money.
114	5	Removing parking makes it safer to be in a pace with your children, and it makes it a more vibratn environment
	5	Parking minimums are such a blight on development. Should be fully removed in order for the city to grow in a healthy way. Stop prioritizing cars

237	5	Subsidizing cars makes neighborhoods less attractive, less vibrant, and less safe.
249	3	Businesses need to modernize for walk up, bike up, pedestrian foot traffic by adding walk up order and pick up windows. This should be highly encouraged. Beyond comprehensive that you can't walk with kids on bikes or your dog to grab coffee, bagel, salad etc. via a pick up window. Making businesses more accessible without a car.
250	5	Studies have shown that removing parking is great for business. People tend to stay longer, spend more, and attract more tourism.
251	5	Many other cities around the country are starting to remove parking minimums and there has been proven success in letting the market decide vs mandates by regulations. Also, allows for greater density of people and increased walkability due this increase of people / business that will follow.
255	5	Cars consume space that could be used to widen sidewalks and add green space. More parking incentivizes more driving. Developers/builders/home owners should have the freedom to determine parking requirements based on personal knowledge of their neighborhood and the needs of the development they are providing. Note: The diagram below actually understates the problem, as parking lot drive aisles are often 24 feet wide!, especially in parking structures.
263	5	Increased density and foot traffic will benefit our commercial business areas.
281	3	There should be a compromise. Ample space for parking as many suburbs are actually GR zip codes and support and participate with the city but commute but also public space for outdoor enjoyment.
282	5	Parking minimums are ridiculous and should be gotten rid of. Mandating that space is provided for the storage of private property (cars) is a classist subsidy for the rich that can afford cars. If you want a car and can afford one you can afford and deal with storing it or walking from a slightly farther parking spot. Handicaps spaces of course should be provided and enforced. Getting rid of parking minimums is a great way to grow density. If a business does not want to provide parking they should have the freedom to not do that, perhaps the business is catered to people who do not drive so they have no need for outdated parking minimums. Oversized and overly lifted vehicles that create a tall blind spot in front of the vehicles puts pedestrians, especially children, at risk of being ran over and should be banned from cities.
283	5	Cities should be built for their residents, not for the auto industry. People prioritized spaces are better for the local community and local economy.
284	5	More people generates more business. More businesses means more people.
285	5	Valuable space that can be used to bring in more businesses (especially bars, restaurants, and coffee shops) should NOT be wasted on parking. People can find street parking pretty easily and use their legs a bit more. This is not a new build neighborhood; it's old and charming and should remain that way.
286	5	In order to have a vibrant city we need spaces where people, not cars, can exist.
287	4	Portland Oregon implemented this. If you haven't, you should check on the benefits and problems it caused. BTW, the first question was very unclear and confusing. It wasn't clear what things meant even though I looked at your materials.
288	4	I've never had to walk more than a block or two for a parking spot, which really isn't that far.
289	5	The less cars, the more safe it is for pedestrians. Also, the businesses can do more with the space, like outdoor seating and events
290	5	Our city is a concrete jungle. You can always find parking - you might have to walk 2-3 blocks but that is not the end of the earth as long as there is sufficient handicap parking.
291	5	Parking spots lead too less walkable city's and no need for public transportation. Parking spots are also expensive. We should prioritize people over parking.
28	5	people spend money, cars cost money
29	5	I have seen a lot of info about removing parking increases the walkability of downtown areas and frequently increases how long people spend in the area/how much they spend at the businesses.
30	5	More large parking lots make the spaces less accessible to pedestrians who walk or commute in the area. Many people are now choosing to bike, walk or take transit, parking lots make the commute longer, less pleasant and hotter (as they hold the daytime heat in the evening). Also, old buildings should be preserved instead of making space for parking.
31	5	Developing and redeveloping spaces for people rather than for automobiles will result in places people want to be. Places want to be will likewise turn into places people want to go out of their way to visit, and ultimately places people would want to live. Grand Rapids is a highly walkable and bikeable community with quality public transit and last-mile transit options like Lime bikes and scooters. There are plenty of ways to get around, aside from driving. In order to continue growing and competing with larger Midwestern metro areas we need to create a community for people, by the people.
32	5	Parking prevents development by making it too expensive for small scale development and growth. Parking also doesn't add value to the area, meaning that we get less tax revenue from the land.
94	3	I wonder if more planning could go into underground parking for new building projects? <any cities that struggle with minimum space and lots of inhabitants build up and park down
20	2	I would be concerned about a business' viability if a plan for enough parking isn't required
21	3	Street parking is already limited especially between 11/1-3/1. Maybe this could work in some neighborhoods but not all
22	2	Gaps in public transit service and accessibility still exist. Housing can be built above parking if set backs or other accommodations can be more easily negotiated.
23	2	It needs to be carefully planned. People will need a place to park or it will lead to chaos and frustration. But, I do think that there is room for discussion. The example below shows how parking is inconvenient.
50	4	I think it depends on density and makeup of the area. Eastern/Alger is different than Knapp's corner. However, the flip side is that the business owner should be able to choose since they are the ones taking the risk. If people want to drive, and there are no spaces, the owner will lose business
55	1	It's about balance. High density areas will experience greater negative impacts than other less dense neighborhoods. Blanket solutions are not the answer. Solutions that start with existing density as the determining factor, will be more accepted and successful. So the work is to set the baselines
74	4	If we prioritized space for people, perhaps the need for parking could be reduced. If resources are in walking distance, per se. However cars are essential forms of communication for some folks, so infrastructure cannot be completely abandoned
229	3	It depends on location, traffic, transportation.
230	3	This feels like it should be case by case re-determined. Some neighborhoods might need those minimums if they aren't nearby public transit options or are trying to prioritize accessibility. Others might need minimums removed to encourage densification and public transit.

231	1	How this question is phrased draws an immediate negative comparison for the person taking this short questionnaire. Would someone select a human over a car?! These survey questions are poorly drafted, and I would welcome speaking with the person(s)/organization(s) that wrote them. The multi-part issue that would benefit from more serious discussion : (1) there is NO data that shows ADUs have any effect on rental prices - even in CA which passed a state-wide law on densification has yet to provide such proof, (2) traffic and infrastructure in Heritage Hill and Cherry Hill cannot handle much additional density, which is why ANY zoning changes must ensure space/parking/ etc, and (3) the potential for adverse impacts to neighborhoods could decrease home prices (lowering property taxes) and force residents to relocate, which rips at the fabric of our long-standing, vibrant and healthy communities.
232		Depends on the location , if they space prioritized ease of access for businesses within walking distance, no issues should be raised. I believe these are close to 20,000 public parking spaces within a 20 min walk from central downtown.
233	2	There are still a lot of parts of GR that aren't 100% walkable yet and/or people commute to work. Perhaps something like this could be instituted in specific zones?
234	3	I like the idea of removing parking minimums but as someone who is mobility-challenged, I also need parking if I'm going to visit business districts without being dropped off there or taking public transit.
235	4	This asking the wrong question. Walkable business districts promote the local economy, allow for efficient and beautiful use of existing buildings and provide space for small businesses to locate. However, for better or worse, most people in GR drive to the business district. Thus, I believe a parking structure should be centrally incorporated into business districts. It should be designed to be esthetically pleasing and fit with the architectural style of the neighborhood.
236	3	Making parking more scarce will hopefully encourage ride-sharing / transit / walking / etc. The potential downside is that businesses located in/near neighborhoods won't actually have that effect, and instead will just have their parking bleed over into the neighborhood, taking away parking for residents. This is especially problematic in traditional / dense neighborhoods where resident parking is already difficult due to single-width or shared driveways, or no driveways at all.
237	3	In theory, it sounds good. However, it depends on whether there's a reasonable expectation of people shifting to walking or public transportation. It is indeed frustrating to be in a business district in a car and be unable to find a place to park. Seems harmful to the businesses that are located there.
238	2	I feel like this is a tricky way that companies that build apartments downtown won't have to guarantee they get parking.
239	1	Parking minimum is set for a reason. Every time a parking minimum is waived it creates stress on the neighboring homes and businesses to fight for parking
240	1	Parking is essential for business
241	1	Easy and inexpensive parking is critical to getting customers to businesses. I will avoid places that have excessively expensive parking (like downtown market) or are difficult to get to and prioritize places that are simple and let me patron businesses at my leisure.
16	3	There are businesses where few parking spots hurts the business. Other places, like the big businesses have huge lots - a lot of open space where heat radiates off - this is not good. Covered parking with if possible solar panels and EV. We do not have a public transportation friendly city meaning the smaller businesses need both parking and people space
17	5	By forcing all businesses to meet a parking minimum requirement, you are limiting the amount of people who can start a business. This creates less competition as the only places that end up being able to afford the land necessary are larger companies that don't bring money back into the community. The amount of space needed to park cars is also not aligned with making housing more affordable. Making sure each unit has a dedicated space only makes renting unattainable for some people.
18	5	Removing the need to make parking spaces will decrease rent and allow more businesses to open up. I don't drive in the city, but still pay for the parking infrastructure.
19	5	Cars don't pay taxes. Cars don't spend money at businesses. Parking minimums almost always over estimate how much parking is needed. Let the business owners decide how much parking to provide, market dynamics work better than heavy handed regulations.
52	5	Parking minimums create unsafe and pedestrian unfriendly areas, parking is a waste of space that could be used by people and businesses. Car parking creates unappealing and non vibrant spaces. We should be talking about parking maximums
97	5	Making business districts more walkable and enjoyable will increase retail use and grow business revenue and reduce vacancies and drive better community experience
177	4	yes! prioritize space for people and space for business! But there has to be convenient and safe places to park and then walk/bus to get there. WE ARE GRAND RAPIDS. We are not Grandville. Let Grandville have their cars and chain shopping stores. Let's be a city that operates like a city.
186	5	The areas and shopping/business districts that residents prefer almost always involve lots of space for pedestrians and other uses besides cars. It makes the entire experience far more enjoyable for the consumer as well as increasing the amount of money people spend in business districts because people walking are far more likely to enter a business and spend money than someone just driving through or going to one specific business.
122	5	People drive business, not cars
123	5	People buy things from businesses. Cars do not.
124	5	People support businesses. We need to make it easier to bus and take micro mobility. Land is valuable.
125	5	People support businesses. We need to make it easier to bus and take micro mobility. Land is valuable.
126	1	People will not frequent businesses if they cannot find parking.
127	4	Thriving and attractive business districts attract visitors regardless of parking availability. Parking does not attract people, businesses do.
128	5	Parking minimums are arbitrary, excessive, and enforce car-centric development patterns while making alternate transportation modes more dangerous and less viable. Already, most new developments request waivers to the minimums -- a pretty good indication that the current regulations are excessive.
1	5	The city is in dire need of housing, so why uphold a restrictive policy? This would help increase housing stock. I also think about the new location for the restaurant Sovengard. They didn't meet parking minimums, but were luckily allowed to use a church's parking lot instead. Take that example and replicate throughout the city. How many jobs could be created? How much more housing would there be?
2	5	Yes for affordable housing!! Not so much for businesses
10	5	Parking is a misallocation of resources

11	5	Parking minimums are ridiculous. The world doesn't need to be a parking lot, we should be making parking lots into housing or businesses
12	5	Because we need places for people to live and not cars to live
13	5	There's so much space that could be dedicated to additional buildings or greenspace. We don't suffer from a lack of parking, either
58	5	Parking minimums promote motor vehicle use; given the climate crisis which the city recognizes, we must aggressively reduce such vehicle use. Parking minimums also increase costs of businesses and their products for all of us, which is especially unfair for those of us too poor or too conscientious to use those vehicles. This is especially a concern re the lack of affordable/adequate housing
61	5	We are in a housing crisis in our nation. Zoning, including parking requirements, is one of the hindrances to affordable housing. Parking restrictions prioritize the individual automobile. Need focus on public transit and other forms of mobility - bikes, scooters, walking
64	5	People need safe places to live, there should be some allotment for parking on main street
68	5	I think a positive move towards our neighborhood/community goals would be focusing less on cars (and those who are frequent drivers) and more on people and making the community easier to navigate, a community will thrive around transportation alternatives. Housing is more important than a parking spot.
181	4	We already don't have enough housing and that should be a priority
189	5	affordable space for people is much more important than car space
194	2	Build the parking / garage on the main floor with living upstairs so you can have both.
201	5	We don't have enough housing, residents generate revenue and business. Cars do not. Alternative transportation is available, but needs to be enhanced.
220	5	Not everyone needs a car. My family of 3 only needs one car. Extra parking takes the place of homes or businesses' productive or useful uses.
223	5	temporary parking should be available.
103	5	People need housing, and cars are challenging in many ways - ie environmental issues, safety, etc. Lets encourage alternate modes of transportation
113	5	People are more important than cars
116	4	Decreases space that could be used for financial productivity and more housing. Many individuals lose housing opportunities because spaces that could be full of units is instead parking.
234	5	Not everyone needs or has a car but everyone needs somewhere to sleep and live. Parking is not the most efficient use of our space.
271	5	Getting a roof over people's heads is more important than ensuring space for every car. Not everyone has a car, wants a car or needs a car - and quite frankly, in this age of climate change, we should be exploring ways to decrease the number of cars in service. As long as removal of parking minimums coincides with appropriate investments in public transportation (and not just the existing city buses, but commuter buses to outlying neighborhoods and cities like Holland, Grand Haven, etc., trolleys on major thoroughfares, metro lines and interurban rail, car sharing programs, and other innovative solutions like designated neighborhood carpool lots), no one will feel squeezed for parking. And a lot of people will be thankful to finally have stable housing.
272	5	Our society and city is dedicated to cars, at the cost of walkability, enjoyability, and pedestrian/cyclist safety of neighborhoods. Moreover, requiring homes to account for parking size raises prices to unobtainable levels for the working class, often who do not benefit from car ownership anyways.
273	5	People and living spaces are more important than cars! We have wonderful public transportation.
274	5	People can walk or ride bikes places, no need to drive from business to business when it's a couple minutes of a walk. Persuade people to consider being a one car family or normalize commuting by bike or city bus.
275	5	Priorities. Simple as that.
276	4	The abundance of parking encourages driving. Much of our city is walkable and business districts are well served by public transportation. Housing for people over cars.
277	5	Storing cars is a waste of space and money for everyone. Storing cars drives up housing costs
278	5	If you want more housing, you need to eliminate parking requirements.
279	3	It depends on the circumstances and the housing but generally I think at least one parking space per unit should be available
280	3	In denser areas where free transportation is available (i.e., Dash), districts should prioritize space for people over space for cars.
281		From a business standpoint , I see both arguments, but I would rather have more people living close than accomadata for so many parking spaces,
282	4	Parking spaces emphasize priority on cars for transportation. Plenty of free parking exists already, so much so that Urban Heat zones are easily developed by open lots. Prioritize affordable housing.
283	5	Increasing demand for housing requires more efficient use of space for people, and if people are able to live more efficiently near one another, then the need for constant vehicle use is diminished, especially in multi-use areas where living, working, recreation, and consumption can all happen within a reasonable distance.
284	5	People > cars
285	5	It will increase usable land for people, not their property as well as the tax base for the City.
286	5	We need housing more than we need parking spaces. People can ride public transit, walk or ride their bike
287	5	Vibrant spaces are built for people -- in scale, in interest, and in prioritizing space. The City should prioritize human-scale development first.
241	1	Stores will lose business if people can not park close enough to the store.
257	3	Our transit is not good enough or used enough to make this feasible.
258	3	If there's no place to park chances are I'll lose interest faster
260	3	If there's no place to park chances are I'll lose interest faster
266	1	The City of Grand Rapids has a parking crisis for both businesses and residential neighborhoods. Drive down any street, and you can see the congestion from the waiving of parking minimums. Parking for both businesses and residential/rental structures has to be a priority and addressed in the master plan. Inadequate parking is a long term problem the city needs to address if the city continues to grow. More parking structures are needed, either as public or private ventures to reduce congestion.
270	3	The "dream" of people using public transportation is clearly not happening, otherwise why would the RAPID be cutting services.
	3	Parking needs must be met to drive customers to business but business that serves its neighborhood would attract Costco
	3	Customers that can walk or use public transportation

272	3	If there's no place to park chances are I'll lose interest faster
275	3	If there's no place to park chances are I'll lose interest faster
280	3	If there's no place to park chances are I'll lose interest faster
281	1	I rarely shop anywhere in GR that doesn't have available parking.
282	1	The parking issue is complicated but removal of parking is problematic. Lack of convenience causes businesses to fail.
283	1	If you remove parking minimum then people won't have a place to park
284	1	If removing parking minimums would cause residential parking to bleed over into business parking spaces, that would be incredibly frustrating for businesses. Also, 6 months out of the year, who doesn't want designated parking in a city? Long term, I see greater value for parking available with a residence.
285	2	If there is inadequate parking this impacts the accessibility to the business.
286	2	If there is inadequate parking this impacts the accessibility to the business.
287	1	Parking spaces are a necessary part of customer service and eliminating them drives business patronage into the surrounding residential areas. Cars are not going away, we need to quit pretending they will. Neighborhoods should not bear the brunt of over-crowding or excessive traffic from commerce that diminishes quality of life for the residents.
288	1	Because it's a business district and parking is a requirement. Better to have any multi-residential structure in a Business District include parking in its design. This prevents a backlog of parking demand! Existing single level (open) parking should be upgraded into PARKING RAMPS. (build UP, not OUT)
289	2	- public transportation is not yet frequent or reliable enough for people living in the area to trust it. - other forms of unprotected modes, such as bikes and scooters, etc., are not acceptable for roughly 6 months of the year. Today very few, probably less than 1% use bikes as primary transportation in the winter and probably less than 5% use it all year. (I'm guessing based on what I see.) - retail without parking suffers from a loss of business. We tried this when we had a Monroe Mall. It didn't work then. It would probably have greater success today, but no where near what the community requires to do away with parking. -
290	1	The city should want to become a place desirable to live, parking shortages only cause frustration and dissatisfaction. This question is framed inappropriately to create a false narrative. The city should be trying to figure out an innovative way to efficiently maintain both needs
291	3	If no place to park what's the benefit
292	3	The way people use cars is changing. That said, parking needs to be considered in business districts - I often hear people comment that they won't go to a business district that doesn't have readily available parking.
293	1	Businesses need parking to serve their customers. I'd prefer if the city or its proxies built more parking garages and more mass transit than allowing more on-street parking.
294	1	No- business districts need parking spaces (street) for visitors to the businesses. You can't rely on only local residents to sustain your business. In Monroe North, we rely a lot on local events and you have to have parking. If there are no parking minimums then residents will take all street parking.
295	2	Prosperous business districts need to support both residents and work force to keep balance. Also, without proper alternative transportation into the business district from alternate parking solutions, a lack of sufficient parking deters people from outside the business district from visiting.
29	2	Parking is already a premium and difficult to find in several business districts, which is a deterrent to doing business there.
30	1	Because our transit system isn't yet up to par to support still utilizing businesses without parking being available
31	2	No parking can result in loss of retail and commercial traffic that adds money and vitality to areas - yet higher density housing is so needed.
32	3	Business districts need parking, need a way for consumers to reach them.
33	3	Not enough spaces may cause customers to go elsewhere. People will not frequent a business if there is no parking.
34	1	The City plans or has already reduced parking already so why ask.
35	3	If it is too much trouble to find parking I just won't go there
36	1	People will not frequent a business if there is no parking. The City plans or has already reduced parking already so why ask.
37	1	People need space for parking. If more people want to visit, where will the park?
38	1	Parking is often difficult to come by already. Unless there's plans to build more multi-level parking structures, removing the already limited amount of parking spaces for increased pedestrian traffic is a self-defeating proposition - less parking will mean less people
7	4	Need to be sure area is safe for biking, walking, etc.
9	4	Except on certain days/times, its very rare that all parking spaces are utilized. If parking minimums are removed, additional supports need to be added to support diverse transit options (e.g. more bus stops, bike lanes, ride sharing, etc.)
11	5	Corporations have known about climate change for decades. We all know fossil fuels are non-renewable. We will run out of die from climate catastrophe. Please consider diverging from fossil fuel dependence. The most desirable areas in our city (EGR, Heritage Hill, Alger) all have walkable districts. Alternative transport is also equitable as cars are financially unaffordable to many. Everyone hates their commute and traffic. Let's get ahead of it by promoting people, not cars.
12	5	Yes but free and practical public transit must replace those parking spots. Your marketing for rolling out this component of the CMP will be critical in its success
13	4	Is there a way to use the reduction/removal as a way to generate additional public transit funding?
18	5	Ok to reduce number of parking spaces, more green space, but still need to increase access to public transportation
19	4	We should be encouraging less driving
21	5	Space for people and bikes. Eliminate 131 through GR and turn into a (?)

23	5	I want people to be prioritized over cars but that necessitates supporting transit. I've tried taking the bus and it takes 4x longer than driving and 2x longer than biking.
24	4	There must be space for relevant business employees parking walking and bike/scooter areas for customers, public transportation we have to learn to wean from cars
31	4	I think you have to be careful that people who can't travel around easily have access to businesses and health centers. Also buses would have to run more often to make mass transit more convenient
32	3	I would prefer to answer 4 or 5 but I know that retail businesses especially restaurants and coffee shops can't survive without adequate parking. More frequent bus service can help to alleviate that problem. Also the rental bikes and scooters are helpful
34	5	Absolutely yes. Our community must support, emphasize, and incentivize walking, biking, and transit. Please avoid the phrase "balanced" mobility. Walking, biking, and transit must be prioritized over automobile transportation. Alternatives could include: people-centered mobility, human scale mobility, sustainable mobility, livable mobility, etc.
35	4	With caution. 80% still drive to work, school, healthcare, etc. There is not enough transit to replace all of those trips and walking may not be practical.
36	5	Pretty much everybody likes walkable area when they live in them, and they are quieter and safer for pedestrians and bike. If a business doesn't need all that parking space, please let them avoid paving the land
39	5	Implement parking maximums to go one step further! Car storage takes up too much land in our downtown and other neighborhoods - could be better served with other uses. Also improve safety and prioritize other types of mobility
42	3	Eventually yes, but public transportation needs to be more robust. In the meantime we should be sharing more of the parking that exists
43	4	More parking spaces encourages more people to drive instead of taking public transit, which creates more traffic.
44	4	Reduce parking minimums so that can decrease wasted space and encourage public transit.
45	5	Millennials and Gen Z want vibrant cities with placemaking, people-oriented streets. The data says we need to have more mobility options to attract top talent and improve quality of life. A comprehensive network of connected protected bicycle lanes is the cheapest, most efficient way to get the job done and by removing parking requirements we can free up space on the street for a robust, connected network protected bicycle lanes that lessens our dependence on the automobile. We know that when a network of protected cycling facilities is introduced, it induces demand for cycling. We know it is good for business because sales increase and it narrows the streets which gives pedestrians a shorter crossing distance. Walkers and cyclists spend more money than drivers. Study after study proves this.
46	4	Encourage mass transit and increase density of neighborhoods
47	5	Cities and neighborhoods are for PEOPLE, not cars. Removing parking minimums enables small businesses to start in buildings that don't meet parking minimums. Small businesses make a city a place. They make it unique. Big box stores just contribute to the "geography of nowhere," where everything looks the same. We need to remove as many barriers as possible to help people start small businesses. Grand Rapids will not thrive without small businesses. We need to make streets more walkable, and increasing parking increases car traffic which makes places less safe to walk around. I work downtown Grand Rapids, and I almost get hit by a car every week. Pedestrian only streets are good for business. It's so much easier to stop anywhere spontaneously when you're walking along a sidewalk. You don't have to go find a place to park. In midst of that contemplation, I always think about if it's worth it to go through the hassle of finding parking. I am much more likely to stop at a store and spend money if I can just walk to it. I think people are less like to stop at a store or restaurant that catches their eye if they drive past it instead of walk past it.
48	5	Encourage more interaction and less reliance on vehicles
49	5	We need more bike lanes and a more walkable city.
50	5	Reduced VMT = reduced emissions and crashes Reduced impervious surface area and runoff contamination Increased density and walkability Reduced heat island effect Increased accessibility for small scale businesses
51	4	Cars take up too much space! We need to start making adaptations. Car culture is strong but prioritizing people over cars will help to shift that mindset. Climate change is here - we need to make as many changes as we can as quickly as possible
52	4	Yes, I believe it's more important to give more choices for people to have a place to live over a place to park. Reducing parking spaces might entice people to carpool, bike or walk more because none wants to struggle with parking.
53	4	Being able to offer more places to live should be more important than offering a place to park. Plus it might entice people to carpool, bike or even walk more because nobody wants to have trouble parking.
54	5	We should be investing in public transport infrastructure that connects business districts in and out of downtown. Also, free busing from city owned lots for carpooling.
55	5	We should be investing in public transport infrastructure that connects business districts in and out of downtown. Also, free busing from city owned lots for carpooling.
56	5	We're in a housing crisis and a climate crisis. Prioritizing people also means prioritizing alternative methods of transportation. Instead of ensuring there's enough parking spaces, we need to be prioritizing pedestrians, bicycles, and public transit to make our neighborhoods safer, healthier, and more sustainable.
57	4	Grand Rapids should be a city that prioritizes pedestrians, bikes, mopeds/motorcycles, and compact vehicles. Large vehicle ownership is increasing, as are pedestrian deaths associated with larger vehicles. People should be incentivized into taking more efficient and more pedestrian friendly modes of travel.
58	5	Parking minimums tend to encourage the creation of spaces that are hostile to pedestrians. These types of places harm the vibrancy and desirability of our neighborhoods, as well as their potential for economic growth and sustainability. The city of Grand Rapids should consider removing parking minimums not only in business districts, but city-wide.
59	5	parking spreads the city apart which necessitates cars which causes more parking. have parking outside business districts with public transit to walkable dense urban centers.
60	5	Making the city walkable is the biggest priority. It's what attracts young talent.
61	5	People are more important than cars
62	5	I'd rather have better public transport to get to the district and be able to walk safely and easily through it.
63	4	Yes with more reliable, frequent public transportation options. In areas with high foot traffic, this would benefit tourists and those living in the area.

64	5	Grand Rapids already has more parking spaces that most similar sized cities downtown. Free up space for people and other modes of transportation, bikes etc.
65	5	I'm not anti-car, just car prioritization and subsidizing. Parking leads to lack of density which greatly hinders walkability and vitality and increases urban sprawl. This lack of density makes infrastructure and utilities cost more. It makes our streets and neighborhood less safe.
66	5	It increases car dependency and makes other modes of transit less safe, accessible, and efficient. Jack up parking costs please.
67	5	Only if public transit is improved. We have plenty of parking. Would love to see more density with businesses
67	5	Cars take up WAY TOO MUCH SPACE as it is. Promote public transportation and safer, more engaging and more attractive use of space by prioritizing people.
68	5	Parking minimums are stupid. One car per household is the base minimum. Anything above is a waste of space. If apartments want more than 1 and charge for it then let them use their space the way they want. Business and office minimums are even worse. People can commute and get to stores without needing to park their car outside the front door. Tired of massive empty parking lots everywhere because of minimum parking laws.
69	5	Absolutely yes, as long as there is sufficient research done to make sure there are convenient public transportation options for those outside of those communities where walking isn't an option.
70	5	To encourage the use of alternate transportation like public transit, bikes or walking
71	5	Parking kills cities. Yes public transit, no to cars.
72	4	Forcing function for better transit options. Less wasted urban space.
73	5	I believe creating a thriving, walkable community with accessible mass transit includes less room for cars. I love taking the Rapid and encouraging people to use it as often as possible. Unfortunately people will often opt into paying for and planning around parking when it's so immediately available and required. Changing the expectation begins by changing the regulation.
74	5	We should improve public transit and make the city as bike and pedestrian friendly as possible. Parking requirements result in poor land use and furthers our community being car dependent which will continue to push people to live further from the city
75	5	Parking minimums are excessive, expensive, and do not take into account other forms of transportation. They also promote car use over other forms of transport.
76	5	Against reality, Parking minimums treat parking demand as static. Often requiring that more parking be built than is actually needed based on economic and demographic analysis. As such, the only thing that parking minimums guarantee as a policy is that our developments have more parking than is in demand. Additionally, Parking demand in an area can change, and actually be reduced if the city successfully promotes alternative modes of transportation, such as walking/rolling, biking, and taking the bus. The creation of parking lots unfortunately works against almost all of the above modes of transportation by pushing development further apart and encouraging car usage, which often comes with the trappings of more car-oriented, more pedestrian-hostile streets and infrastructure. This may be out of the scope of the master plan, but I would much rather we apply a policy of parking maximums and have the city coordinate parking for an area through the use of shared public lots/garages. Parking demand could then be managed based on time of day, reducing redundant parking lots that sit empty during different times of day.
77	5	We should prioritize transit accessibility and walkable neighborhoods/business areas to improve community access.
78	5	We need more people friendly logistics.
79	5	We need to start putting the pedestrian first. It will be uncomfortable, but that is what will initiate real positive change.
80	5	Parking contributes to pollution.
81	5	Climate crisis, social equity, public health, economic development.
82	5	Parking contributes to pollution.
83	5	Mandating parking ensures that innovation to solve alternative transportation problems will not over. Residents who do not wish to or are not capable of driving have their options limited. Also resources are diverted from more inclusive transportation methods. The city could even get a larger tax base with higher density.
84	5	Yes, our community needs to come to terms with alternative forms of transportation and move beyond the expectation to have parking outside the entrance of a business or entertainment venue. However, I firmly believe we need to have parking standards that account for those that need accessibility due to mobility or for other reasons and would love to see more commuter lots outside of the city that bring people into commercial corridors
85	5	Yes, our community needs to come to terms with alternative forms of transportation and move beyond the expectation to have parking outside the entrance of a business or entertainment venue. However, I firmly believe we need to have parking standards that account for those that need accessibility due to mobility or for other reasons and would love to see more commuter lots outside of the city that bring people into commercial corridors
86	5	There are great mobility options to satisfy demand
87	5	That will encourage people to walk or bike , reduce pollution and promote more social interaction.
88	5	We can't have as many cars as people without making it impossible to drive around
89	5	We can't have as many cars as people without making it impossible to drive around
90	5	If paired with improved public transit networks, reducing car traffic and parking in the city is an excellent goal. Too much real estate is dedicated to parking vehicles.
91	4	Cars are only one way of getting around and they aren't the safest or the least expensive, but they dominate the urban fabric and deter getting out and engaging with the neighborhood.
92	5	Places designed for people naturally encourage walking, transit, or parking offsite and n walking in, which over time can convert more folks to a car-optional lifestyle, from which our city will benefit!
93	4	Fewer parking spaces will cut down on drivers coming to the location, so maybe calmer streets but potentially fewer customers coming to a business, so this must be done in conjunction to developing better public transportation AND incentivizing people to use it
94	5	I have travelled to dozens of cities across the world, and the most vibrant, memorable ones were the ones that prioritized people over cars. Although it may seem counterintuitive, making spaces more accessible and pleasant for pedestrians will result in greater utilization of the space. By returning the streets to the people, we can create spaces for people to safely connect and linger. All that space currently occupied by empty cars could instead contain places to sit and relax, plants to beautify our streets, or trees to provide shade. Encouraging people to walk, take in the sights, and connect with the outside world is also beneficial to their physical and mental health.
95	1	Infrastructure around cars creates less green space, less bike space, less human space, less human activity. Duh! However public transit has to be accessible where this happens, or garage space directly under units

96	4	People should always be the priority, especially when it could give the opportunity for more homes. I understand people would be frustrated with the lack of parking but that's when we could push other methods of getting around such as carpooling, walking or biking.
97	4	Yes. Prioritize space for people and space for business!! But there has to be places for people to park and then walk or bus.
54	5	Eliminate the drive aisle - to cut down on space that can be used as a green space to religion
57	1	Adequate parking should be accessible for all dwellings. Expanded transportation would allow for lower use of cars and greater access to city for residents. Future public transportation should be climate friendly, low cost or no cost and income justified
59		Even with no parking there will still be problems unless we invest in low or no cost transportation systems
62	5	It will provide more economic opportunity for people who live in the area that do not have transportation to and from work'
63	4	Because as I have seen in my neighborhood a 3 bedroom house has 8 people living in it that drive with their own cars and that's not including the kids and dogs
65	5	World class cities invest in dens, walkable city center and neighborhoods with high frequency transit. Personal cars and parking lots take up lots of space that can be dedicated to housing, amenities and green space. Noise and air pollution makes areas unlivable
66	5	I've been to cities all over the US and the ones that value pedestrians simply just do. It doesn't stop people from visiting, they make accessible options for transport, encourage, biking, car pooling and walking. I.e. - New Orleans, Chicago, Los Angeles, Mackinac Island, etc.
69	5	Parking minimums encourage people to use cars more. More driving leads to less vital cities and less use of other modes of transit. Less use of public transit leads to less support for that infrastructure which is bad.
70	3	Before there can be a switch, people need to utilize other transportation options. Bus, bike, walk, carpool, etc.
73	5	Encourages utilizing other types of transportation and maximizes space
75	5	Yes; walkable cities are more accessible, better for the environment, and lead to higher quality of living for residents
76	5	As we grow as a city we will rely less on travel by car for daily living. Promoting development patterns around accessibility for people results in a better city for all
79	5	We need to dramatically reduce dependence on single vehicles. Investment in public transportation and alternate options
81	4	People first! Limit parking - increase fee-per-time segment. We learned a lot when Monroe Center. Consider removing parking in select business district blocks to encourage pedestrian traffic
82	4	Parking should be optional, paid for separately. Space for bikes (electric) and smaller vehicles
83	4	We need to find ways for people to use transportation other than cars
86	3	Should be more shared parking options but without fair and reliable public transportation systems, people will continue to use cars, esp in a place like Michigan where it is cold
89	5	Walkable neighborhoods should be our North Star
92	4	Less cars should be on the road with an upwardly mobile city. People over cars!
93	5	We should not deprioritize individual car ownership
95	5	Technology will change that eliminates private vehicles and need for parking, and need to allow for driverless cars that need a queuing lane rather than a parking space
96	5	It's the surest way to community vitality and economic development - research bears this out. Private cars get public subsidy while leading to a net loss in terms of money staying in the neighborhood. This said: mobility options are important to get people to people-friendly spaces. Otherwise, only nearby neighbors benefit from the space for people
176	4	People should always be the priority especially if it brings forth the opportunity for new housing. People will get upset because of the lack of parking but we need to push for other methods of getting around such as biking, walking or carpooling.
180	5	People are more important than cars. Cars destroy a city's walkability. People without cars improve it.
182	5	I would say yes as long as public transport can support general travel distances for people. Plus, I believe it's more important to be able to house more people than place cars.
183	5	Because the city should move toward more walkability/public transit and other forms of transportation and away from sprawl designed around cars.
184	5	I would say yes as long as public transport can support general travel distances for people. Plus, I believe it's more important to be able to house more people than place cars.
187	5	The motto, "build it and they will come." If we build parking spaces then we are encouraging people to drive there. If there are no parking spaces then we are encouraging people to walk/bike/etc. As Americans we need to start walking more and being more active.
190	5	Off-street parking minimums make unsubstantiated assumptions about the way people want to live in an urban in the future. Far too much space (public and private) is dedicated to car storage. Investment in transit-oriented development is better.
193	2	If we prioritize people we need better transportation systems in place
195	5	We need to improve our mass transit frequency and reliability.
197	5	Grand Rapids should continue to improve walkability and focus on people-centric design. Parking minimums provide a barrier to people-centric design and the growth of mixed-use space in the city. Grand Rapids should seek to ban new surface parking lots and seek to repurpose existing surface lots in the urban core.
200	3	If we can get a better public transportation infrastructure, people near business districts won't need to utilize cars as much. It can also make areas more welcoming to pedestrians.
202	5	Prioritize carbon friendly commuting into the city; biking, walk, bus, DASH, etc. Less driveways = less concrete = less destruction of potential green spaces
203	1	Parking is the single greatest impediment to a vibrant downtown. Both for residents and visitors. The only thing I hear about from friends when asking about downtown visits is, "the parking is such a headache, it's not worth it."
208	5	Removing parking minimums will encourage residents to take alternative modes of transportation to their destination. In turn, it will increase the density of the business district leading to more customers and more walkability from place to place. This will lead to less traffic, less accidents, and a better place to live! Build the city for people, not cars!
214	5	People need to utilize public transportation but the city needs to provide better - higher quality transportation.
221	5	There should be an effort to enhance public transit. To compensate for the city's growth.
106	5	We need to encourage universal utilization of public transit, walkable streets, and bikeable areas
108	5	Encouraging non-car modes of pedestrian travel adds to the physical health of a given city. Human density and space should be prioritized over car density and space. Replacing parking minimums with other modes of transportation could also be beneficial for residents
110	5	A sustainable city should have as few motorized single occupancy vehicles as possible. 15 minute community is a great model, and should be used to develop areas such as neighborhood business districts
111	5	Cars actively make cities worse. By reducing parking and increasing density, we can improve quality of life for non-car users

112	4	Yes, it is better for the environment if we switch to shared transportation, biking, and walking. I am nervous that there will be too much resistance to make this feasible though. Our society has such a strong reliance on cars, I'm not overly optimistic that it's possible
115	5	Parking minimums take up business or housing space that could be better used to meet demand. Parking can be solved with better public transportation or by building up (garages) to minimize sprawl and reserve that space for better use
117	5	Cars are only a vague priority for businesses. Removing cars and adding bike infrastructure has shown to have a net economic increase on businesses. Removing car infrastructure to allow for greater building density can offset any loss of businesses if built to an adequate level (?)
118	5	We made a huge mistake prioritizing cars in development. We should always put people and their needs first. In fact, 1 car or 0.5 cars per person maximum would be better. Cars will soon be a thing of the past with climate change
119	5	Prioritizing space for people allow for multi-modality, which increases equity and safety
120	5	Yes but you need walkability. There is no point if people have to drive across the city to get there
121	5	Overall I just believe that cities should be for people, not for cars. Removing parking minimums should help free up more space for more sustainable land uses to better meet the needs of the community
123	5	Reducing dependence on cars is a priority. Reducing parking may help that but more importantly improved mass transit/walkable/bikeable infrastructure is relevant
124	5	Yes. Walkable, bikeable, busable (assuming increased demand in bus service will improve scheduling and bus routes). Increases density - more housing units
125	3	Cars take up more space
126	5	We have prioritized cars for too long. Investing in alternative transportation options would also help.
127	5	Cities should be dense enough to support commerce with local populations. Parking displaces other uses (and housing).
128	5	Encourage and prioritize walkable neighborhoods in addition to expanding the transit system
129	5	Encourage walkable neighborhoods and investment in public transportation
130	5	Car-centered communities are just plain stupid. People > everything.
132	4	If you don't have a car, this would be a lot harder to find places, so with more people room, more people would have access
133	5	Yes - we need to encourage walking, carpooling and public transportation. People are primary.
134	4	We should be relying more on public transportation instead of vehicle ownership
227	5	Parking lots don't generate good tax income and only help people farther away, at the expense of people who live close. Denser business districts mean more foot traffic, regardless of the number of parking lots.
228	5	Parking minimums lead to spaces built for cars instead of people and fragment our communities
231	5	Prioritizing public transit, walking, and biking encourages environmentally-friendly means of travel. We want the city of Grand Rapids to grow, to welcome more people. Living, working, and entertainment spaces should be prioritized
236	5	Life would be more pleasant if fewer people relied 100% on cars for their transportation.
239	2	We need both - but even more we need more public transportation. That would decrease the need for individual cars.
240	5	Life would be more pleasant if fewer people relied 100% on cars for their transportation.
242	5	This will greatly increase walkability and the vibrancy of our downtown and city. It will allow us to create a sustainable and affordable city.
244	5	By prioritizing space for people, more space will be developed instead of being parking. This would allow for higher density living and more businesses. All of this equates to more tax revenue for the city to provide for better services. If cars are limited in access, it will be safer to transit the city through alternate means. Creating a city that is truly equitable because mobility is not determined by access to a car or the ability to drive. We should not need a police presence to make crossing the street safe when going to an event at the Van Andel. We cannot afford to cater to a car-centric city if we plan to exist in the future.
247	5	As the minimum space for cars increases the problems for alternative transportation increases. Travel distances are increased. Bus stops are increased. Innovative solutions are discouraged. Community collaboration is reduced.
256	5	Our cities are supposed to be built for people, not cars. Cars only exist to "solve" the issue of transportation, which is better solved in cities with public transit, biking, and other mixed modes of transportation.
259	4	We are losing tons of valuable real estate to parking, which drives up costs for businesses and housing.
265	4	This might encourage more creative ways people learn to navigate town without such a heavy reliance on cars. It also doesn't preclude people from including spaces for people to park cars; it just removes or lowers the minimum requirements.
267	2	Parking minimums should be reduced and money put into public transportation & walkability. More multilevel and creative parking solutions.
269	5	No, due to our lack of public transit infrastructure, it is critical to have enough parking spots in business districts.
276	5	Parking minimums dedicate space to cars which would otherwise be used by humans.
277	5	Prioritizing parking does not create a built environment that is desirable for the existing residents. We should focus on increasing our walkability and alternative modes of transportation. Like many medium and large cities, visitors may be slowed down or mildly inconvenienced by less parking, but it is worth it to evolve into the city we want to be.
278	2	Because making space for parking is a vicious cycle that forces everything to be farther apart and ingrains reliance on cars. Increased density and public transit are the only sustainable future.
279	4	Unless public transit improves, people in Grand Rapids almost always drive to their destinations. Without enough parking, nearby neighborhoods suffer (have experienced where I live) as do the businesses as people don't go if they don't have parking.
280	5	Reducing parking could force the city to focus on other forms of transportation (bus, bike).
281	5	GR should move away from cars as much as possible
282	5	Walkable neighborhoods with good public transit encourage denser, more walkable spaces that don't need cars. If the spaces are dense enough they don't need cars then there is no need for parking minimums, and the minimums should be removed to encourage these spaces.
	5	Increase density, increase walkability and bikability. Discourage single passenger vehicle use!

		<p>Well, unless you're a psychopath, I would think everyone would agree that human beings are more important than cars. It follows that giving people a place to live is more important than storing some else's personal vehicle.</p> <p>I mean we've invented more ways to get around than just by car. Unfortunately, we bulldozed and set fire to our amazing streetcars in Grand Rapids. And we've treated cars as the only valid transportation option since the 1940s. Because of our terrible zoning since the 1950s, things are way too spread out to walk from place A to place B. So we kind of have to use some form of vehicle to move us faster than our own two feet can take us. We've kind of been screwed over and thrust into car dependency by the past few generations, which is just lovely.</p> <p>I want to see Grand Rapids invest in and prioritize transit options that don't require people to leave a car behind when they walk into a building. I want to live somewhere where I don't HAVE to own a car. I'm not insane, so I'm not going to bike in the dangerous bike gutters here in Grand Rapids, where I'm protected by a superhero safe line of paint slapped on the road that totally protects me from a 6,000 lb SUV. We're also letting The Rapid starve financially, and none of the city commissioners seem to care. To be honest, city commission and planning commission seem to be on board with housing, but they seem to be blind to the transportation aspect. Come on. If you want to fill the housing shortage, don't you understand that we can't dedicate so much land to car storage? It doesn't work.</p> <p>And by the way, I know public transit is not self-supporting anywhere in the world, so I want my tax dollars to subsidize it just like they subsidize interstates, roads, and air. At least if my tax dollars fund the Rapid (which I take as often as possible) and passenger rail, I can save the \$12,000 a year I spend on owning a car. Now that would be worth it.</p> <p>I'm Gen Z and have a window to the world through social media. I see that good high-speed rail in Switzerland and that good bicycle infrastructure in Utrecht and that good walkable built environment in Barcelona. If you want to attract talent, get with the program people. Young talent doesn't live under a rock. We know what's good, and we don't see that in Grand Rapids. Your 2019 Bicycle Action Plan is weak. It's a vision, not a plan. Sprawl and single family housing and car dependency is out. Gen Z doesn't want that. We want to live in a city with density and mixed use zoning and transit and PROTECTED bicycle infrastructure and walkability.</p>
283	5	Cars are inefficient and require too much space. Better public transportation, walkability, bicyclability, and leisure space should take precedent
284	5	We should prioritize parks and green space and improve public transportation to improve city
285	5	Not only does walkability take up less space than drivability, but it also costs less taxpayer funds to build/maintain and fosters increased economic activity.
286	5	People first! Not cars.
287	5	Not everyone drives a car and hopefully that will become even more so as technology improves for driver-less cars and improved public transits.
288	4	I believe that by reducing or removing parking minimums and enhancing multi-modal transportation alternatives the loss of parking will not disrupt business districts overall traffic.
289	5	More walkable and bikeable business districts allow local residents to access local businesses with better efficiency (15-min community mindset). Adding improved bus facilities would also improve pedestrian access. We need less cars on the roads to become a more sustainable city.
290	5	Because cities should be walkable and prioritizing bikes and foot traffic would incentivize the city and county to make buses and other forms of transportation more available.
291	5	Cars are ruining our planet. Please focus on more sustainable housing and transportation.
292	5	We should work to design communities for a future with less dependency on private vehicles.
293	5	It would encourage public transportation, Ebikes and bikes etc.
294	5	Auto-oriented land use patterns are unsustainable. They take valuable space away from needed housing, drive the cost of development, and negatively contribute to the needed densification of our tax base to support transit, school, city services, and reinforce the need for a vehicle.
295	4	Walking is vital to thriving neighborhoods and better for the environment and aesthetics.
296	3	We need both, so why not have parking mandatory as the ground level? Instead of side by side
297	5	Also, to decrease need for cars, have an incentive to use public transportation.
298	5	We are in a climate crisis.
299	4	I think cities need to be more walkable and accessible for people who don't have cars, Grand Rapids has the potential to be more walkable and bikeable.
300	5	Parking minimums stunt housing and business growth and promote car centric developments. Reducing parking allows for more growth in public transit and developments that cater to foot traffic. I would love to be able to live in Grand Rapids without owning a car but that is difficult because of the way the city has been designed for the last few decades. Designing neighborhoods with everything you need in a half mile radius builds community and economic strength.
301	5	We should be prioritizing a city with more walkable/other forms of transportation besides autos. We should absolutely not be tying parking space minimums to new business district development.
302	3	Prioritization of people over parking should only occur IF a stronger, more evidence based collaborative working relationship is established between the City and the Rapid. Currently there is great dysfunction in planning and implementation of transportation needs of city residents and public transportation. If we want to increase density while discouraging the increase of vehicles then there MUST be a more robust public transit option put in place with this planning change.
303	4	Focus on people encourages growth of mass transit / uber / biking / walking.
304	5	Because car-oriented city planning is a failure and is not sustainable. Public policy should be tending towards reducing car dependency, improving public transportation, improving walkability, and while increasing housing density.
305	5	Cars are not as useful as people, please remove this minimum, bus service could help people get to business districts.
306	1	We would need a much better public transportation system for folks living in the city if parking spaces are not an expectation. Folks living in Grand Rapids likely have a car and need parking spaces for each of the tenants living in the unit. Parking is already a large concern in our city and more ramps should be built to accommodate the needs of those living downtown.
307	5	Because the City should move with Expeditious Force to implement Light Rail and other pedestrian transit options throughout the city.
308	5	Density matters for sustainability and public transit. Cars over people will always be a mistake in safety and quality of life.
309	5	Parking spots lead to less walkable city and no need for public transportation. Parking spots are also expensive. We should prioritize people over parking.

310	5	Parking spots lead too less walkable cityâ€™s and no need for public transportation. Parking spots are also expensive. We should prioritize people over parking.
311	5	Parking spots lead too less walkable cityâ€™s and no need for public transportation. Parking spots are also expensive. We should prioritize people over parking.
312	5	Density matters for sustainability and public transit. Cars over people will always be a mistake in safety and quality of life.
313	5	to encourage public transportation, minimize streets and increase business.
314	5	Because we should be moving away from car centric cities in the first place! Reducing car based incentives and requirements will take care of most of what we're trying to do with this questionnaire
315	3	There needs to be more people living or walking downtown to keep it growing.
316	3	Ideally yes, I don't believe that public transportation currently supports.
317		Remove parking minimums now. They make developments unaffordable. Adding one space can cost \$50,000 we should be spending that on access to transit and education around alternative forms of transport across the whole city. Transit is going to be a long term lifestyle change that we need to be building infrastructure for now.
318	5	Yes, people over cars. We need to rely on mass transit and focus on housing density as we are the fastest growing city that is also facing a growing housing short fall.
319	3	in order to have people patronize your business you need to have places for them to park or have reliable public transportation to get them to your business.
320	3	It's a double edge sword... add housing, hurts parking capacity. This makes it hard for people to come visit. But it would encourage people to use a public transportation; however then public transportation would need to improve.
321	3	Yes, because then it will help incentivize people who live in town to walk to more places. No, because not everyone is able to walk everywhere or they live farther way.
322	5	Cities grew around people before the introduction of the car. We need to take back our streets from automobiles! Behavior won't change if we don't make it more difficult to drive everywhere.
323	5	We need other parking solutions that do not take up so much green space. We should consider expanding public transit over parking lots or structures.
324	5	Only yes if there is an improvement to our public transportation systems. Parking minimums tend to over estimate usage. If there is street or other parking close by, they could be used as overflow.
325	5	The question is phrased in a way that is leading in my view - even though I agree with it. Seems like it would be hard for someone to say "let's prioritize cars over people". Again, I do agree we should build out infrastructure for a future that doesn't have as many cars, but there's a risk that cars usage continues or even grows over time despite these efforts and we end up with nightmarish traffic, parking etc. But I'm still for taking that risk - there just needs to be a simultaneous major investment into reliable, quick, affordable, comfortable, user friendly public transit systems.
27	5	Because not everyone uses a car.
324	5	Cities should be built for people not for cars. Cars are a terribly inefficient way to transport people. This results in way to much space being dedicated to a small amount of people transported by a car. A lot of the times even a single person.
325	5	Parking mandates make useful urban land far less productive and profitable per square foot. Decreasing the ease of driving will help keep cars off the road (reduces pollution, pedestrian collisions, and overall amount of crashes). An increased availability for public transit will make traveling around the city easier.
326	5	Parking mandates make useful urban land far less productive and profitable per square foot. Decreasing the ease of driving will help keep cars off the road (reduces pollution, pedestrian collisions, and overall amount of crashes). An increased availability for public transit will make traveling around the city easier.
327	5	People living in urban environments might not use a car as their main method of transportation or may not own a vehicle at all. In times of housing shortages, we should emphasize housing people over housing vehicles.
328	5	It will reduce street congestion, improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists, decrease emissions, and encourage a healthy society and
329	5	Cities based on cars are generally less pleasant to be in and around. I would much rather prioritize building spaces that allow residents to live car free.
330	4	Because younger generations are choosing not to have own vehicles or share one for the home. Also, they enjoy other mediums of transportation such as Uber, street scooters, biking, or public transportation.
331	5	Walkability encourages more community
332	5	Living in a city means having to sometimes park a few blocks from your destination, and that's normal! Prioritizing cars isn't helpful when we need more housing and densification.

333	4	Yes, BUT free parking should absolutely be available to everyone to help bolster the businesses and allow accessibility to everyone, not just people who are walking distance. If the GR Metro area developed a train system to provide easy cheap transportation for the area like cities like London and Manhattan have done, then parking would not be as big of a concern.
334	5	As someone who does not drive a car, making businesses accessible to pedestrians is essential in building a community that is less car dependent. A decrease in car dependency would increase equity by allowing everyone to access businesses, not just those with cars. Walkable districts would also reduce carbon emissions from vehicles, increase social interactions, give a sense of community (something that is essential in a city), and benefit businesses with greatly increased foot traffic.
335	4	If public transportation and public parking is increased then the area will be more accessible and also allow for more housing
336	5	Parking minimums hamper growth. Prioritizing people and transit/walking/biking/micro-mobility creates areas where people want to live and do business.
337	5	There is SO much parking in GR! I would much rather see bike lanes, sidewalks, safe and comfortable bus stops.
338	5	Parking mandates make useful urban land far less productive and profitable per square foot. Decreasing the ease of driving will help keep cars off the road (reduces pollution, pedestrian collisions, and overall amount of crashes). An increased availability for public transit will make traveling around the city easier.
339	5	This only works if Grand Rapids becomes significantly more walkable within these areas and a city as a whole. Public transit would also need to become much more accessible and usable by everyone. The bus schedule needs to be regular and consistent, regardless of what day of the week it is.
340	5	the future dictates that fewer people are interested in owning cars.
341	4	I believe we should make a shift away from being so car-centric. Make the city more walkable, bike-friendly, with better public transit.
342	3	Neutral. If for resident parking, that location choice should lean into public transportation, bicycles, etc. more. For non-resident parking, much more is needed. I have not experienced a crowding issue anywhere. But i always experience parking issues, every time.
343	5	Vibrant, livable and equitable cities are cities designed for people rather than the storage of private vehicles. Especially as Gen Z and Gen Alpha grow up and desire more walkable, less car-dependent lifestyles, the prioritization of walkable and public-transit-oriented business districts are a must for cities looking to recruit and retain younger populations.
344	5	We need to focus on growing a walkable city that is friendly to pedestrians, public transit, biking, etc. The only way to do so is to consistently prioritize people over cars, which includes rescuing space in the city dedicated to parking. The City will also need to improve public transit to meet its community-wide goal to reduce carbon emissions, much of which comes from transportation and can be improved by prioritizing better public transit that is convenient and gets folks to the places they need to go.
345	5	Walkable neighborhood business districts. Places for people instead of cars. Increases demand for transit and non-motorized transportation.
346	5	We need to begin to think beyond fossil fuel powered transport and encourage the development and use of public transport and other shared-use options.
347	5	We need more pedestrian and cyclist forward architecture in public spaces. More people should walk, bike, use public transportation and carpool to get to work and live life.
348	5	To prioritize and increase the importance and need for quality public transportation options.
349	5	Pushing people to be less car dependent and use alternative methods of transportation is best for our city, its growth and our environmental impact.
350	5	This will force the Rapid Bus to become a true public transport instead of a service employee shuttle, as it currently stands.
351	5	This will force the Rapid Bus to become a true public transport instead of a service employee shuttle, as it currently stands.
352	5	If public transit improves, cars are less needed.
353	5	We need to invest in convenient, sustainable public transportation and reduce the use of cars in all places. We can use our space so much more efficiently that way!
354	3	Yes, but it can't happen until the bike/bus infrastructure is in place.
355	4	Because it will encourage more walkable business districts, and the sight of cars makes people not feel comfortable walking to these places. However removing parking minimums can mean that the lack of one developments planning will become another's problem. Lowering the minimum would be helpful but removing it all together might create more of a mess than a solution.
356	5	Yes you should be making communities more walkable so that people don't have to drive and park.
357	5	We need to make a societal shift away from cars. People will always choose cars if it continues to be the most frictionless option.
358	5	The city of Grand Rapids should move away from any ordinance or regulation that promotes reliance on personal automotive transportation rather than public transportation, bicycle infrastructure and walkability.
359	5	People and space for community building are much more important than space for cars. More parking spaces encourage more people to drive rather than walk and use any other mode.
360	4	If we had stronger public transportation I would vote higher towards yes but unfortunately a large amount of folks in the city use personal vehicles to travel. Ideally there is more room for people over cars but if folks don't have a place to park, this may prevent them from visiting.
361	5	Let's prepare for the driverless rental car future. The era of personal vehicles is ending
362	5	We should encourage less driving
363	5	Grand Rapids needs to prioritize expanding transportation options so that residents are less reliant on personal cars and vehicles to access entertainment and participate in the local economy. If the city helped to fund diverse transportation options, like efficient city buses, trains, and bike lanes, then the need for parking spaces lessens, and there would be more space for living spaces and businesses.
364	5	We should encourage less driving
365	5	Requiring parking minimums makes development more expensive, less accessible to people with disabilities who cannot drive, and less pedestrian friendly.
366	5	We can have areas for people to park and use transit to get people around
367	5	Neighborhoods and businesses should prioritize people, bicycle, and public transit traffic as that can support a greater throughput and incentivizes more people to shop, work, and visit these location. Cars are also noisy, big, and costly. Parking minimums waste valuable space for people and businesses.
368	5	Disincentivizing driving should be a priority for every city, as cars are dangerous to pedestrians trying to navigate the streets. They are also loud, which is noise nuisance, and the exhaust and particulate generated by rubber tires cause negative health outcomes.
369	5	We want to emphasize neighborhood districts so it should be encouraging people to get there without using a private car because it's in the neighborhood close enough to not require a car.
15	5	There are 2 billion parking spaces just in our country. Please stop.

27	5	There should be shared parking, these places are for people not cars. Parking is important for business health, A few spots in front or near in view, then the rest somewhere else. Design spaces with human body as unit of size, not the size of cars.
28	5	People are more important than cars
29	5	Parking is bad land use. It reduces the tax base and prevents new business from starting up due to financial expenses of parking
30	5	Parking lots are largely wasted space.
31	5	Too much parking already
32	5	Parking lots are a blight on the city.
33	5	Parking minimums make horrible use of the intrinsic value of the space. In general parking should not be prioritized on site or be a requirement in an urban setting.
34	5	If we continue building our cities for cars over people, soon enough our cities will be oceans of parking lots and highways without a person in sight. Parking is important yes, but mandating parking creates more problems that it solves. One of the reasons why so many cities are stagnating is because the places people want to go to are often separated by miles of parking lots and anti-pedestrian infrastructure. By allowing parking to be built as needed, not mandating it's creation, we can allow for our city to grow around the people who live in it rather than the cars they drive.
35	5	Parking minimums encourage sprawl which inherently increases tax burden and ruins the walkability and urban fabric of cities. The idea of storing large personal property in valuable real estate for free is also absurd.
36	5	Abundant parking induces demand. The city has an obligation to do its part in stopping car dependence. The reality is that making parking less available and a little harder to find is a critical part of that. The city should be doing real parking demand studies that look into shared parking agreements with neighboring businesses.
37	5	Parking minimums accommodate not only business patrons but neighbors in area
71	5	Cars suck life from locations, an parking minimums present a barrier to business owners because they need more capital to buy the extra land. Parking minimums create more distance between businesses creating less community
175	5	Because fuck cars. Parking lots are the biggest waste of space in cities.
215	5	Not every renter has a car and street parking in neighborhood areas is free
216	5	We actually have a lot of parking lots already. We have tons of spaces that are privatized and remain empty. These spaces could generate income for the property owners and should be encouraged to make them into public parking. Also, cars are not people. When we prioritize parking spots over dwelling units, we are putting cars above housing. Housing should always come before parking. If you have affordable housing in walkable neighborhoods (this means you have everything you need within a mile of your house), then cars become less of a necessity.
217	5	in walkable neighborhoods the parking restriction is over estimated
218	2	Build according to the needs. The city as it stands is too spread out.
219	5	Yes, because we have lots of parking garages in the area
220	5	Too much valuable land is being wasted storing personal vehicles that not all community members own or use.
221	5	Walkable cities happen when businesses and housing are close enough together that people can walk. Parking lots create large gaps and creates unnecessary distances between businesses.
222	5	The more parking that is required the more land is consumed for the storage of cars and the less opportunity there is to create walkable or transit rich neighborhoods.
223	5	Once you actually start noticing how many unused expanses of parking lot we live among, you can't unsee it! So much unused land, environmental waste, and visual blight.
224	5	Mandating impervious surfaces contradicts goals that cities should have to proactively address climate change; parking lots also take up prime real estate in the city that could be used for many other purposes that are far more lucrative to local business and the city
225	4	People need accommodation more than vehicles but this city is still heavily reliant on cars so residents downtown should have spaces to park. For those visiting downtown, we should limit garages and lots to increase demand for public transit and non-motorized traffic (reducing carbon and noise pollution), while being mindful of this with physical disabilities. Also, maybe not remove parking minimums but just reducing them to start.
22	1	Currently, we the city of Grand Rapids does not have the public transit needed to eliminate vehicles - example job in Grandville, home in Creston. Every property needs at least 1 vehicle parking space other wise property does not accommodate ability to live in the property
26	2	Parking is an important part of day to day life in the city. I don't think it's really a people vs cars issue. If we're decreasing parking, we need to have the Rapid running on at least 15 minute increments. I could quit behind decreasing parking if that was the case.
2	4	I keep trying to submit this and it crashes. I put a 4 because we need to prioritize people over cars BUT there has to be some room for parking... we are in a mid-sized city, not NYC. We are not going to have many car-free-by-choice residents, thus parking needs to be considered.
3	1	Prioritizing people over cars is a worthy idea. Problem is that this doesn't address the fact that cars exist and that other options are sadly lacking in Grand Rapids. The Rapid is kind of an unfunny joke and not everyone can ride a bike everywhere (nor would they want to in the winter.) As someone who lives outside of the downtown core, driving to get to downtown businesses requires parking. If there were a viable option to driving, I'd use it. Unfortunately, the businesses downtown are competing with businesses in the suburbs where parking is plentiful and free.
4	2	because cars are a necessary reality in current life. We don't live in a place and time where most people can accomplish life the way they want to live without vehicles, and that requires parking.
5	1	It becomes untenable to keep adding new buildings without adding additional parking. We don't have good public transportation either.
6	2	Parking in this town is hard enough
7	1	Parking is essential for traveling to these dwellings.
8	1	This would be a splendid idea 50 years ago; we are an automotive-centric culture and that is not going to change soon. If more space for people is necessary, do away with (dangerous) bike lanes that are only (under) utilized in the summer months.

9	1	The city/region does not have a robust transit system at this point in time. Therefore, a majority of people still use cars as there mode of transportation. Parking minimums could be reduced, but not eliminated.
10	1	Many elderly & handicapped people need the accessibility which parking minimums provide.
11	1	Cars still need to go somewhere and they end up in the neighborhoods next to the business districts leaving little to no room for residents to park or access their driveways.
12	1	It's frustrating not to have close access to your front door from your vehicle.
13	3	This is an infrastructure problem and is difficult to implement when space and zoning also are not flexible.
14	2	Until there is better infrastructure for walking and biking, cars parking is needed. Especially for the disabled.
15	2	We're still auto-centric to a large degree and we still have service and accessibility gaps in public transportation. I see this changing gradually, but many people still rely on cars for convenience and many households have one car for every family of driving age. Space-saving alternatives to surface parking (ie. underground parking, stacked parking, turntables) aren't economical for most residential homes, but housing can be built above garages, so the requirements may not be burdensome if a compromise on setbacks and greenspace can be reached.
16	1	Even if you don't own a vehicle, you should have the option of a space for yourself or a visitor.
17	1	We need parking because transit is not adequate outside downtown.
191	2	If someone is working somewhere they should have a spot to park close by
192	2	Increasing density downtown, urban, suburban does not increase access to safety, food or lifestyle. Urban crowding creates parking scarcity, increases traffic and pushes successful income earners away from downtown in search for better schools, shopping and safety. There is a sub-group that desires higher urban density, free or subsidized transportation and walkable neighborhoods as long as government provides necessary infrastructure where communities are provided security (policing), traffic scarcity (lack of visitor parking) and food security (local grocery at a loss to the provider).
198	3	You need to ensure ways for drivers to access business. Some people do not feel safe riding bikes. I'm almost 60 years old, it's been ages since I've ridden a bike and I do not believe it is safe to ride amongst traffic. The mishmash of bike lanes is a joke. Lack of curbs between cars and bikes pose danger. I prefer models where cars use completely separate roads than peds. Also you need more DASH lots to reduce business required spaces. People still drive to work, school, long trips. The idea of discriminating against drivers is fantasyland. Reality is people still rely on cars. You cannot turn a switch and cause everyone to adjust so quickly and cause all jobs and other destinations to instantly become walking distance from downtown. People say well move - it's not that simple especially for people like myself who live in affordable housing with rates that does not exist anywhere else. You cannot repeal parking spaces outright unless there is alternative infrastructure for drivers. I would rate this question higher if that is included but asking with the absence of alt infrastructure is dubious and misleading.
212	2	Lack of business and commerce district parking is a huge problem for cities that have grown to fast. More people will stop going to these areas to shop and eat.
217	1	Because the city needs to be accessible for everyone. If parking requirements are removed it makes it harder for people who don't live right in that area to take part in business transactions. It also makes it less desirable for people who don't live in the city to come in and spend their money in the city.
131	1	One of our biggest problems is parking. It is as big as the housing problem
225	1	People don't like parking their cars far from their dwellings or on the street. A garage or designated parking area can keep cars and owners safer.
243	3	With respect to businesses, I think this free market approach can be ok. BUT: we have to make loading zones widely available and ENFORCE THEM. (See Bridge St. No loading parking for food delivery pickups, not ever around the corner on Alabama.) AND: We cannot continue to expand residential on lots without REGULATING parking. Those with drives and lots should be REQUIRED TO USE THEM, and leave street parking for those without. Or for guests and deliveries. We don't live in the transportation utopia we imagine, and we cannot keep acting like just eliminating the spaces will eliminate the cars while The Rapid continues to fail miserably.
245	1	I travel a lot and would prefer to use a car, which requires parking. Do not remove parking minimums!
246	1	I drive a lot for my job. I need a place to reasonably park so I can earn income. Please don't take parking away.
248	2	Most people still drive.
268	1	Parking is already an issue. If we have less parking than payment for parking needs to be re-evaluated. If one has to park a mile away from their destination payment for that seems unfair. Also, if space for people is prioritized than parking will definitely become an issue.
274	1	Because on street parking is a pain. I once lived across the street from a duplex that had 6 college students living there, and they all had cars and no parking. At times it was impossible to find a parking spot on my block. It was inconvenient in the summer but an ordeal in the winter where no one (primarily renters) shoveled their walks.
282	4	We as a community are still very auto dependent so there needs to be some places to park. But the minimums when housing is being built should be flexible
283	5	There should be places for residents to park.
284	1	There is never enough parking
285	3	Not sure, the tenants will have to park somewhere. Maybe a parking garage for all tenants, or underground parking with the unit on top.
286	1	Why does the city of Grand Rapids hate cars so much? It's a great way to get around. Not everyone has the luxury of having the ability to ride a bike or walk long distances. Grand Rapids is a place for everyone in the region to enjoy, not every small farming community or small town gets to have the same things the city does. So we DRIVE to Grand Rapids to get to these places. There is nothing wrong with that. So businesses should have space for cars.
287	1	I can't afford to live in the city because I want to live near my family in outlying areas. As a city with the majority of jobs and resources, I need to be able to commute to my place of employment. I pay city taxes and gas tax, and should be able to drive to work and not have to worry about parking. Otherwise, I want a refund on both taxes.
288	1	Driveways help keep the streets cleaner and minimizes frustration when finding parking. Chicago is notorious for driving around for 30-45 minutes to find a spot near your home.
289	1	Because parking is a huge issue for many people - this includes people with disabilities and people from the suburbs driving in. Eliminating off street parking on main streets as proposed just pushes the parking problem down the side streets. Many of our built out neighborhoods near city center already have tight street parking, please do not make it worse!
290	1	We are already dealing with parking issues if you remove parking minimums and add more people there will be no place for anyone to park which could lead to all sorts of other issues
291	1	Keep enough parking so I can get to my place of employment, enjoy restaurants and activities that the city has to offer, and so all of us can utilize the hospitals without having to wait for a bus or taking a bike in to the ER.

292	1	It will just make street parking on side streets more prevalent.
293	1	Without a really workable rapid transit system, cars will still be needed.
294	1	I commute to this area for my job and use a car. When I am in town, I go to various stores. I need to be able to park somewhere to do that. Don't limit parking; I'll just go Haines see out of town that are more open for people like me.
1	1	the current 2 car parking per unit is relevant to households today- if we increase the living units and don't allow for the reasonable norm for our culture & climate, we are ignoring the needs of our community- cars for transportation are the norm- and we need to give them attention to where and how to accommodate them.
2	1	Most people have vehicles.
3	1	No. One of the reasons some people (and most older people) don't want to come downtown.
4	3	I don't feel strongly either way. I do believe generally sentiment/ downtown is that there isn't enough affordable parking.
5	2	People need parking- If we build more housing + no parking where will people park? I know people still on waitlists for city parking.
6	1	No, Parking is essential for renters. I manage apts and that is very important to my renters.
7	1	We need to be a city who welcomes those that drive in as a destination
8	2	I think if residential is being built they should have parking built onsite as not to take away from businesses. The businesses need parking.
9	1	No, parking is already a problem most places downtown whether it be [rice or lack of spaces. This will only deter people even more from coming downtown. More people= more parking needs.
10	2	To have residents there needs to be space for their transportation
11	2	Parking minimums are important because we need to be able to put our cars in a specific place. Street parking is often not practical. I think new buildings should have innovative parking options under the building or a shared parking garage for residential areas in a business district.
12	3	Buses are not convenient for seniors and those with disabilities. It's hard to carry bags of groceries on a bus. They need to find space for smaller parking lots and then people can walk to where they want to go. There is a small city lot on West Fulton between Straight and National. That lot at any given time is 80% full. People can walk to all kinds of different businesses on the West Fulton corridor. Those smaller lots serve the neighborhood businesses and that way it doesn't interfere with neighborhood residents.
13	1	Ease of access for street parking
14	1	Absolutely not! People still drive, and park, but the parking is pushed into the traditional neighborhoods!!! It's at ALL HOURS. The "dream" that people will use paid lots nearby is not reality. Our traditional neighborhood streets are not even wide enough for current double side parking!!! We have duplexes here and they have 4-6 cars parked in the backyard not to mention what's already on the street!
15	1	There needs to be adequate parking for people to come into the city. Since people and businesses are leaving downtown and other areas there has to be a welcoming way to get them to come downtown and the lack of parking does not help.
16	2	You need parking
17	1	Because some families have more than two drivers and two cars, we need to keep the parking vs occupants equal so that occupants can have guests over and not take parking away from others.

		Because then there will be nowhere to park, forcing cars to park on other random nearby residential streets, when they can find space. Yes, there is public transit, but no, not everyone uses it all the time. In the example below of the parking taking more space than the unit maybe the unit is too small! If two people are to live there, then where are they supposed to put their cars if they both drive? And maybe they do use public transit regularly, but still own a car for when they take longer or different trips. At their home, they need a space to store their belongings, such as their car.
18	1	
19	2	We do not have sufficient transport infrastructure to support people NOT using their own vehicles.
20	2	Because our transit infrastructure isn't ready for it. Most people need cars to commute and can't rely on the busses. Only apartments in the heart of downtown should be able to reduce parking under certain circumstances.
21	1	Parking is necessary for growth. Bike access is great but that only gets you so far...
6	5	
14	5	
28	2	
41	3	
42	5	
43	3	
44	5	
45	5	
46	5	
47	3	
48	5	
49	5	
50	4	
51	5	
52	2	
53	5	
54	5	
55	1	
56	5	
57	5	
58	3	
59	5	
60	2	
61	5	
62	3	
63	5	
64	4	
65	4	
66	1	
67	1	
68	3	
69	5	
70	1	
71	1	
72	5	
73	3	
74	5	
75	5	
76	5	
77	5	
78	4	
79	5	
80	3	
81	5	
82	5	
83	2	
84	5	
85	3	
86	1	
87	2	
88	1	
89	3	
84	3	
90	3	Eh...
179	5	
185	4	
188	1	
196	5	
199	5	
204	5	
205	5	
206	2	
210	1	
211	1	
213	5	
216	5	
218	3	

104	5
226	3
230	5
232	4
233	5
235	5
238	5
252	5
253	5
254	5
261	3
262	5
264	
273	5
274	5
275	3
276	5
277	5
278	3
279	1
280	3
281	5
282	5
283	4
284	3
285	1
286	1
287	5
288	5
289	1
290	2
291	1
388	5
389	
390	2
391	5
392	3
393	5
394	5
395	2
396	5
397	3
398	1
399	4
400	3
401	4
402	5
403	5
404	5
405	3
406	2
407	2
408	5
409	2
410	5
411	3
412	4

As much as I want to answer your questions, I cannot say duplex in a type of neighborhood, yes or no. So much depends on space, location not necessarily a corner good in one neighborhood, but not good in another type neighborhood. I cannot take an overall arching approach to say yes prioritize people space over car space. You have to look at neighborhood to determine an approach and still obtain your goals outlined. You have drill down futher in you analysis

Do you work in the city of GR?	Do you work in an employment center?	If not, why?	How important is it to preserve areas for manufacturing?
Yes	yes		5
yes	yes		3
yes	yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote	2
No	No		4
Yes			4
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	5
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	Other	4
Yes	Yes		5
No		Other	4
Yes	No	Other	5
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		4

No			4
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		4
No	No	Other	1
Yes	Yes		5
No	Yes		5
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	5
Yes	No	Other	5
Yes	No	Other	5
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		4
No			4
No	No	There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	5
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3

Yes	Yes		5
Yes	No	Other	5
Yes	Yes		5
No			4
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		5
No			2
Yes	No	Other	4
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	4
No		Remote	5
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	4
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		3

No	No	Military	5
No	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	4
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	4
Yes	No	I work off Plainfield	3
Yes	No	Remote	4
Yes	No	We needed access to public transportation, but also a quiet neighborhood.	5
Yes	No	Remote	4
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		2

Yes	Yes		5
No		There are better job options elsewhere	3
No		There are better job options elsewhere	3
No		There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		3
No		There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	Yes		5
No		There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	Yes		4
No		There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	4
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote, Iâ€™m a Realtor	3
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	4
Yes	No	Remote	5
Yes	Yes		3

Yes	No	Remote	3
No			5
Yes	No	It's more convenient to work near my home.	5
Yes	No	Remote	5
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote	5
Yes	Yes	Too hard to get to place of business by automobile, so finding a job with free parking and easy drive options.	5
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field, There are better job options elsewhere	3
No	No	25 year teacher in another district	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	self employed	5
Yes	Yes		5
No	No	Didn't live here for 30 years, just moved back. That is if I understand the question?	3
No		Disabled veteran	5
Yes	No	Remote	5
Yes	Yes		5

No		No or few jobs in my field	3
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field, Remote	4
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No		4
Yes	No	Remote	4
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	No	Other	4
Yes	Yes		5
yes	yes		5
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field, Remote, Other	4
Yes	Yes		3

Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	5
Yes	No	Remote	2
Yes	No	Remote	2
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		4
No			5
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		5
No		There are better job options elsewhere	5
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		5
No	No	No or few jobs in my field, Remote	4
Yes	Yes		3
No		Did not live in Grand Rapids until I retired	4
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	Other	4
Yes	Yes	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		4

No		No or few jobs in my field, There are better job options elsewhere	4
No	No	Public educator in Ottawa County with the opportunity to be hired in Kent County nearly impossible with how teacher contracts exist (too many year=no opportunity to change districts).	3
No	No	Public educator in Ottawa County with the opportunity to be hired in Kent County nearly impossible with how teacher contracts exist (too many year=no opportunity to change districts).	3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		5
No	No	Retired when I moved here	3
Yes	Yes		5
No	No	Remote	5
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	I do home visits	5
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	5
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	5
Yes	No	Remote	5
Yes	No	Remote	4
Yes	No	Remote	5
			4
Yes	No	Remote	1

Yes	No		2
Yes	No		5
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	No	Other	4
Yes	Yes	Other	3
Yes	Yes		5
No		Other	3
No		Other	5
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	No	Other	4

Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	I just happened to get jobs elsewhere	3
Yes	No	Remote	3
No			5
Yes	No	My employer does not happen to be located in "an employment center."	5
Yes	Yes		1
No	No	There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	Yes		2
No			4
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3

No		Currently a full time student, not looking for a job during the school year.	2
Yes	Yes	Remote	3
Yes	No	Remote	1
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field, Remote	3
No	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	Other	2
Yes	Yes		3
No	No	Remote	1
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote, Office is not located in employment center "hot spot" (East Hills).	3
No	No	Other	1
Yes	Yes		2

Yes	No		2
Yes	Yes	Remote	2
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		2
No	No	Remote	2
Yes	No	Remote	4
Yes	Yes		5
No			4
Yes			5
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	4
Yes	Yes		4
No		No or few jobs in my field, There are better job options elsewhere, Other	5
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		1
No			4
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		5

Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	5
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No		5
Yes	Yes		3
No	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		5
No	No	Other	4
Yes	Yes		2
No		There are better job options elsewhere	4
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field, There are better job options elsewhere	2
Yes	Yes	There are better job options elsewhere	4
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		4

Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes	Other	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	5
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		5
No	No	I was on a neighborhood association board of directors (SWAN) and I was a neighborhood volunteer	4
No		No or few jobs in my field	2

Yes	No	Other	5
Yes	No	Remote	3
No	Yes		4
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
No	No		2
Yes	No		5
Yes	Yes		3
No	No		3
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	3
No	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote	1
No	No	Other	3
Yes	No		5
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	1

No	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	2
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field, I don't have a way to get to those jobs	4
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	1
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Other	1
Yes	Yes	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		1

No		Remote	1
No	No		2
No		Other	3
No			5
No	No	Remote	4
Yes	Yes		3
No	No	I don't have a way to get those jobs	3
No	No	Other	3
No		Remote	3
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	3
No	No		4
No	No	There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		4
	No	No or few jobs in my field	5
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3

Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote	2
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Other	2
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	2
Yes	No	Remote	1
Yes	No	Remote	1
Yes	Yes		2
No			1
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		1
No	No		1
Yes	No	Remote, My office is not located there.	3
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		3

No	No	Other	3
No		Remote	2
No	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		3
No	No	I live in GR and work in Walker	2
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		1
No		I own property in Grand Rapids, but don't work there.	3
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		3
yes	yes		2
Yes	No		1
Yes	Yes	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	1

No	No	Disabled	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		4
No		Other	3
No		Moved here from Idaho after I retired	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
No		Other	3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote	4
No		There are better job options elsewhere, Remote	4
No		Remote	2

No		Remote	2
Yes	No	Remote	1
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	2
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	No	Other	1
No	No	Other	2
Yes	Yes		1
No	Yes		3
Yes	Yes	Remote	5
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No		3
No		There are better job options elsewhere	2
No	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
Yes	Yes		
Yes			5
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Other	4
No	No	Other	4
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere, Remote	4
Yes	Yes		3
No	Yes		
Yes			
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
Yes	Yes		3
No	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
Yes	Yes		3
No		Other	3
Yes	No		3
Yes	Yes	No or few jobs in my field	2
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	3

Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		3
No	No	No or few jobs in my field	
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		5
No		Other	3
Yes	No	Remote	1
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	2
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	No	Remote, Other	
No	No		5
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	Other	5
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	No	Remote	5
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		5
No		Remote	
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		3
No		Remote	2
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote	5
No		There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	Remote	5
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	No	Other	3
No		Remote	2
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
No	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	5
Yes	Yes		3
No	No	Remote	2
Yes	Yes		3
No	No	Remote	3

Yes	Yes		3
No		No or few jobs in my field	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	No		2
Yes	No	Remote	3
No	No	Other	3
No		Remote	2
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		3
No		There are better job options elsewhere	4
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	3
Yes	No	Other	4
Yes			
Yes	Yes		3
No		Other	3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		
Yes	No		3
Yes	Yes	Other	4
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	5
No			4
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
Yes	No	Other	4
Yes	No	Other	4
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		
No		There are better job options elsewhere	5
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No		
Yes	Yes		3
No	No	Other	3
Yes	Yes		2
No	No		3
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
Yes	Yes		5
No	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	5

Yes	No	Remote	5
No	No	No or few jobs in my field, There are better job options elsewhere	4
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes			
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
No	No	No or few jobs in my field	2
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		5 - Very important
No		Remote	
No		Remote	
No	No	No or few jobs in my field, There are better job options elsewhere, Remote	1 - Not important
Yes	Yes		3
No		I don't have a way to get those jobs	1
Yes	Yes		
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	Other	
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
No	No	Other	3
Yes	Yes		
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
No	No	There are better job options elsewhere	5
No	No	Other	
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	No	Not where my job is	4
Yes	Yes		5
No	No	No or few jobs in my field	3
No			
No	No	Other	3
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	No		4
Yes	No	Remote	3
No		Other	2
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field	5
No	Yes		5
Yes	Yes		4

Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	5
No	No	Other	4
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	Yes	the jobs are closest to my residence and I can walk to work	3
Yes	Yes	Remote	3
Yes	No	Other	3
No	No	I don't have a way to get to those jobs	5
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	We need density to support business plus we have non motorized vehicle transportation	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	Yes		
No			
Yes	Yes		3
No			
Yes	No		
No	No		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote	4
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Other	1
No			3
Yes	No	Remote	2
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote	
Yes	Yes		5
Yes			4
No	No	There are better job options elsewhere	2
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		5
No	No		
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
No		There are better job options elsewhere	5
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	No	Remote	3
No			3
No			
Yes	No	Other	5
No	No		3
Yes	No	Other	3
Yes	Yes		5

Yes	Yes		
Yes	Yes		5
No	No	I work elsewhere	4
yes	yes		2
Yes	Yes	Other	5
yes	yes		5
No			
Yes	No	Other	5
Yes	Yes		3

Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		
Yes	Yes		3
No			
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		1
Yes	Yes		
Yes	No		
yes	yes		1

yes	yes		5
yes	yes		
Yes	yes		2
yes	yes		
yes			
No		No or few jobs in my field, There are better job options elsewhere	
No	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	1
Yes	No	Im in a different field of work	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes			3
Yes	no	no or few jobs in my field, there are better job options elsewhere	3
No	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	Other	5
No	No		
Yes	Yes		3

Yes	Yes		2
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		2
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	No	Remote	4
No	No		
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		
Yes	No		2
No		I'm a student	2
Yes	No	Remote	4
Yes	Yes		
No	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Remote	2
	Yes		5
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		
Yes	No	No or few jobs in my field, Remote	3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	Other	
No	Yes		1
		Not sure if slightly darker blue area counts? Slash that's not where my job is?	
Yes	No		3
Yes	Yes		1
No	No	Remote	3
Yes			
		There are better job options elsewhere, Remote	
Yes	No		4
Yes	No	Remote	3
Yes	Yes		4
Yes	Yes		3
		There are better job options elsewhere, Remote	
Yes	No		4
Yes	No	Remote	3
No			3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	Yes		3
Yes	No	There are better job options elsewhere	5
No			3
No		Did not live in Michigan	

Additional Comments

Job growth more money into the economy

In maintaining a positive economic footprint for the city but without yielding city growth.

I believe we need space for manufacturing but where that space should be, I'm not sure.

Because this industry is needed in our local economy as it brings large numbers for employment and activates the city as office employees support local businesses purchasing meals or entertainment in the surrounding areas.

I personally don't care, and the manufacturing on the west side (junk yard, coca cola) aren't very pleasant. Though I understand if it helps the city.

It is important, more jobs. More concentrated areas and more variety of jobs instead of just healthcare

Manufacturing jobs increases diversity of population. Makes for healthy tax base.

Right now yes that is the area that employs the most people

The "more ideas" on your board are key. Visualizing manufacturing centers outside city with excellent public transportation from center city residential areas. We can't be everything - encourage concentration of high quality manufacturing in specific sectors

It's not something I've thought of much. Manufacturing is important though for economic opportunity.

It will become more important in my opinion as reshoring of manufacturing occurs over the next few years (I hope!)

Generally these are higher paying jobs which helps with affording available housing

Manufacturing provides important diversity to protect ebbs and flows of the economy and provides a diversity in the types of jobs available

Manufacturing is part of the economy, and one type of job available to people without a college education.

A diverse economy based on real industries - which required infrastructure - is a more resilient economy.

Manufacturing jobs are foundational to Michigan's economy and history.

We need jobs for a broad range of people.
Idk maybe jobs?
Manufacturing helps to diversify the economy.
Manufacturing is a major part of our economy, but if demand declines then utilizing some of this space for other economic opportunities for the city is reasonable.
I don't work in Grand Rapids because you tax me to work there. Requiring manufacturing spaces is only good for your tax revenue. Find the city some other way. Stop stealing wages from poor souls that need jobs.
Businesses come and go but the spaces for them need to stay.
This facilitates a diverse economy with a diverse type of jobs; also the type of infrastructure necessary for manufacturing at scale benefits everyone.
Why what? Is there a debate I'm unaware of that making things is fundamentally good? What would the planning committee prefer to see in place of manufacturing; McMansions for retired snow birds? Phrase this question better as it is a baffling premise.
Yikes, this question itself is actually pretty scary. We need to drop the post industrial mindset. We're a manufacturing city/metro. Embrace it and encourage more!
They employ many residents and can help power the economy
Manufacturing still represents a large portion of the state's economy and could increase in the future.
Manufacturing produces jobs & taxes for the city & development. I grew up on the west side & it seems to be taken over by Grand Valley University. Does Grand Valley pay taxes? I now live on the north end of Grand Rapids.
Manufacturing is a significant part of GR's economy, and having many of these work locations within city boundaries makes them more accessible and reduces the need to commute. Being within the city boundaries also means that GR has the power to provide transit access to a lot of these work locations.
A diversified economy with space for both manufacturing and services is best.
Manufacturing can be a stable revenue source for a region and provide reliable jobs. However, not all manufacturing is relevant these days. So investment must be made case by case
Manufacturing is important for our economy.
It is important because manufacturing employs a lot of people, but I feel that maybe the zoning for manufacturing areas could be looked at. It's rough seeing manufacturing facilities move into historic buildings or sort of in the middle of business districts
Generates the wealth.
Manufacturing is a strong economic driving industry. Persevering areas for companies to provide employment is important.

Skilled labor required for manufacturing work is a huge asset to local economy.
Many people are employed in these areas busing finally is reaching these areas
That is currently the main industry in Grand Rapids. There are a lot of legacy companies that should keep the manufacturing jobs local to help build class mobility.
Manufacturing is an important part of US economy and more of it is returning to the US. GR should capitalize on this so there are good paying jobs for middle class people.
Manufacturing is still an important Industry. Rezoning more of the already limited industrial zone GR has would have a detrimental effect to both potential new business and existing ones. Plus it would push industry farther out into the surrounding areas making it less accessible.
Competing with lower labor costs of Mexico/other nations is a losing battle for workers while NAFTA and other free trade agreements exist. Should only be supported if wages/quality of living for manufacturing employees is rising.
As Grand Rapids becomes a more advanced city it will need spaces to produce tomorrow's goods
Manufacturing should be allowed
We need to reduce total manufacturing worldwide because we need to reduce addiction to "stuff". But needed manufacturing should be local where possible
Keeps manufacturing in the city and preserves natural areas outside of the city
Live local, would love to work locally
Light manufacturing
To me manufacturing within the existing corridor makes some sense but much of the future growth will be in service and digital
The city needs the support of manufacturing jobs.
Manufacturing is key to the economy. There would be costs to transition area from manufacturing to other uses
There needs to be a focus on attracting new companies to Grand Rapids and we can only do that if we have land set aside to develop.
diversified economy
Good paying jobs. You all sit perched in your fancy offices thinking like we all can do the jobs you do in your paper pushing offices. People who work in manufacturing in existing locations will be pushed out if work by not preserving manf areas. Then you'll have more homelessness and great distress on individuals and families. Don't make GR into an elitist city of only office workers.
Manufacturing is still a large segment of West Michigan employment. If manufacturing moves out of the city, employees may not be able to get to jobs.
Jobs

<p>Manufacturing is a force within Michigan's economy. Preserving areas for manufacturing is important because it localizes the industry within certain areas, I believe this is important for pollution control. Accessibility to these areas should be more ergonomic.</p>
<p>Having jobs for people of all backgrounds and skills is important for economic mobility - if manufacturing is necessary for this than we should prioritize.</p>
<p>diversified economy</p>
<p>Balanced local economy; jobs for skilled workers without college degrees; national security.</p>
<p>depends on the manufacturing, traditionally a lower income employer, as more progress to automation benefits to community will continue to decline. Higher wage earners tend to commute with their own vehicles.</p>
<p>Manufacturing jobs are commonly held by our immigrant neighbors. Very important to preserve these areas to allow all communities to have livelihood. I appreciate the goal of making these centers more feasible for residential improvements</p>
<p>Grand Rapids has always relied on manufacturing</p>
<p>A diverse economy is more resilient. Manufacturing also supports infrastructure, which anchors industry</p>
<p>So they wont move out into residential areas</p>
<p>Want a diversity of employment opportunities/creates more resilient local economy</p>
<p>Jobs tend to be more stable and pay better than service jobs.</p>
<p>Need to make use of the factories not currently being used are put to good use.</p>
<p>The current amount of manufacturing property is needed and could be expanded. These businesses provide a lot of jobs that tend to pay well and are needed.</p>
<p>When they are gone they disappear</p>
<p>Manufacturing creates wealth and jobs in an area without having to rely on tourism or excess cash. If the economy takes a downturn casual shopping will be cut out along with entertainment. Having manufacturing would allow for stable jobs and tax income for the city. Service heavy industries are too high risk of being outsourced to rely on.</p>
<p>Because I work at one and would like to keep my job.</p>
<p>We need to keep manufacturing to keep our town strong. Betting on service industry and technology will not serve everyone well and is not equitable.</p>
<p>People need places to work / produce value. If there is no place in the city to do that people will move out of the area.</p>
<p>Manufacturing need a space to do its thing.</p>

Manufacturing is still a vital industry, and is making a resurgence due to the desire to make more things locally, rather than exporting our hard earned wealth to other states or countries.
Options
Options
Options
Mixed jobs are very important so all kinds of people can make a living
important to have job variety in regards to income & education and skills
I think it's important to have the potential for local manufacturing, but as our economy evolves fewer and fewer products are manufactured in the states
Options
Manufacturing can supply good paying jobs, and economic growth is dependent on it.
Options
We need jobs for every kind of worker.
Options
Grand Rapids is known for making products. We are literally becoming a white collar town and pushing our talented blue collar hardworking citizens out. That is wrong.
We need manufacturing and what these industries produce. Thus having places where such businesses can exist is important
To provide employment for people with skill sets used in manufacturing.
Convenient access to a diverse array of good jobs is important for the health of a city
It's the financial life blood of the city.
It is certainly less important than it used to be, but keeping a diversity in the types of businesses here makes us more economically viable.
To provide for more employment opportunities
Need to have more than just manufacturing jobs available. Also, their pay needs to be higher if preserved.
Manufacturing provide jobs. People need jobs to afford housing.
Michigan is an industrial state. Be a shame to lose that altogether.
Preserve suggests intervention. The market can decide where manufacturing wants to go.

Manufacturing brings good jobs, but existing manufacturing footprints are probably adequate.
Increase job opportunities and revenue for the city.
Tax base for City, employment for residents, allows working closer to home.
manufacturing jobs pay well
I don't think I am educated enough on manufacturing in the city to answer this question effectively. That's why I picked 3. If it was based solely on opinion, I would believe that it is important for manufacturing in the city to keep jobs in the city. I think it promotes diverse representation of the citizens from economics to ethnicity. The more jobs you keep in the city, the more likely people are to live and thrive in the city. Manufacturing can create more jobs than office space or retail. The more people, the more diversity, the more chances for a vibrant, multi-faceted city.
I think all available jobs should be preserved if possible so many different people have the opportunity to work.
Michigan is an industrial state. Be a shame to lose that altogether.
Build stuff in Grand Rapids, not China or outside of USA.
Manufacturing in and around areas with high population improves supply chains and gets the products to consumers faster, easier, and more timely. It's a win for everyone.
Manufacturing spaces - yes, however, I don't think the standards for those units will be the same with the advancement of Artificial Intelligence and the impact to workforce.
Need places for job creation
Manufacturing is the #1 industry in Michigan. We make stuff here and people buy it. We should provide the chance for manufacturers to stay if they want. But we should not give preferential treatment to any industry.
industry improves our tax base, including property tax, personal income tax and business tax
diverse economic engines are needed for a sustainable and less fragile economy.
Important to the economy, unless you just want service work.
Local Job Availability.
Manufacturing centers generally create several jobs requiring some skills and higher wages that come with those acquired skills
Creates a lot of jobs for skilled trades and for residents in the area who may not be suited, or want, to work in service industry. Plus, we get the benefits of local products made right here in town, with local materials, and it's more cost effective.

If demand exists and jobs can be filled
A diversified economy is a healthy economy.
Manufacturing is the life blood of the economy. Vibrant city living needs manufacturing near to it or people will just move away to be closer to work.
Manufacturing is important to the economy, but I. am not sure what is meant by "preserving" versus "allowing" - I assume preserving is maintaining specifically zoned areas, but it seems that manufacturing might work in mixed use areas depending on the industry (and might promote economic development, again depending on the industry... noting NIMBY attitudes for noise/odors/ toxicity issue)
Manufacturers create a lot of jobs and value for a city
Manufacturing jobs are still in high demand and provide a way for low skilled employees to get a footing.
Other jobs will replace manufacturing if our city grows and has higher density, but losing jobs will never be a positive.
It's important to have stuff developed locally and distributed worldwide. It helps put the city in the spotlight as an area open for business and we can have self reliance on essentials that we currently need to obtain from outlying areas or other countries.
We should prioritize bettering the lives of our community first and foremost.
I would want to be involved in manufacturing/industrial site changes or rezoning
MFC brings jobs
to continue to provide careers for GR residents
Manufacturing should not be exclusively outsourced. Local products and manufacturing zones increase city identity.
Generally a economic source of revenue and strong tax base and employment base.
I don't know enough about the way manufacturing plays a role in a balanced economy, but I do believe the economy should not be over indexed on service / information based roles. If we can find a way to have good paying manufacturing employers in the city, we should do so.

Grand Rapids is a mix of blue and white collar workers. It is essential that we keep skilled trades, which generally pay a higher wage.
It is important to preserve these areas but remain flexible and adapt the local workforce as needed.
It is important to preserve these areas but remain flexible and adapt the local workforce as needed.
Manufacturing areas provide jobs that we need. Manufacturing provides goods and services that our country needs more of to reduce the reliance on imports from other states and countries.
If manufacturing moves out restaurants, businesses that require foot traffic, gas stations, basically ALL businesses will lose out.
Manufacturing is an important industry, and keeps lower education citizens employed. When they remain employed, they can afford to live and remain in our community, rather than being forced out by increasing rent and housing prices. If we lose our labor class, we will perpetuate a cycle of increasing cost of living and decreased diversity of skills in our community.
Keeps good paying jobs in area with benefits
It provides diverse employment opportunities for those who live in the area to work.
Grand Rapids should embrace its past and be a city for people who create, not consume. We should be able to take pride in our manufacturing industries that help support the needs of people all over the country.
Manufacturing is an integral part of our economic system.
Creates wealth and opportunity
It's important to maintain good middle class jobs to keep the local economy healthy, and I think manufacturing is (or has been) a big part of the economy.
Manufacturing still provides decent jobs for people without college degrees in the city. For as long as we fail to build transit rich and dense regional corridors we're going to continue to need job base in the city.
Grand Rapids needs a balanced economy. Clean manufacturing close to where people live is important.
So people like my husband can stay employed.
This map is illegible for me and for anyone who may have a visual disability. Where are the employment centers located???
Manufacturing Jobs are important, as long as they pay a living wage or more which for a single person working 40 hours per week is 25 dollars per hour.
It is very important to preserve areas for manufacturing if the manufacturing companies want to be there. If an owner or leasehold has a better use for the space, there is no reason to have a space left vacant for a manufacturer which may not be interested.
Because a healthy economy provides jobs and localized production of the goods we need.

Manufacturing creates great jobs and diversity.
There are LOADS of buildings in GR that provided manufacturing jobs to our residentsâ€”big business needs to utilize those spaces!
There are LOADS of buildings in GR that provided manufacturing jobs to our residentsâ€”big business needs to utilize those spaces!
Manufacturing is vital to our. Country's future.
It is a key driver for the economy.
Employment opportunities
Jobs are still needed
Manufacturing provides many employment opportunities across a spectrum of levels of educational attainment.
Blue collar jobs
Manufacturing provides jobs and stability to an area.
Manufacturing offers a variety of jobs. As long as the businesses located near housing do not adversely affect daily life of residents the two can be somewhat close together.
Jobs and a healthy economy are primary so we can lift up our residents at all levels
Keeping manufacturers together seems like a good idea
Keeping manufacturers together seems like a good idea
3D Printers make it economical locally
Manufacturing is a very important piece of our well-diversified economy
3D Printers make it economical locally
Only if manufacturing does not interfere with the health of residents living nearby - big trucks going through neighborhoods - need to consider smells, waste removal, chemicals
Traditional manufacturing locations were often chosen without regard to ecological, community, or equitable needs.

Short commutes and accessibility are important. Other things are more important for well-being, like housing and access to groceries and green spaces/parks. Manufacturing is a low priority for me in a highly populated area. Also, some of the manufacturing in my neighborhood has caused some potent pollution. There is no place that should be happening.

Resilient food system

Air quality issues and esthetics.

Industrial manufacturing contributes to air pollution.

Air quality and esthetics.

The type of manufacturing is what should be the determining factor in this question. Is it sustainable, progressive, and continuous in creating jobs? Then yes.

I need a job and I work at the employer that pays me most and has the best culture. I work near home and consider myself lucky that all three of those things align. What seems more important for planning purposes is that employers should be sure to protect the quality of life in the neighborhood environment and encourage alternative transportation.

Grand Rapids should preserve space for CLEAN manufacturing: think CNC machines, 3D printing, etc. It should not be a place for polluting industries over the long term.

I feel some manufacturing have viable purposes in communities but it can be after determined of the residents that live nearby or around manufacturing that could be dealing with pollution.

Manufacturing is important but should not be in communities that the people health and safety is at risk

I wouldn't want to live next to a factory unless it was clean, close to major arteries, and not noisy - small facilities in protected neighborhoods would be fine or provide good transportation to outlying manufacturing

"Clean: manufacturing is important. Needs to be carbon neutral and environmentally friendly spread through city so worker can walk or bike to work or on public transit routes

Accessible for employees is important, but marginalized communities shouldn't bear cost of pollution, proximity, or other negative effects

Industry = jobs, however, they must become more environmentally sustainable, and reusing > tearing down, use what we have and improve it

<p>Manufacturing jobs should be accessible in the city but must be strict on pollution - the cities that host manufacturers should not be sacrificed in terms of their health/air quality to support manufacturing</p>
<p>I don't want to see more sprawl and factories just pushed further out while thei former neighborhoods get gentrified. However, I have real concerns about factories polluting where people live. I'd like to see strong standards for factories if they are to stay in the city. Move polluters out of residential areas.</p>
<p>Manufacturing is important to West Michigan because it provides good jobs, but it can be destructive to the environment. We need to create more job diversity in the metro area.</p>
<p>I think, honest conversations with many of the larger manufacturers would show that they are downsizing their real estate footprint. Why encode protections for these areas that will make it harder to transform them once the manufacturers move?</p>
<p>I'm not even sure what manufacturing we do. I think where manufacturing currently is seems fine, but I wouldn't want manufacturing sites located near neighborhoods where pollution and traffic could more directly affect residents.</p>
<p>When regulated appropriately for noise and pollution manufacturing areas are great for providing jobs. However, this shouldn't come at the expense of peoples health or the ability for folks to find housing.</p>
<p>Very important, but care must be taken to provide effective buffer zones between manufacturing uses that create pollution and excessive truck traffic, which creates dangerous traffic and pollution that harms residents nearby.</p>
<p>Manufacturing carries risks to human health, from chemicals used (hello, PFAS!) to noise generated by machinery to the traffic associated with transporting goods and materials. While not all manufacturing is created equal, heavy manufacturing should occur in designated areas an appropriate distance from residential neighborhoods.</p>
<p>People over Profit.</p>
<p>Manufacturing done well provides important jobs and resources, it is important to make sure the manufacturing sites follow proper environmental regulations</p>
<p>Manufacturing sector needs, demands, and requirements have changed since these areas were originally developed. Current and future development should reflect these changes and provide adaptability.</p>
<p>We need to ensure that manufacturing areas do not cause negative impacts on residential areas. The trucking industry is particularly problematic, as truck routes disrupt neighborhoods, make streets unsafe and spread pollution among homes. Trucking companies should not be allowed adjacent to residential areas - a substantial buffer zone should be required.</p>
<p>on a case by case basis if there is a better fit than industrial for an individual property, so be it</p>
<p>In Grand Rapids, we make things. The only issue is controlling environmental hazards related to manufacturing, as they do in Germany.</p>

While I understand the benefit of moving manufacturing away from the city to reduce local pollution (via air, noise, & water), concentrating manufacturing areas increases the space between housing and work for employees, increasing travel times, congestion, and making it too easy to ignore pollution issues.

It's important to have some space for manufacturing ONLY if it is done in a way that is sustainable. The facility should be energy efficient, operate with 100% renewable energy, have a green roof, and the land around it should be native plants and trees instead of grass lawn. People working there must be paid living wages that keep up with inflation and have comprehensive benefits and PTO. Additionally, the facility should be producing something like plant-based food packaging, as there is a high need for this in our community. There is also a need to stop using plastics as they break down and up in all of our water, and then in our bodies. Please no manufacturing that will contribute pollution to our wonderful city and its beautiful people.

Because it causes too much pollution in an already densely populated and there are other ways to generate jobs for people. Also, you could use those buildings for housing, just saying!!!

Manufacturing is an important part of an economy, but it also requires a lot of space and resources, uses a lot of land, and comes at a cost to the community. We need to think about the implications manufacturing centers have on neighborhoods where lots of people live: noise pollution, air and water pollution. People generally don't want to live in places like this, but may need to because it's the only place they can afford. I think we not necessarily try to expand manufacturing but try to hold corporations accountable for the harm they are causing for the community.

We need the jobs and public transit routes for employees. However, manufacturing sites are often a blight and a risk for pollution so it's more complicated to answer this question without addressing those issues and potential solutions.

Housing first, then manufacturing in the outskirts of the city

Preserving these areas is important for being a circular and self-sustaining community, but it may also be beneficial to consider one of these centers for housing development

Manufacturing spaces will continue to dwindle as more countries move labor overseas for reduced labor costs. It is a better long term strategy to create legislation to revitalize brownfields for housing

Do we need to preserve mfg? So much of it takes place in the suburbs and we don't have enough housing for the people who live here

While jobs (and access to those jobs) are important to a thriving city, it seems that we are becoming more of a residential community rather than an industrial powerhouse (as we previously we in the early 20th century). More people would rather live in a safe, clean and healthy community than be plagued by industrial pollution & heavy traffic.

This is a densely populated residential area, and it has a lot of charm. Manufacturing is ugly and loud; it doesn't need to be taking up valuable space that can instead be used for housing or retail.

Housing is a huge need!

<p>It entirely depends on if they are being used. If they are consistently in use and providing jobs then keep them. But otherwise they are an eyesore and could be used for housing, green space, or multiple businesses.</p>
<p>It is important to maintain, but the priority in city limits should be the people.</p>
<p>There is ample space within Kent County, and Grand Rapids-proper, that is ripe for development or redevelopment zoned for manufacturing. We need to be very intentional about where this is located, so that areas for housing, retail, and public spaces are kept clean, safe, and enjoyable.</p>
<p>I feel we have an abundant amount of area for manufacturing. There are vacant and underutilized buildings that should be utilized long before adding more. Housing, AFFORDABLE housing, needs to be the first and foremost priority above all, especially additional business ventures.</p>
<p>In urban areas manufacturing areas are increasingly difficult bc they are offputting to commercial retail and more so residential. They do make more sense in industrial or office parks which are more suburban than urban</p>
<p>There should be good jobs near where people live for a complete community</p>
<p>However, what is being done to ensure mobility to these areas. Most lack quality transit access.</p>
<p>Having a diverse set of businesses is important for the longevity of the community. Multi-modal transportation must go hand in hand with this</p>
<p>Near truck, rail and air transportation. Need rail to truck terminal</p>
<p>I did service work at homes. It is important for that work to travel easily between jobs</p>
<p>I did ride the bus or walk to work whenever possible</p>
<p>A range of employees and job choice (including small scale manufacturers) reinforce an inclusive community where resident can walk, bike, or take transit to their job</p>
<p>It is good to have local job areas connected to residential areas with transit. I am require to commute because Biotech innovation is surprisingly hard to find in this community</p>
<p>Somewhat - would be good if they were as concentrated as possible, and away from the riverfront. All employment centers should be easily accessible by public transit and biking. More variety in types of industries - not just healthcare. More biotech and life sciences investment. More residents should be able to work in the city they live in</p>
<p>Manufacturing is much more regulated now. We don't have chemicals spewing into waterways or smoke stakes pouring out smoke. Mixing zones allows people to live near where they work. My mottos is a short commute = a happy life!</p>
<p>Pushing manufacturing jobs out to greenfield areas outside the city makes them inaccessible for everyone except car owners</p>
<p>Small manufacturing near residential areas allow people to walk/bike easily to work. Companies should be held to beautification standards. Gentex in Madison Square/Garfield Park is a good example</p>
<p>These are jobs that someone with any education level can get and should be preserved. Companies should also be incentivized to get their employees to use transit to get to work.</p>
<p>It's important to have areas dedicated to work and areas dedicated to living provided they are not too far apart and there is a healthy public transportation system in place.</p>

<p>It is very important to preserve areas for manufacturing because Grand Rapids will always have a working class that may not have access to reliable transportation and need to have employment within a reasonable distance.</p>
<p>Long term it may not be important to maintain areas for manufacturing so long as there is development on strong public transportation in the area.</p>
<p>Employment centers provide job access for large quantities of people. They also provide access to entry level and unskilled labor that support our low and middle class. In my work for in affordable housing, I often hear stories of residents who have opportunities for employment in manufacturing but transportation is the the biggest barrier.</p>
<p>They can be in the suburbs, especially with public transportation. This area would do well with a regional government like Indianapolis or Louisville</p>
<p>Connecting manufacturing jobs by mass transit is important but restricting zoning to just manufacturing can limit opportunities for growth in all industries</p>
<p>As far on the outskirts as possible with bussing available</p>
<p>If there's better public transit, maybe it wouldn't be very necessary, but we need there to be employment that is convenient for GR residents</p>
<p>They need to be strategically placed so that transit is easy and parking is not needed.</p>
<p>Manufacturing parks are a plus. It would tend itself to fewer bRATA bus stops</p>
<p>Manufacturing isn't always reliable but it provides jobs for folks who don't have professional degrees - so how might we ensure those neighbors still have access to work?</p>
<p>Provide many jobs for new Americans - and bussing routes are usually available to those areas</p>
<p>We will need areas for manufacturing and making them more accessible to workers is good</p>
<p>You do not need to 'preserve' areas for manufacturing. Today's manufacturing looks a lot different than it did when these center's were developed. If there is a need for manufacturing, we should place those manufacturers in locations that make it easy for employees to get to and enjoy outside of just work.</p>
<p>High density usually imparts lower income but also early career positions. Some high-paying careers in manufacturing are being moved to rural or deep sub-urban locals resulting in job-flight away from urban centers. Due to higher local taxation, tax incentives and better expansion opportunities. Or another way, continue to remove cars and you'll end up with lots of small housing units where no one can find a manufacturing, supply chain or production job.</p>
<p>Jobs are very important to our city and tax base and jobs where people live hels transportation issues</p>
<p>It's only important if nobody else in the region is accomodating the demand with increased (?). Obviously, this would need to be in tandem with sufficientn regional transit to more workers.</p>
<p>People need accessible jobs since the Rapid has a very poor transit system. Jobs that pay a livable wage.</p>
<p>High density of jobs nearby that are also serviced by our transit systems.</p>

It's important to diversify our economy to be resilient. Plus not everyone wants a desk job. We're not in the industrial revolution anymore, so I'm not worried that Grand Rapids will suddenly turn into an atrocious wasteland of manufacturing and industrial blight. Separate zoning by uses has its place in some instances. But not for huge swaths of LDR literally everywhere in GR. I'd do anything to be able to walk to a park, a coffee shop, a restaurant, a small grocery store, a hardware store right from my house. It sucks having to drive for everything in GR. I hate it.

Important to allow folks to walk/transit/bike to work if multiple employment areas are found in the city. However, environmental racism is a reality and these centers need to be regulated and not just delegated to poor, working class, minority neighborhoods. NIMBY is a big issue as well (would East Town be okay with a manufacturing center? If not, why is it okay for SW or west side to have a factory next to a park?)

Fine to have manufacturing areas, but they must be connected to robust public transit, bike, and walking paths.

Jobs in the city mean ability to get to work without a car or with minimal auto transportation which minimizes traffic and pollution. Less commute time means better work life balance

of course the employment locations themselves should not negatively impact the environment

So people can live close to there employer.

We are in a climate crisis. Needs jobs to be close to housing.

Grand Rapids was founded on manufacturing. Our City is comprised of people who make things. It is core to those who live in and around our City. So many people I know and live near work in manufacturing. Some take the bus, where others drive 10-20 minutes to the factory.

People working in manufacturing should be able to live a reasonable distance from their work and be able to commute by transit, walking, or biking.

Because these areas provide good-paying jobs for residents in close proximity to where people live

Some people are just not cut out for retail work or the fast food/restaurant industry and manufacturing jobs tend to pay more. Some people don't have transportation so manufacturing in a neighborhood is key to a successful stable neighborhood. I walked back and forth to work for about 5 years. I lived in the John Ball Park neighborhood for over 40 years. I grew up there and started my adult life in that neighborhood. I worked in a local factory called Morgan on Hovey SW. I had everything I needed in one area. It would be beneficial to have some higher paying jobs in neighborhoods. They keep pushing the narrative less cars on the road so having employment opportunities are key

Manufacturing requires large amounts of space and some distance of separation for safety (air quality, noise, traffic). It makes more sense to keep manufacturing facilities further away from urban centers where land is cheap, and run public transportation lines out to the facilities so that people can commute efficiently and quickly. Since shift hours are predictable and regular, public transit can match up with commuter needs quite easily and provide low effort and low cost transportation. This would also significantly reduce traffic on major roadways.

place manufacturing in one district is more cost effective and better suited for transportation of manufactured goods out for distribution.
Manufacturing is still a priority industry for the state's business attraction efforts. If preserved, I think it is vital that manufacturing jobs and employment centers prioritize convenient, multi-modal public transit for employees to be able to access these jobs around the clock without requiring a personal vehicle.
I think we need the job base. I live on the west side but actually work a bit NW on Walker Ave. but I am still happy that I can bike to work. I think density with help support our public transportation too.
Grand Rapids's economy seems based on manufacturing, and those jobs should be easy to get to
Some manufacturing in the city is needed, but we can find ways to get people to manufacturing jobs (public transit, free shuttles) that opens up that space and cleans our air in the city.
People need to work near to where they live.
Jobs are necessary, and it is beneficial to for tax purposes to keep them within the city. However, my main concerns is with housing affordability and public transit access around these employment centers.
Balance needed
Not all current industrial areas are wanted, appropriate, or needed. Think it's a case by case situations, and preserving or not preserving is a broad stroke that erases the details
Manufacturing is only a part of what makes a city vibrant and diverse. We have lots of areas where manufacturing can take place, there's not really a need to preserve those areas.
Not everyone wants to work in an office or retail.
Manufacturing is not a need in the City proper. Cities are for small business, housing, green space, and recreation. Manufacturing does not contribute to vibrant, walkable, connected neighborhoods and businesses. It is often loud, dirty, visually unappealing, and is taking up valuable space for housing.
Balanced economy , provides opportunities for mixed population
We need diversity in businesses. That's protection for our economy and good for talent retention. Not everyone wants to work a desk job. Also, some people might want to start their own manufacturing firm. If there's existing talent in the area, this can become a reality.
Simply manufacturing is important for the short term but long term most manufacturers will shift production to where labor is cheapest, whether in US or elsewhere. Facilities/HQ that are based in Grand Rapids have longevity and may be willing to pay the premium to stay close to manufacturers.
I think they should be used for whatever is needed most, don't know if manufacturing is most needed or not.
Grand Rapids is growing and the land that once were meant for factories are now places that should be for people.

<p>Manufacturing is an economic driver, but should hopefully not prevent us from entering other economic domains or prevent us from developing for citizens. Much of the existing manufacturing inhabits the most desirable land on our riverfront that could be used for something more beneficial for all.</p>
<p>Manufacturing is important as are the jobs the industry provides, however if the land that is being used by these buildings can be better used towards another purpose then we should allow for that to happen.</p>
<p>I think it's important to keep a high number of jobs within city limits. I also think it's important to preserve flexible spaces for makers, start ups, artists, etc. that typically happen in industrial areas. But I'm also slightly concerned about impacts to nearby residential areas, and would like to know strategies that other cities are using to balance those land uses.</p>
<p>It is important to allow manufacturing but I don't think it is that important to reserve areas for it if it is not what the market demands. It should be allowed but not required to be reserved imo</p>
<p>Manufacturing is an important part of the West Michigan economy, but it makes more sense to continue to build up these activities away from residential neighborhoods (and possibly outside of GR city limits) rather than focusing on preserving existing zones</p>
<p>Manufacturing as an exclusive use hollows out neighborhoods and generates unnecessary vehicular traffic. Multi modal and mixed use manufacturing areas are much more nimble and adaptable to a changing economy</p>
<p>Clear manufacturing areas keep residential and commercial areas clean and quiet.</p>
<p>I don't believe we need to save space for it because there are a lot of new ways to manufacture product and I'm sure it will keep evolving, if a factory is needed maybe they could repurpose an older building for it,</p>
<p>This needs to be done in a balanced manner. We need to balance current manufacturing industries with new opportunities to provide jobs that are accessible to a range of skill sets and neighborhoods. This should be done in sustainable, environmentally-friendly ways</p>
<p>Our economy should not be reliant on manufacturing. If GR wants to be a leader in the state it should try to attract a mix of industries and not just manufacturing</p>
<p>Important to have jobs in the manufacturing sector - don't want it to decrease. Would be good to improve these spaces for multiple uses (housing, retail, corporate)</p>
<p>I think it depends on how that space is being used. Especially with the growth of hybrid/remote jobs</p>
<p>We need to reserve spacing for housing, not just new building, but for single housing units</p>
<p>While I believe it is important, I also believe we can be creative about how that space is developed and used</p>
<p>As technology evolves so does the number and type of jobs available, I don't see a big need for factories in the future and there are buildings that have been abandoned that could be used if needed.</p>
<p>They can find other ways or assemble parcels if they want to be in a particular spot. Historically, housing would follow industry. No, it's segregated.</p>

<p>Manufacturing will go where it's cheapest to manufacture. We shouldn't artificially preserve areas for that that would be better used for other things. The free market shall decide.</p>
<p>I'm not informed enough to make a real comment. I'd say that having blue collar jobs within city limits is important. If we could bring in more housing to those areas that could be important.</p>
<p>Manufacturing employs a lot of GR people, but the land also has a more singular and exclusive use when used for manufacturing. We should ensure the manufacturing will have longevity</p>
<p>But in restricted areas</p>
<p>Important but not at the cost of urban expansion</p>
<p>Some areas should be maintained if they are blended with placemaking amenities. Reduce the span of manufacturing sites and infill with restaurant, retail, and other businesses. This variety within walkable areas draws more interest and activity</p>
<p>You can use all those industrial zones near west bank of river and convert them into housing, shops and cultural center</p>
<p>Although manufacturing certainly helps the economy, land preserved for manufacturing where the demand for manufacturing isn't there may as well be used in a way that better suit the needs of the community</p>
<p>Not sure - GR has moved away from being a primarily manufacturing town</p>
<p>A balance between manufacturing and residential is important to neighborhoods and commercial areas.</p>
<p>Preserving in terms of keeping it in the USA and in Michigan, yes. Preserving it at the compromise of community growth when manuf. could relocate within the area feels worth a dialogue on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>where existing manufacturing is functioning then it is important for local jobs and tax base to maintain those businesses. Long vacant manufacturing buildings should be considered for adding density instead of existing residential areas.</p>
<p>Manufacturing can be loud or have heavier traffic, which may not be right for a neighborhood.</p>
<p>When people can work near where they live it reduces our carbon footprint, wear on roads, etc. Maintaining a residential character next to a manufacturing facility is difficult however.</p>
<p>Economic sustainability and long term viability relies on a mix, a balance between all sectors of business as well as offering residents a variety of work opportunities based upon skill sets and interest. IE., our eggs never should be placed in one basket.</p>
<p>I am not well informed on the needs of the manufacturing community so I am putting this as neutral</p>
<p>We might need it for now, so we should have some areas. Overall, we need a plan to concert these buildings to other uses quickly instead of having them become blight.</p>
<p>We might need it for now, so we should have some areas. Overall, we need a plan to concert these buildings to other uses quickly instead of having them become blight.</p>
<p>We might need it for now, so we should have some areas. Overall, we need a plan to concert these buildings to other uses quickly instead of having them become blight.</p>

We might need it for now, so we should have some areas. Overall, we need a plan to convert these buildings to other uses quickly instead of having them become blight.

Manufacturing districts are important for job creation, however, some of the space closer to the city center that is currently used for industrial likely has a highest and best use of something more commercial or residential in nature that allows for a higher density.

It is important to preserve these areas but remain flexible and adapt the local workforce as needed.

We should always evaluate how much manufacturing is needed in our city. If manufacturing is no longer necessary or is limited, then we should ensure those buildings and areas are converted quickly into the types of buildings we are short of.

Manufacturing could be mixed in with traditional business districts.

We should keep manufacturing areas together and try not to spread out too much because we need to utilize space for other projects. We should keep the manufacturing areas up to code and reuse as much space and materials as possible.

We need jobs but I worry how this question isn't asking about people and jobs but the manufacturing business itself.

We don't want manufacturing in the middle of the city

Manufacturing is the first thing that should go to the outskirts of the city. The manufacturing that still exists in the city is an unhelpful remnant of the 20th century. Best and highest use!

In my opinion manufacturing can take place in areas where space is not as scarce.

Space in the suburbs and exurbs can support manufacturing

Housing needs trump manufacturing needs. Move the manufacturing to surrounding area outside the city limits

Space for manufacturing sounds nice but we're already running out of room in the employment centers so why not move manufacturing out of the employment centers.

Manufacturing can be done anywhere.

It is no longer necessary for these places to be located in our city center. The city originally developed this way when the river was vital to industry and workers mostly commuted by foot. They are now relics of the past and that space could be utilized for housing, grocery stores, and so many other amenities that would benefit Grand Rapids communities (rather than producing profit for CEOs in some far off place). Not to mention the far reaching environmental and health impact on surrounding neighborhoods...

Manufacturing is important as an industry and as an employer. But should not take up valuable space in the city center.

Manufacturing should be on the periphery. We have a beautiful body of water that should be lined with social draws like entertainment and restaurants and green spaces to enjoy its natural potential. It could be the boardwalk of the Midwest if done well.

The suburbs and exurbs may be better suited given our future

Areas for manufacturing should be preserved, but for areas that are not in high demand (the river front)
Full disclosure: I work in tech. I would rather see downtown real estate used for green space or more space-efficient industries
I think it is important to have. However, it should not take space in the urban core of the city. Needed for the jobs, but keep prime development land for just that.
Not in city center, not in poor communities
Manufacturing can be valuable if they also directly offer a store front - otherwise, the trucks and shipping will clog up road space. Move them further out of town, near trains so they can send goods by rail.
There are often more cost-effective locations for industrial and manufacturing developments outside of the center of the city. They cannot accomodate the growth in residential needed to address the crises our city faces.
These areas could be used for other purposes like housing and retail.
We don't need to carve out space specifically for manufacturing in our city.
Manufacturing doesn't need to be done in the city as much, why not use those buildings for people and businesses that can have less waste of space.
Definitely don't need more manufacturing downtown or along the river. As long as it's outside the city core then I'm fine with it.
I don't think it's important to keep it in the city, I think the city space could be more useful in other ways.
Land on the periphery of town is better than downtown
cities should be for living, corporate business and entertainment . Manufacturing which doesn't require being in a city should be encouraged to reside outside the city.
I'm not sure why we would need to preserve areas for manufacturing within the city. We need manufacturing in the area, but I don't feel strongly that it has to be within GR city limit. Maybe there's an angle I'm missing here...
Readily available and accessible facilities outside of populated areas
Manufacturing is important but it doesn't belong in the city center
Maybe I'm uneducated on this topic, but I don't know why we should preserve manufacturing space inside the valuable city center area? Couldn't those businesses move outside the city? Wouldn't that be a better use of space?
Big trucks belong in the burbs. We can't design a city for truck movements.
Big trucks belong in the burbs. We can't design a city for truck movements.
There is space outside city for this

Manufacturing should be a bit more on the outskirts.
Preserving areas in the downtown for manufacturing is important for the economy and for class integration, but it seems absurd for so much of the riverfront to be devoted to manufacturing from both a pollution perspective and from the perspective of maximizing the natural features of the city. The river provides free natural appeal, but is completely underused and undervalued.
On the one side I believe that manufacturing should be available to all but I also know they require a lot of resources. Should we allow suburbs to create proposals that are best for them and that require new infrastructure rather than forcing companies to reuse an industrial site.
It is important but we also have to bring other employment areas such as tech, education, entrepreneur/business, low income better job opportunities.
The city should make it easier for all businesses, be it service or manufacturer, to start-up or move to Grand Rapids. It's tough for the city to pursue a plan. Maybe we're a better fit for software companies or consulting firms. I don't see how city hall can predict the future and why we would become a manufacturing mecca.
While most manufacturing jobs are no longer in America, having the option at this moment is still necessary. I'd like us to develop a plan to shift those buildings quickly into either office space or housing once they are no longer needed as manufacturing.
Other jobs will replace manufacturing if our city grows and has higher density, but losing jobs will never be a positive.
It's important to have diversity of use in an area. This also provides important amenities in close proximity for the workers. Helps activate the area through different times of the day as well.
We need a diverse tax base, but manufacturing should be outside the downtown area
Need job diversity
We should focus on diversifying our offerings to build a strong local economy that is less susceptible to volatility in any one segment of the market. We should also make sure that manufacturing is done in a way that does not poison people or the environment. We've seen many examples of companies engaging in dangerous practices that have caused harm for decades. We should also be aware of the harms caused by noise and air pollution to people living in the immediate vicinity. Care should be taken that historically affected groups are not further negatively impacted.
Manufacturing offers a variety of jobs. As long as the businesses located near housing do not adversely affect daily life of residents the two can be somewhat close together.
Need a variety of jobs, but maybe not in areas such as downtown.
Manufacturing sectors provide important and varied employment. A mix of job opportunities is key to ensuring a wide range of people can live, work, and thrive in our community.
Need to supply a full range of jobs for all skills and education levels. Retain ability within the US to make our own products.
Manufacturing does not seem forward thinking. Also, having grown up in Rockford, I am not enamored with manufacturing companies such as Wolverine.

Manufacturing does not seem forward thinking. Also, having grown up in Rockford, I am not enamored with manufacturing companies such as Wolverine.
We have moved past the manufacturing economy and cities don't need to accommodate as much of that as we once did. People are ready to LIVE in cities again, and commute to industry, not the other way around.
Manufacturing is an overdeveloped sector of the Grand Rapids economy. The development of other economic sectors would spur faster economic growth.
Manufacturing is not coming back.
Preserve land for farmer, community gardens, a park, nature!! There's jobs available. People are choosing not to work!!
Aren't there plenty of areas dedicated to manufacturing?
Manufacturing always moves around and is a back and forth industry.
Manufacturing does need to go somewhere.
Not informed enough to comment
Is vacancy low after covid? Do businesses project growth? Will they invest in other ways beyond jobs? Will those jobs pay living wages? Only grow businesses if they commit to building our community
Maybe if we could find a way to promote local businesses that use local materials and are not going to damage the local ecosystem
Eclectic and clear planning - look at Amsterdam
Unsure. I don't know enough about it. Manufacturing what?

No idea! This is not my area of expertise.

Trick Question!!

In the city center- no. In the outside of the city center-yes
Not qualified to respond. Likely opportunity to create more defined zones and remove the seemingly sporadic zoning currently in place.

Bus Bulb		Access Management		Curb Bulb-out		Protected Bike Lane	
Impact	Thoughts?	Impact	Thoughts?	Impact	Thoughts?	Impact	Thoughts?
3		3		3		5	It would be nice to have some connectivity, say, Fulton and Division as larger thoroughfares
5	Protecting from rain and wind in the winter is important	5	Sometimes you can't see pedestrians	5	Reduces the length to cross. Also drivers can see pedestrians easier	3	If less bikes than cars, then larger streets with more traffic should prioritize cars to prevent traffic jams. This ok in smaller streets.
5		4		4		2	Would be nice to see people on bikes. Very few ever seen. Must be using trails in the county
4		4		5		3	
2	I never use bus	3	I can't think of many examples of this as an issue in the areas I walk	2	Seems like an expensive project for minimal benefit	4	I would like to bike to/from work, but it's too dangerous as-is
1	Timers for when bus arrives at stop is helpful	3		5	With lights because most traffic doesn't respect the signs shown without lights (flashing)	5	In certain places. I know this isn't possible everywhere but if there were more safe biking options, more people would use bikes
2		4		3		5	
3		5	This is a big issue. It's almost always driveways where I almost get hit	5	Pedestrians first!	4	
5	Provides a comfortable and safe area to wait	4		5	Also helps provide drivers with a visible shift to hopefully slow	5	
2		5		4		5	
3	Covered bus stops or benches would be nice	3	I'm all for more bike safety	5	Lets get rid of all cars!	5	YES!! (please)
5	Important for safety and welcoming	5	Seems impossible to implement	5	HELL YES. With lights and noises. If you want to prioritize pedestrians then cars and drivers need to be educated	5	Yes but do people bike in winter? This feels like a weird investment in a winter community
3		5		5		4	I am not currently biking
5	Increased amenities improve usability	4		5		4	
5	These are great. Please make sure there are safe pedestrian crossings nearby.	5	Please do this. Alpine especially suffers from too many driveways	5	Put these in everywhere	5	More of these. Please connect Turner lane to the trail on West River Dr
5	Access to transportation	5	Keep people safe	3		4	
4	Efficiency very important	3	Need to see data to understand if reduced driveways = safety		Can be confusing for bike traffic	5	Very important to increase transportation options - recommend developing bikeways
4	Lets encourage people to ride the bus	4		4		5	
4		4		5		3	
5		5		4		5	
5			Yes on busier streets, commercial areas, not in neighborhoods	5	Yes good idea	5	
4	Ease of entry to buses especially when snow builds up would be an improvement	3	Unsure about this, are these thoroughfares the ones with lots of pedestrian traffic?	4	Always slow traffic in critical walking/pedestrian areas	4	As a bike commuter I've had close encounters with cars on my rides
3		5		2		2	Very difficult for me to use effectively and completely
5	Absolutely needed	4		5	Cities should be designed with safety for all individuals. Cars weigh more than 3,000 lbs.	5	GR has 100+ miles of painted bike lanes and 3 miles of protected lanes. To reduce car accidents and incentivize other modes of transportation, protected bike lanes must be built. Not everyone has the confidence to ride
3	I would use the bus if it ran more frequently	1	Not as much impact but sidewalks everywhere are helpful	4	I enjoy walking to get places and thankfully it's been a good experience	4	I am considering buying a bike to use the bike lanes.
	Not sure		Might increase traffic speed, depends on type of street	5	Leave space for bike lanes	5	Might be very expensive, need to balance with other bike improvements
1	Simple covered area with seating is needed at all bus stops	4		1		3	
5	Provides awareness of community needs	2		1		3	
5	Yes! Create also more high frequency public transport	5	Yes, people first	5	Yes	5	

	3	Bus hubs also sometimes make your route a lot longer to take as you wait for a long time	2	I think public announcements on TV and billboard on looking for pedestrians and bike riders would be better	2	Curbs bulb out when they don't provide a bicycle lane is stupid and dangerous	4	Bike lanes are great but only when enforced. Unless there is better enforcement of actually stopping at stop signs and red lights, and no speeding you are just going to have more accidents
	4	Very good for wheelchair access	5	Boulevards with lots of driveways to businesses are dangerous! Cars stop suddenly and turn into driveways without looking for bikes or walkers	3	Good for pedestrians but bad for bikers who are forced into vehicle lanes	5	Cut a channel through the bulbs for bicyclists
	5	Safer and easier for bus riders to access the bus	5	Less pedestrian deaths	5	Less vehicle-ped conflicts	5	We build infrastructure to be hit by cars, so lets not build our bike lanes for it
	4	Transit frequency and speed are essential to a reliable, well used transportation system	4	Access management coupled with protected bike lanes is an important strategy for slowing automobile and creating a safe space for other users of public space	4	Please design streets that slow automobile speeds to less than 20 mph	5	Protected bike lanes are an essential tool for helping more people ride bikes and achieve the city goal of 55% of trips without an automobile
	3		4	Encourage cross access to limit (?)	3		2	Small % of total trips
	3	These are great, but secondary to frequency or bus service and expanded routes	4	Poor design in my neighborhood for curb cuts causes many problems, but individual businesses cannot solve this themselves	2	Can be nice, but somewhat conflict with bike lanes	5	Bike lanes help all traffic, but need to form a continuous network to be useful. Please keep it up and make space for bikes
	4	A dry place to wait for a bus is a good thing	5	Secondary streets to access businesses is a good thing	4	Pedestrian safety enhancements are always welcome	5	More to separate the cars and bikes encourages more bicycle use
	4		4		5		5	
	3	This is a good design and loading area make safer. Bike lane should go behind! Laker Line and Silver Line good model	4	Reduce "swplanes" (?) where drivers cut through driveways to skip an intersection	5	Essential. Could add bioswales to manage stormwater	5	Should be mandatory when resurfacing roads. Think NETWORK that is connected - not just a few here or there
	5		1	No one wants to walk on these streets - bring the amenities to the neighborhoods	5		5	
	4		4	Yes - on main streets	4		5	
	5		5		4		3	
	5		3	I don't understand this tool. if you are using it to put sidewalks on 5-6 lane strodes it is a 1. No one feels safe walking on those roads. sidewalk or not.	5	Road diets! Put one on my street! Close the street down for pedestrian traffic only! Bridge, Wealthy, Monroe Center, who needs cars here? Deliveries and emergency vehicles only.	5	YES EVERYWHERE. People are dying.
	1		4	I walk and bike more then other modes of transport (at least I try to). Having opportunities to do so more safely would help a ton.	3		5	I walk and bike more then other modes of transport (at least I try to). Having opportunities to do so more safely would help a ton.
	4	It's always easier to use transit if there's a known stop that is well-marked and has shelter to account for the elements.	2	Good in theory, not so sure it has too many real-world impacts.	1	These are honestly just a pain in the butt without having much impact on safety. It could be argued that people drive more carelessly when they encounter those bulb outs because they just go into the other lane and don't pay a ton of attention to what's coming toward them. Definitely a safety downgrade.	5	If you totally separate the bikes from traffic, these can be great. If it's just painting a stripe on the pavement on one side of the road, that's not super-helpful.
	5		3	I don't understand this tool. if you are using it to put sidewalks on 5-6 lane strodes it is a 1. No one feels safe walking on those roads. sidewalk or not.	5	Road diets! Put one on my street! Close the street down for pedestrian traffic only! Bridge, Wealthy, Monroe Center, who needs cars here? Deliveries and emergency vehicles only.	5	YES EVERYWHERE. People are dying.
	3		4		4		5	
	1		4		4		4	
	1		3		2		5	I think Lyon or Fountain should have this to connect Easttown to Downtown
	3		3		4		3	
	2	I don't use the bus because it's way too long.	4		5		5	This is important to foster a culture of bikeability.

4	Helps people get on the bus safer	5	People will walk where they feel comfortable, and it helps business through increased commerce	5	Let's stop killing pedestrians due to poor street design	5	If you want to get people biking and free from the 12000 expense of a car, you need to design a space where they will not get murdered by someone driving. It a car can hit it, it will hit it. We Design all other infrastructure this way, so let do it with a person too
4	Places to sit at more of the bus stops would be nice.	3		3		1	Just paint doesn't provide enough protection for cyclists.
				4		5	
1	Do the opposite. make a space in parking lane for busses to get out of traffic so they don't disrupt flow while loading/unloading.	2		2	'slows turning vehicles' sounds like a good way to create additional congestion on the roads.	1	We live where it's cold half the year. Bike lanes are adequate. Stop investing money in this when there are much greater needs.
4	Should only be used where implementation won't impede construction of separated bikeways.	4		3	A better effect could be achieved by replacing the parking lane with a protected bikeway.	5	Isolated segments of bikeway wherever space is left over is not good enough. Bikeways should be built on all major streets in Grand Rapids, even where this comes at the expense of on-street parking or vehicle travel lanes. Protected intersection design is as important as the lanes themselves. The Turner Ave Bikeway does a good job separating traffic until the intersections, where cyclists are put in dangerous situations and left to fend for themselves.
3		5		4		4	
3		2		4		5	A robust network of protected bike lanes would radically change how I commute in this city. I often decide against biking because of safety concerns, especially during peak traffic time. I see protected lanes as absolutely essential for our city.
5	improves efficiency for bus loading/unloading which ultimately speeds up transit	5		5	Fully support any pedestrian safety efforts, even at the expense of slower travel for cars.	5	Protected bike lanes promote biking as a form of transit by making it safer and more enjoyable

							PLEASE ADD PROTECTED BICYCLE LANES! These are for children, for elderly, for pedestrians to have a narrower width. All of our plans say the same thing: we want walkable, bikeable communities. Engineering will tell you that bicyclists are in the minority because most people drive but that's misleading data! Most people drive, not bike, because they don't feel safe riding in the street and the sidewalk is dangerous. We need the City of Grand Rapids to lead on this issue. Asking citizens to continuously advocate to protect people is a waste of our time, to be honest. We submitted our feedback to the bicycle action plan. We submitted our feedback to the green grand rapids plan. We submitted our feedback to GR Forward. We submitted our feedback to every single public engagement that there has ever been. If we want to compete as a city we need to do the popular thing for PEOPLE that will attract talent and retain talent: build multimodal options that are connected, vast, and truly protected. We need to be designing for 8 year olds and 80 year olds. If that means eliminating street parking, that means eliminating street parking. Our indicator species needs to be the wellbeing of kids because that is how families make their decisions about where to live. And we, as a city and as a state, are telling the leaders: Build the Lanes. Stop Making Excuses. DO IT!!
5		1		5	1 This is terrible for cyclists. However--we can achieve this same effect of narrowing the street by adding protected cycling infrastructure. It slows vehicular traffic, narrows the street, provides a protected piece of the road for bicyclists, and keeps the sidewalks clear for ADA users.	5	5

			<p>Yes! Yes! Yes! This is how streets are designed in the Netherlands. Here are the three categories of roads in the Netherlands from SWOV (which we should adopt):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through-roads allow traffic to travel from origin to destination as quickly and safely as possible (â€œflowâ€). Car traffic has the highest priority. Through-roads may only be situated outside urban areas. These are either trunk roads or motorways. 2. Distributor roads connect through-roads with access roads. Traffic flows at road sections and exchange occurs at intersections. Distributor roads are found in both urban and rural areas. They are mainly 50-and 70 km/h roads in urban areas and 80 km/h roads in rural areas. Recently, a new type of distributor road has been proposed: a distributor road with a 30km/h limit. It concerns distributor roads that cannot be safely designed as 50km/h roads and/or have both a traffic function and residential function [1]. 3. Access roads (ETW) offer direct access to residential areas at the locations of origin and destination. The residential function is most important and car traffic needs to adapt (in particular by travelling at low speeds). Access roads can be found in urban areas and in rural areas. It concerns 30 km/h roads and home zones (15 km/h) in urban areas and 60 km/h roads in rural areas. 				
5	Yes! When I take the bus to work from Kentwood to my office downtown, I want protection from rain. People donâ€™t want to show up to work drenched in their nice work clothes.	5		5	Yes! Yes! Yes!	5	Yes! A thousand times yes! I would bike everywhere if there were protected bicycle lanes. This would be so beneficial for Grand Rapids. Life would be so much better if we had a network of protected bicycle lanes. A line of paint on the road isnâ€™t going to protect you from getting hit by a car while riding your bicycle. Iâ€™m afraid of dying while riding a bike in Grand Rapids, which is why I do not travel by bike. I would love to travel by bike instead of by car, though. My family would like to just have one car instead of two. Having a network of protected bicycle lanes would enable us to do this. We would save so much money, and we could use this to spend more on social activities in Grand Rapids.
3		4		2		5	Bike lanes are great
		5		5		5	
1		3		4		5	
5	More bus stops with better accommodations for those with disabilities	5		5	It would be helpful to have these in commercial and residential areas to avoid through truck traffic	5	Biking is TERRIFYING in Grand Rapids, and there needs to be steeper fines for those who disobey sharing of the roas
2		3		4		5	
5	Protection from the elements would greatly improve my experience on public transit along with high school students I see regularly on my commute.	3		3		4	I have a bike lane for 3/4 of my commute and it has made a huge impact on my sense of safety and my willingness to commute by bike.
4		5		5		5	
3	Transit user safety	5	Less pedestrian deaths	5	Less time a pedestrian spends in the river of death	5	Think about the children! Paint doesn't protect from a 3000 car
1		1		1		1	Bicyclist shouldn't be on the road. It's dangerous for the cyclists and those driving automobiles.
2	That looks similar to the silver line/laker line stops. They are recognizable and the shelter is nice, but the money may be better spent on getting bus routes to more places.	5	Increasing walkability would be huge here. Drivers in this city generally have a low level of respect for pedestrians. I have experienced too many near misses.	4	They make sense.	5	Most bike lanes in the city now are essentially the shoulder of the road. They are often blocked, filled with trash and glass, and vehicles drift into them almost constantly. I still use them, but I keep my head on a swivel and have to take the lane quite a bit to avoid cars, bins and debris. Protected bike lanes would be a huge improvement. I rode in the new one on Turner last weekend and it was great.
5		5		5		5	
5		5		5		5	
4	Anything to help flow of traffic is great	3		3		2	I rarely see bikes in the bike lanes we have

4		4		4		5	Create bike lanes that people feel safe using!
5		5		5		5	
3		4	Especially important in walking districts	2		4	Reduces car speeds meaning safer roads.
1		2		1	These make no sense when it snows. It makes for terrible walking and worse parking.	2	These need to be segregated from car lanes, like on turner. Putting the down the center of the road like 6th and 7th street is dangerous for bikers.
4		3		2		5	
5		5		5		5	I would bike to work everyday if there was a physical divider. I don't trust drivers on their phones.
5		5		5		5	
5	I want reliable Transit, so this would great.	5	I walk and bike a lot and this would reduce the amount of near misses I've been involved in.	5		5	I just rode through the turner bike lanes and I think we need more of them. The ones on Alger were good but marking them mountable reduces their reliability as cars may park on them unintentionally. Please don't place parking next to bike lanes, you can't always rely on people to park competently.
1		1		1		5	
3	Easy boarding will lead to a more on-time performance.	2		4	Slowing vehicles is always good. We need to design our streets with the worst, least attentive driver in mind... not the best	5	There would be SO many more bike commuters in the city (and less traffic) if they felt safe along their way. Painted lines are not the infrastructure we deserve.
5		4		5		4	
3		3		4		4	
4		4		4		5	We need actually protected bike lanes with ballards or concrete raised between bike and cars especially on major roads like Division etc.
5		1		4		3	
5		3		5		3	
5	I do not know where bus stations are. This would simplify the transit as long as it isn't a hangout for the house less.	3		3		5	This would enable me to travel via bike everywhere. Shared bike paths or sharing road with cars is not ideal.
1		5		3		4	
3		3		3		1	
4		4		5		5	
5		5		5	100%. Pedestrians need to be prioritized above all other modes of transportation.	5	Critical! SO important! I would totally give up my car if these were everywhere. This is the Dutch capital of MI. Have you been to the Netherlands? It's incredibly safe, fun, and easy to get around there esp. without a car. Copy that here and GR will bring in young people by the droves. Walkability is very important to young people. Young people base moving off of where they would like to live, not career choice.
3		4		5		5	
1		1		5		1	
3	Don't care	5	Reduced drives should be main priority to improve walk ability.	5	I love these. Great features where installed.	5	If it's not protected is it really a bike lane? No, No it's not.
4		5		5		5	
4		3		5		5	
3	Bus schedules and routes are the biggest problems stopping me from using them, not bus stop amenities	3	Sounds nice	4	Too many close calls with distracted drivers for me. Anything to improve safety walking around town would be nice.	5	I would very much like to bike around town more, but don't feel comfortable doing so currently
2		5	This would be great as long as the access points still open expand to facilitate higher usage.	4	Good idea as long as it doesn't compromise amount of lanes available for traffic	3	They need to have barriers to prevent cars from utilizing them.
5		5		5		5	
3		5		4		5	

4	Prevents the bus from having to pull into and out of the flow of traffic, reduces dwell time, making trips faster.	5	Uninterrupted sidewalks are safer for everyone. Keep cars on the streets where they belong.	5	Improves visibility of pedestrians crossing the street, reduces the distance pedestrians have to spend in the street.	4	Motorists have complete legal immunity to slaughter man, women, and children; thus they pay little attention to what they are doing with their multi-on murder-boxes. I don't want to be force to share space with them.
1	Only helps if there is a shelter which most stops don't have.	3		1	I hate it as a driver. If people stayed in their lane it would be fine, but they don't.	1	Cyclists are in extreme danger driving on the roads in this city. People will also park in this lane, and it is never enforced.
3		3		4		4	
2		4		4		4	
4		3		4		4	
2		2		4		3	
5	If it does what you claim, the veracity of which I am skeptical of, then I am in support of it.	1	I don't understand what this is. I cannot recall ever coming into conflict at a driveway as a driver or pedestrian.	1	These are obnoxious and a waste of space. We learned how to safely cross streets when we were children.	1	I detest bikers and their utter disregard for traffic safety and the traffic congestion they cause. The ONLY bikers I see are recreationalists, not folks who are getting to work/shopping because a bike is their only option.
4		5	This reduces the points where accidents could happen while cars are backing or pulling out.	4	Work pretty well, but in my experience people still drive too fast.	5	I bike to work a lot, there are many places where the bike lane is in the normal flow of traffic, I'd prefer to have a barrier of some sort.
2		5		4		4	
4		4		4		5	
1		3		5		3	
2		4		4		5	
5		5		5		5	
5		4		5		5	
4		4		4		5	
5		5		5		5	
4		2		1	These create congestion problems & will be problems for snow plows.	3	With more apartments there will be more traffic & fewer lanes for driving. It might protect bikers but how many will use them, especially in winter.
4		5		5		5	
3		4		4		5	
4	Anything to improve public transit is good.	5	Neighborhood walkability is a very important aspect of community that is never prioritized here.	5	Improvements for walkability and pedestrian safety are very important for modern communities.	5	Pedestrian/biker safety makes non-car transit much easier which reduces road congestion.
3		5		5		5	
2		5		3		4	
5	Making our public infrastructure stops cleaner and safer will encourage more ridership, and higher ridership generally leads to improved services which benefits everyone.	5	Hostile pedestrian infrastructure actively discourages people from walking. This leads to more cars on the road, more pollution, and less natural foot traffic for local businesses. Improving walkability also has shown significant increases in happiness.	5	It is the moral obligation of the city to protect it's citizens. The city should be doing everything in its power to improve pedestrian safety and once again, build our city around people NOT cars.	5	The primary reason why people choose not to bike as main mode of local transportation is due to the fact that there is little to no protection against reckless drivers. Riding your bike in this city is like playing a game of russian roulette, it's only a matter of time before a distracted driver will seriously injure or kill you. Providing safe biking infrastructure, like protected bike lanes, will dramatically increase the number of people who choose to bike rather than drive. This will reduce the number of cars on the road, pollution, traffic deaths, and overall make Grand Rapids a more pleasant place to live in.
3		5		4		4	

	Bus bulbs are great, but what we really need are dedicated bus lanes.		It's important that roads are roads and streets are streets. Separating business and residential from main arterial roads makes them safer and more efficient.		These features calm traffic slightly, but a raised pedestrian walkway is preferred.		These are absolutely necessary for the promotion of alternative transportation.
2		4		4		5	
1							
	It's hard for me to imagine GR with a transit system that would make me leave my car at home.		I'm afraid the cities ideas would make the roads unusable, causing more traffic congestion and longer drive times.		Again, the cities current strategies seem to be more dangerous, causing more traffic congestion and longer drive times.		This is another area where the city seems to be causing harm in an attempt to add safer biking. Causing traffic congestion and longer drive times for a few bikes when most people are switching to electric vehicles over pedal bikes.
2		3		3		1	
4			Wider driveways are more of a problem for pedestrians than more frequent narrow driveways.	4		4	Fully separate bike lanes are much better, but prioritizing bike-based transit is not necessarily realistic year-round in this climate or with the hills around the city.
3		5		4	Pedestrian deaths due to cars has been increasing dramatically over the last decade. Apart from reducing traffic in and around the city, placing a premium on pedestrian safety is important in the meantime.	5	Protective bike lanes are integral to making bicycle traffic a safe and easy choice for residents. There are MANY people in the city that do not choose to ride their bikes because it is dangerous and our bicycle infrastructure is lacking that would be choosing to do so if it was safe and convenient.
4	I would especially like to see these paired with proper, dedicated bus-lanes.	3	Especially important on higher-speed through streets where car traffic entering/exiting curb cuts will be traveling at higher speeds with narrower fields of view.	5	Beneficial in that they reduce pedestrian crossing distances, narrow the street scape at intersections signaling cars to slow down, and daylight intersections by eliminating on-street parking close to them. These should be applied universally, wherever possible, on all street types.	5	One of the most commonly cited factors for why people do not bike in Grand Rapids is comfort/perceived safety. The city currently dedicates a significant portion of street ROW to nonseparated, painted bike lanes, which ultimately go underutilized as the vast majority of bike users do not feel comfortable riding with no separation from traffic. As illustrated by other cities which have implemented robust, protected networks, creating more protected bike lanes, would be a boon to city cycling.
2		2		3		5	These are a real game changer. I don't ride in GR because I don't fee safe. However, painted lines are often disrespected by drivers so that would be low impact. Having a truly protected bike lane with physical barriers would be amazing. Most impact for sure.
5		5		5		5	
2		3		3		5	
1		1		4		4	
5	There is literally nothing worse than a bus stop that is just a sign on the sidewalk. Weather happens and there should be shelters at bus stops so when you're waiting for the bus, you don't get drenched.	4	There's been plenty of times that I've almost been hit by people pulling out of their driveways. I think people need to actually pay attention when they drive and look for pedestrians who actually have the right of way	5	Perfect	5	I HATE riding in the road because I've almost been hit so many times. It's awful and cars literally do not care about bikes. Having a city full of protected bikes lanes would be my dream. I feel like so many people would actually ride bikes as their form of transportation because they'll be less worried about getting killed by a car.
3		3		3		5	

5	These seem much safer than a traditional bus stop.	2		3		4	Separate and protected bike lanes are a great idea in theory. If our tax money will be spent to take action on this, I would also like to see much higher enforcement on cyclists to ensure they are following traffic laws. In my experience, the people putting cyclists in danger are not drivers or pedestrians, it is the cyclist themselves by running red lights and stop signs, riding the wrong way down a road, riding on the sidewalk when it is convenient, etc.
1		1	Most people drive here.. it seems like a hassle for them. I don't think I've ever had a conflict with a pedestrian in such a spot.	3	I bike a lot and these are terrible for bikers - look at the bike lane in the picture	1	The GR drivers are very respectful of bikers. I've never had a problem here, so I don't think it's worth it to change anything.
4		5		5		5	
4		4		5		5	
3		3		3			
5		5		5		5	Covert the bike lane network to protected bike lanes ASAP.
1		3		5		5	
2	While needed we need improvements to biking infrastructure as a priority.	3	Important because if people feel safe walking it encourages more walking.	2		5	Definitely need to prioritize biking. Perhaps actual concrete and pole separators. Also needs to be plowed and deiced.
3		1		3		1	Use the side walk.
4		3		4		5	
5		3		5		3	
3		3		3		4	
2	These may have some importance to me riders or in dangerous areas but most riders are not concerned about these.	4	These areas are where most accidents occur and are very dangerous for president and bikers. There are also a source of congestion and frustration for drivers.	1	These may have some use but I haven't found it. Buses and trucks run over these when turning.and bikes have to cut into traffic when these are present.	5	Clean, protected bike lanes would go far to make biking more enjoyable and safe. The constant stress of cars coming up behind you is unnerving. Talking biking seriously in the city could also provide motivation for bikers to follow the rules of the road.
1		1	What is the actual proposed tool? I don't understand. My answer is not meant to be a real one.	3		5	
5		3		4		5	
3	I would rather see a trash can ðŸ—“, then a light Trash is more a concern then lighting	1	Leave driveways alone many of us still drive big vehicles and park in driveway	3	I see them As a nice looking thing	5	Biking is best way to reduce traffic congestion and emissions We need heater lanes to accommodate all year biking
5	Many bus stops are completely unsheltered, which is uncomfortable any day that the weather isn't "perfect"	3		4		5	Protected bike lanes restrict the road which naturally causes traffic calming in addition to making another form of transportation much safer
3		4		5		5	
3		4		5		5	
3		2		3		4	
1	The bus bulb is not that impactful, the problem is frequency and reliability of bus services. Driving to the airport from my home takes 15 minutes, a bus takes 2 hours. Thatâ€™s the problem that needs fixing, not better bus stops	4	This will be impactful, especially minimizing driveways and reducing conflicts.	4	These are great for pedestrians, maybe less so for automobiles but we need to prioritize people over cars if we are to be a more sustainable and walkable city so I say go for it	5	This is absolutely critical for us. Bike lanes are not the only thing though, itâ€™s about bike routes. Too many bike lanes in Grand Rapids start and end in the middle of nowhere, we need not just protected bike lanes, but bike lanes that actually go all the way to where people want to be rather than ending abruptly in a busy street (looking at you Fulton and cascade intersection)

3		4	“Streets” are a big problem in West Michigan. If we can create areas without car-pedestrian conflict and fewer on/off and driveways, that should create a safer driving environment	5		4	
5	Nice for people waiting for public transit.	5	Less chances to be hit by cars while walking. More room for trees/green space.	5	Safer for walking, which encourages it.	5	I'd ride my bike more with PROTECTED bike lanes. Refuse to use painted bike lines or "shadows" or the share arrow. I ride on the sidewalk instead or not at all (and I yield to pedestrians).
5		4		1		2	Biking is very seasonal here
4		4		4		5	
3		5	Intersections are where most accidents happen. Every driveway is an intersection. Reduce the number of driveways, reduce the number of accidents.	4	Useful for visibility of pedestrians and drivers	5	More people biking means less traffic elsewhere
5	When put in, makes sure that the front and rear doors are both accessible on the bus bulb.	5	Reducing private access around main mobility corridors would improve the usage and safety!	5	Narrow roads are safe roads for pedestrian traffic.	5	Increase the rapid prototyping usage with in Grand Rapids.
3		4		5		5	It seems very strange that the M-DOT plans for 131 isn't a part of this conversation. It's such a frustration that the different entities making these huge decisions for our community can't/won't talk to each other
5		5		5		4	
4		5		3		3	
3		4		5	Even temporary/low investment solutions like cones and paint to make more walkable infrastructure would be huge! I know the long time frame for permanent infrastructure, so would love to see experiments and community feedback from quick fix options.	5	
4		5		5		4	
3	Makes for an easier way to exit and enter a bus	4	Having safe sidewalks are very important especially for those that rely on both public transportation and walking	4	These are great way to get people to slow down in high pedestrian traffic area. They make everyone slow down and look.	4	This as above creates an area where everyone pays more attention to what they are doing.
3		4		5		5	It seems very strange that the M-DOT plans for 131 isn't a part of this conversation. It's such a frustration that the different entities making these huge decisions for our community can't/won't talk to each other
5		5	This is so very important, especially considering that cars are getting larger and larger every year. Modern trucks and SUVs have significant blind spots, making crossings like this extremely perilous.	5	This type of infrastructure is also very needed. We must design the roads in a way that forces drivers to slow down and be hyper-vigilant. Too many people drive recklessly or on autopilot.	5	I will never bike in the city until these are more common.
1		1		1		2	

	I think the picture of this doesn't fully explain what it is I think people who do not know what a bus bulb is or a Transit tool are not going to understand. I like the idea of bus bulbs to improve amenities for bus riders however it does create traffic backups when the bus is in the right of way for a stop.		I think creating connected drives between parking lots on a backside of a business with a way to get out is a nice plan or two businesses that are next to each other that might have two different parking areas to have their parking lots correct connect for a one drive to limit the amount of driveways out onto a main road would be nice but harder to do in a more traditional neighborhood with a older business district with an older infrastructure. Again can we please get businesses to share their parking instead of having a parking lot for a single business that might not get used and this includes churches I would like to see more parking agreements between churches and businesses on or in a business district		I think in creasing the amount of bulb outs is a great idea I do feel like it does have an impact on safety for those cars that might be parking in a bulb out or even for the pedestrians that are crossing at all about by making the distance shorter I also like the idea of native plants and stormwater management happening at those bulb outs.		I love the idea of protected bike Lanes I do think that if the protective bike Lanes also provide parking spaces for residents that have them nearby that they should be ADA compliant for accessibility because in some areas like Turner north of Leonard where they put in new protected bike Lanes they did not provide access to the homeowners that may be elderly or using wheelchairs to be able to accessibly reach their cars without going further down a sidewalk which unless in the winter time is going to be shoveled consistently is not a viable option for them to go to a crossing additionally I don't like how on those same set of protected bike Lanes they did not use the spots for stormwater management, there should have been curb cuts where the water could drain into the dirt into natural plantings they're also should have been curb cuts made for accessibility to the parking along the protected bike lane but I am a big fan of the protected bike Lanes especially in high traffic areas.
3		4		5		5	
4		4		5		4	
3		4		4		5	Protected bike lanes should be on every major roadway in the Grand Rapids metro area
2		3		4		5	
3		3		3		5	As it is now busses use the bike lanes at stops. Cars use them as turn lanes. And there is no protection for bikers.
3		4		3		5	
3		4		5		5	It seems very strange that the M-DOT plans for 131 isn't a part of this conversation. It's such a frustration that the different entities making these huge decisions for our community can't/won't talk to each other
5			I don't know what this means	1	Buses often drive over these	4	
3		4		3		4	
3	Nicer bus stops is always a bonus	4	Lowering traffic would be even better	5	Great idea, maybe creating a raised cross walk	5	Creates a beautiful and bikeable city
4			Taking away space for cars is more important. Cars shouldn't be a priority - pedestrians are still an afterthought with this even though it is better, it is still not pleasant	5	This is great	5	Narrow the roads to add this - but intersections need to be safe or there's no point
3	The bus bulb is not the problem, it's the bus routes. Are they convenient for the people?	5	People walk like they drive! Better attention to where they are walking don't talk on the phone if it is distracting you	5		5	I think it becomes confusing at turns when a car has to cross the bike lane in order to complete the auto tuning
4	Better, foster connections on public transportation to factory jobs would help many 2nd ward families			4	I like the bulb outs even though they reduce parking	4	Maybe bikers would use bike lanes more if they were universal, nnot to mention that drivers would get used to it
5	This is critical to increase ridership on the city bus	5	This is critical to encourage people to consider walking and increases accessibility	5	This is absolutely critical for public safety	5	This is absolutely critical to reduce the number of crashes and deaths involving cars and bicycles
3		4		4	This and other design changes that slow vehicles are all to the good	5	Need to be better designed too close to parked cars on every street. Love width for motor vehicles to be reduced.
	Lower cost - more service before removing parking		Solve public transit! So we can remove car centered city (parking/driveways, parking downtown, fees/tickets)	5		5	

5		5		1	Drivers are no longer being affected by this architecture	5	These should be barrier protected so cars never have access
4		3	Difficult to imlement in established neighborhoods	5	Appears to work in some places	4	Present lanes often appear arbitrary.
5	I don't use the bus but much benefit to those that do	5		5		5	
4		4		5		5	
5	Very important to make transit safe, accessible, and appealing	4		5	This seems pretty important but obvious	5	Painted lanes aren't enough to make people feel safe
5	rapid, safe, watherized and attractive - make it sexy	5	Why wouldn't we want to?	5	Totally. Especially in a ped right of way city -increases local shopping	5	Biking is the most efficient way to get around - also promotes healthy lifestyles
5	Bus bulb needs to be safe to encourage folks to use it	4	As a city with high density it is important to iincrease from car	5		5	
4	The bus is great! Having more info about routes would encourage more use inner-city	4	Comparing to larger cities our routes are similar distances - why walk that route/distance in NYC but not GR	2	Better pedestrian understanding/focus on safety and awareness	5	More bikers and less worry about safety
3		3		3		5	Protected bike lanes would radically change how I move through the city
4	Makes waiting for the bus worth it	2		5	I live on Burton and sometimes it takes a long time to cross the road	3	
5		5	This is not only a pedestrian safety thing, it's also a car safety thing	5		5	Makes biking more comfortable
4		3		4		5	
4		4		5		5	
2	I don't use the bus - but might if more efficient	5	Never thought about it	5	LOVE	4	I don't want a car to push me off the road
5	Makes waiting for bus feel much safer	5	Great idea - eliminate the "stroard" like the netherlands did	3	Good when used in conjunction with flashing beacons but tend to still be ignored by cars	5	Great! Much better and safer for cars and bikers
3		4		5		5	
3		4		3		2	
4		1		4		1	
5	Inclement weather is a primary reason I don't use transit when I have the option	4		4	Helpful, especially with small children	5	Huge oppourtunity to help more people feel comfortable and safe riding as a primary mode of transportation
5	Transit must be improved and expanded	5		4		4	
4		5	As a cyclist, reduce conflict points	5	A very effective traffic calming device	5	Yes!! Also, connect bike lanes city-wide
5	Use solar to light and warm this space at night. Kiosk to promote community events, add art to prevent vandalism		Add sidewalks, bus stops and reasonable intervals with safe and lit seating space	5	Yes! Add trees, green space, stormwater management	5	Yes! More people would bike!
3		3		4		5	
4		4		4		4	
2	Occasionally ride bus	3		5	Walk often	4	So many bikers
5	We live in Michigan - anything we can do to improve transit can help	3		4	Busy corners are scary - this can slow folks down	4	
4		5		4		5	
5		5		5		5	
1		4		4		3	
5	Wifi on all busses, bus stops that all tell when the next bus is coming	4		5		5	
3	I defer to those with disabilities regarding accessibility	4		5	Safety improvement and encourage walking awareness	5	This is HUGE! It not only increases safety for bikers but show support for non car based transit
1	I don't use the bus because I own a car and a scooter/vespa	5	I walk to work	4	Helpful for visibility especially in winter weather	5	I ride a scooter/vespa most months of the year abd these lanes are very helpful
2							
5	As long as paired with improved bus service	4	Important!	4	Important for traffic calming but do so with care for bikers	5	We need these so much. An economic winner and important way to provide mobility options that are low-carbon

1	I do not use busing	1	I don't understand this	4	Love it!	5	Major need for GR
3	Anything we can do to increase use of walking, biking, and transit is worth doing. Bus bulbs make loading and unloading easier.	3	Anything we can do to increase use of walking, biking, and transit is worth doing. These roads are death traps for non car users. Doing this would help make other modes of transportation a little bit safer. These stroads still stuck though.	5	Anything we can do to increase use of walking, biking, and transit is worth doing. Love this idea. Narrowing the car lane will naturally slow down drivers and help reduce potentially deadly accidents. Slowing down cars to human speeds will improve comfort for pedestrians.	5	Anything we can do to increase use of walking, biking, and transit is worth doing. Protected bike lanes are the ultimate comfort for cyclists.
2	The only concern with this is our homeless using this to sleep, i don't want them to get in trouble for using it but we do need to be able to offer them something after shelters are full.					2	I dont really bike much but i can understand how this will help them.
4		3	Decreases the chances of getting smashed!	5	They will help with visibility both as a pedestrian and as a driver.	3	Protected bike lanes help with biking comfort, but I feel rude walking in them, so they are relatively single-purposed.
4	I feel like providing space for pick up & drop off makes it safer for everyone.	3	I think this is unrealistic for existing infrastructure.	3	Until drivers pay more attention to driving I don't think the impact will make much of a difference.	5	If I felt safer biking, I would be much more inclined to use public transportation. Currently, the nearest bus route is too far to consider walking there as reasonable time to include in any trip.
5		5		3	This creates more difficult navigation for cyclists as cars typically attempt to pass, even when the roadway narrows.	5	Protected bike lanes help both cyclists and drivers navigate safely
1	I don't use the bus because it doesn't go the places I need at convenient times.	3	I don't walk or bike often because our city isn't designed for it. I suppose it would be useful if it was designed that way.	5	These are great the times I've encountered them.	5	The protectedness actually makes it safe to bike.
3		5	I ride my bike to work when the weather is nicer and it would be great to feel confident that I am safer. Cars definitely don't pay enough attention especially in driveways.	4	I love that they make cars slow down and that it is safer for a pedestrian to cross.	5	I would ride my bike a lot more often if we had protected bike lanes. It does not feel safe to ride most places in the city unless on the sidewalks, and even then, driveways don't feel safe and I don't like riding on the sidewalks because of pedestrians
1	It doesn't impact me personally since I don't use them nor public transport. I usually bike around if not drive some distances. However I think they are important for general safety for the various people who utilize them for public transportation.	5	For walking, running, and especially when I bicycle. In terms of safety having bike lanes and accessible sidewalks is very important for avoiding street traffic.	5	I believe it's unconscious however all the more important for keeping people mentally sound and naturally safe when walking near and around them.	5	Very much, I bicycle most days to work and around town. I believe it's more important to have strong physical guard rails to prevent collisions between cars, pedestrians, and cyclists like me.
4	Shelter at bus stops is helpful when it's hot or raining	4	I need more info to answer this, I don't know what it entails. But I used to bike everywhere in this city and it feels much less safe than it did 10 years ago because of the extra cars and crazy drivers.	4	I like the idea of it for the elderly, disabled and kids	5	Please please please give us lots of protected bike lanes. I used to commute by bike and I no longer feel safe because the way people drive has gotten so bad and the current bike lanes are not great. I would like to see all streets designed with the future (sustainability) in mind.
1	It doesn't impact me personally since I don't use them nor public transport. I usually bike around if not drive some distances. However I think they are important for general safety for the various people who utilize them for public transportation.	5	For walking, running, and especially when I bicycle. In terms of safety having bike lanes and accessible sidewalks is very important for avoiding street traffic.	5	I believe it's unconscious however all the more important for keeping people mentally sound and naturally safe when walking near and around them.	5	Very much, I bicycle most days to work and around town. I believe it's more important to have strong physical guard rails to prevent collisions between cars, pedestrians, and cyclists like me.
3		4		5		5	

3	This won't do much to increase my comfort walking or biking, but it would make it slightly more likely that I would be comfortable riding transit because there is a safer place for me to wait for the bus to arrive than just randomly at a post in the side of the road.	4	SO many people just fly out of driveways without looking at sidewalks or bike lanes and only looking at the road, so reducing the number that I would have to cross at any given time would make me feel a lot more comfortable just going on a walk, especially during times when it is dark or not great weather.	4	The bulb outs make it far easier to cross a street that does not have a light because cars can see you without having to walk into the street beforehand. However, cars rarely yield to pedestrians on cross walks without a light, so it would not make it a ton easier to cross the street.	5	I refuse to ride my bike in non protected bike lanes after I witnessed two friends and a teacher die from being hit by cars while biking through cities. It is simply not safe to only put paint on the road and expect cars to make room for bikers. A protected bike lane actually makes me feel much safer and more comfortable riding my bike without the CONSTANT threat of death everywhere around me.
3		3		4		3	
4		2		5	these slow traffic too much for truck turning. plowing snow is more difficult and typically causes the loss of a parking space	2	
3		3		4		5	
1		1		1		1	
3		4		3	Mixed results -- often changes in street widths/bulb outs neglect bicycle lane as a priority.	5	This is long overdue. Painted lines do little to protect bicycles from vehicles.
4		2		4		5	
1	They are expensive, blight and do not improve the neighborhood. IMHO, they are only surpassed in cost by bussing for disabled. I suspect they are \$1M per bulb and construction costs are all borne by non-transit riders. Their locations sacrifice parking spots. Their locations increase blight, reduce ridership, are often vandalized and reduce bike riders options.	5	I'd love to see more bike lanes or traffic diet plans, however West Michigan drivers are not ready for them yet. Too often, drivers use bike lanes as turn lanes during high-traffic congestion points. Again, do not confuse bike riding with medium access methods to mass-transit locations. Think in terms of using bike riding to AVOID using mass transit. It is the negative to get people more bike and micro-mobility, not the access method to use mass-transit.	3	Unfortunately, bump-outs empower communities to expand walking curb use for retail. If retail establishments use curb and curb-parking for restaurants and retail, they create hazards for walking pedestrians, mixed use micro-mobility and biking. This forces those users to the main travel lanes used by vehicles and that is the high-danger zone area we don't want mixed together.	3	As above, dedicated bike lanes work where communities have more than seasonal access to cycling. As we transition from a pedal bike community to a micro-mobility community of ped-electric, pure electric, scooter and micro traffic centric vehicles, how will these protected bike lanes be used to support, deny or complement each other?
2	If they will be in more places I would be more likely	4	More allys	1		2	I like it but we lose so much space needed for cars
1	I do not use public transportation.	4	I think this would make it much safer to be a pedestrian walking on public sidewalk.	3	I think it would make it safer for pedestrians crossing.	5	I think this is the safest way to bike on a public road.
4		5	Walking pass multiple driveways on a busy street is definitely the scariest part about walking.	4		5	I ride in all bike lanes, but recognize a lot of people are nervous to ride with the traffic. Protected bike lanes are a great resource.
2	I don't really go anywhere that has them	4	I bike and walk a lot in the spring and summer. It would be great if it were safer.	4	Gives roads structure and a sense of organization	5	This is crucial to our city's growth and development. So many different types of people want more bike and pedestrian access! Sometimes GR acts like it's 1982 still.
5	As a cyclist, they squeeze we into traffic	5		5	Don't like them. they squeeze cyclists into traffic	5	LOVE THEM!!!
3	Improvements to public transport is important, however bus bulbs are not aesthetic and do not improve comfort walking/biking	4	Walkability in Grand rapids should be a major focus.	5	Important safety feature	4	Dedicated and safe places for bikes is an important step in reducing dependence of cars in the city
5	The are more efficient than busses stopping more often and if I rode the bus more good lighting and security cams make them safer even if having to walk a bit to actual destination	5	Key word safety for all. Not just peds and bikers. Bicyclists in fact pose a risk to drivers. People only look at the weight of a vehicle bodily damage ratio. But if a bicyclist accidently or purposely does not yield or pops out in front of a car and is injured, public sentiment is becoming it is automatically the driver's fault - thus increasing liability and risk of prison even if the bicyclist was at fault. Sharing the road means ALL not just bikes and peds.	5	Good idea but the existing ones allow vehicles to park too close to the corner which impedes visibility for drivers coming off a side street. I drive a sedan not a testosterone charged SUV and it is impossible at times to see oncoming traffic due to cars parked in these too close to the corner.	5	The only way bike lanes can be defined as protected is by them being completely separate either by curbs between vehicles and bikes or by dedicating some roads to only cars and some to only peds and bikes.
1		1		1		3	
1		4		3		3	
4	Makes street safer as stop is obvious.	5	Drive crossing in business districts will be more pedestrian friendly.	5	Gives pedestrians opportunities to see past parked cars, drivers can see pedestrians approaching.	5	Critical - but bikes and scooters need to be using them. Needs to be very obvious that sidewalks are not bike lanes.

3	Increased comfort/shelter	4		3		5	Increase confidence of safety in commuting via bike
1	Public transit is important for many people to experience downtown.	4	Walking and biking hubs where stores have common courtyards and walkability encourages visitors to mingle amongst businesses and entertainment venues. Something similar to Tangor Mall in Byron Center.	4	It's helpful for parking and safety	2	I do feel bike traffic should be encouraged but there are less months to really make biking the priority.
3		2		2		5	
3		5		5		5	
4		4		4		5	
5	Standardization of bus bulbs/platforms would greatly enhance one's ability to recognize a bus stop, give better access to people with disabilities, and give people a place to sit.	5	This creates safer infrastructure for those who utilize other means of public access than motor vehicles and creates less opportunity for mistakes.	5	The curb bulb-out creates restrictions for a driver. Corners must be taken carefully, if drivers are aware of this design then I believe it would slow drivers down around corners and possibly create more time to be aware of pedestrians.	5	I don't want to create the opportunity for a vehicle to smash into a cyclist.
1	I do not currently take the bus. I don't think bulbs would change this.	5	I love to walk but GR main roads to walking - have to stay in my neighborhood so I am unable to run errands via walking because I am concerned about motorists.	5	I love to walk but GR main roads to walking - have to stay in my neighborhood so I am unable to run errands via walking because I am concerned about motorists.	5	I have been considering getting an ebike to get around town but am nervous about being hit by a motorist especially on nights and weekends which is when I would be using this. If a protected bike lane were available to get to my primary destinations I would use them often.
3	This will definitely help. I would love more bike friendly roads in the city. It's pretty good and I walk/ride most everywhere, but it's not always the safest due to traffic. Lighting isn't a major concern.	5		4		5	This is huge. Many bike lanes, particularly on Fulton which I bike most often, do not run continuously. I'm speaking particularly Fulton from Fuller (east) to the zoo.
1		1		4		5	
1		1		1		1	
5		1		4		1	Bike lanes are so overhyped. You rarely see anyone actually using them and they create more danger for those who are by creating a false sense of safety. They often get very convoluted and confusing and dangerous at intersections, especially. They also eliminate driving lanes and parking for cars, which will continue to provide the vast majority of transportation for most people.
3		5		3		5	
5		5		5		3	
3	The ones that are kept up do not affect my daily needs however, maybe of these bus bulbs is "bad" areas are not kept up or monitored. This is major area where people hang out during their day rather than waiting for the bus.	1		1		2	Enforce bikers to use bike lanes rather than car lanes. Include turning lanes for bikers
5	As a cyclist, they squeeze we into traffic	5		5	Don't like them. they squeeze cyclists into traffic	5	LOVE THEM!!!
3	It would be annoying when walking or biking. I don't use the bus so that's not relevant to me.	4		5		1	Bike lanes cannot be utilized for almost half of the year in Grand Rapids. Making more space for traffic to move efficiently, allowing for less time on the roads, is more beneficial.
						1	
5		5		5	Pedestrian safety is important	5	Safer biking
		4	I would never try to walk in busier areas if there were no sidewalks or access points. This would make more places accessible	4		5	I don't bike where there's no bike lanes because I don't feel confident or comfortable enough to bike side by side with cars. Too many accidents or people not paying attention

5	I drive down a street with multiple bus stops and very few street lights. When it's dark, these lights help me be mindful of people at the bus stop, especially people close to the curb	5					
4	Study European bicycle infrastructure. Typically bike paths are routed behind bus stops, not in front of them. If bus bulbs are used, bike paths may have ramps on either end so bicyclists do not have to veer out into traffic.	5	Auto cross traffic over sidewalks not only makes waling and biking less comfortable; it makes it more dangerous. Retail parking lots should be behind retail buildings, with limited access and served by secondary streets. See 8th Street Holland, Michigan.	4	Less road to traverse at intersections for pedestrians. If there is parallel on-street parking, might as well have them; but should be eliminated if there is no on-street parking in order to keep bicyclists out of traffic.	5	Would greatly increase not only the perceived safety of biking, but the actual safety as well. Would therefore increase bike ridership. Only needed in streets with certain levels of car traffic volume and speed (there are guidelines for this).
4	should be switching to automated light rail on dedicated lines.	3	This is very street dependent, but in general makes me feel safer walking with my kids	5	slows vehicle down	5	Actually assists biking.
3		5	Almost every single time that I go for a walk or a bike ride, somebody in a car comes out of a driveway and blocks the sidewalk while they are waiting to turn onto the street. Many times they almost hit me, but even in situations where they do not, they are actively blocking the sidewalk for anyone who might want to use it.	5	Slows down traffic - desperately need to slow traffic!	5	I feel extremely unsafe biking in the road. Also, I want to point out that the photo you used as an example here is NOT a protected bike lane! Just spray painting a "bike lane" on the road does not protect anyone - we need a physical barrier protecting bikers from cars!
4		5		5		5	
3		4		3		4	
5		5		5		5	
5		5	See my comments on parking	5		5	
3	Important for sfety and comfort	5	Feel far more comfortable crossing 1 street than 3 driveways	3	Good for minor roadways and busy intersectiond	5	They make biking safe and provide relocation as well as utility
5	A nicer place to wait is great incentive to take public transport. People deserve comfort	5	Pedestrians shouldn't have to be constantly concerned with and anticipating a car collision.	4	Crossing the road is a great place to protect pedestrians. Helps control traffic flow and safety for cars and pedestrians	5	A curb is not enough, bikes need a physical barrier to protect them from car traffic
5		5		4		5	
3		4		4		5	Please replace all existing stripes with protected lanes
3	While a nice QOL improvement, my biggest concerns are bus frequency and road safety (Kalamazoo Ave is dangerous to cross)	5	On stroads like 28th, I bike on sidewalks. Driveway crashes are my #1 concern when sidewalk biking (ideally the street would be safer though)	4	Pedestrian friendly design will make me feel more "wanted" on sidewalks	5	I would love to bike with my wife but she is uncomfortable with road and sidewalk cycling... protected lanes would be huge
4		3		5		5	
5		5		5		5	
5	Anything to help our transit system is wanted!	5	Prioritize people, not cars!	5	Same as before	5	Bike lanes are great. Protected os better. Picture if it was a walking lane, not biker, would it feel safe?
5	At a minimum, getting protective covers at all bus stops	5	Great because it prioritizes people	5	Can help reduce accidents involving people	5	Better biking paths will get more people off the roads
3	Could be beneficial for rain/snow	4	Big problem in GR	2	Not very effective	5	Not enforced enough. Most cars drive in bike lanes.
2	We take the bus so this is helpful	4	This touches everything so it has a huge impact	3	We are a big walking family	5	My family bikes everywhere and has a small child
5	More of these!	4	Again, de-prioritize cars	3	I see the importance for peds, but these make bike riding very difficult	5	Huge impact to get people out of auto-dependency
4	Better visibility and safety for transit riders	4	As long as it is accompanied by wide sidewalks and crosswalk style signage	5		5	Very important too! Would love to see one lane of traffic converted to bike lane next to the sidewalk and parking along the traffic lane
5		5		5		5	
4	Take note from the (?) Line, try to expand that sort of bus stop to other places	3	I haven't seen many cars going into driveways in front of me while walking, but it could certainly be an issue for sure	4	It would definitely make me less intimidated by traffic when crossing the street.	4	Unprotected bike lanes are definitely not as safe, so the protected part is very important here
5	Promotes safe transit	3		5		5	
3		4		3		5	This would make a huge difference to me
5	Make it easier and faster to get on and off buses	5	Makes it safer to walk	5	Slows traffic	5	Makes it safer to ride bicycle
5		5		5		5	
5		3		5		5	LOVE THESE

4	Buses do not need to pull in/out of traffic, reducing dwell time	5	Improves safety, motorists do not pay attention	4	Improves visibility, reduces the amount of distance pedestrians spend on the street	5	Encourages alternate zero-carbon transportation, also inexpensive transportation
4	Need more!!	4		4		4	
5		3		5		5	
4		2	Never thought about this to be honest	4	people > cars again!	4	Yes!
4		3		3		4	
3		4		5	I'll be more ok with walking to nearby places	4	I would bike more because I'd be safe
4		4		3		2	
4		3		5		5	
5		5		5		5	
4		5		2		5	
3		3		4		5	The reason I dont take my child biking around town is because it is in the road. Please separate bike lanes by bollards.
4		5		4		5	
1		5		5		5	
3		4		5		5	
5	Having more bus bulbs will encourage travel on buses and exploring the city!	5	I love walking to and from places in the city and pedestrians do not have seem to have the right of way here. Cars do not look left and right for pedestrians. They are only looking out for other cars	5	I walk through the city a lot and feel nervous that cars do not see me or are not looking out for me.	5	I am a little scared to bike on the roads and I know biking on the sidewalks is discouraged. Having a protected lane will only encourage me to bike more places
5		5		5	More comfortable/ safety walking, especially with youth who walk alone.	5	I think more people would possibly use the bike lanes. I've seen were different states even bike has a separate with a curb between the street and the bike lane and event a Bike traffic light.
3		3		3		5	Protected bike lanes would have the most impact on my comfort biking by far. Biking is the most realistic alternative to driving a car where I live in Grand Rapids. The biggest barrier to riding my bike instead of driving my personal vehicle is not feeling safe riding in the road.
3		5		5		2	
5	Anything to increase rider comfort and ridership in public transit and people powered transportation and decrease dependence on cars is a good thing.	3	I support anything that increases pedestrian safety, but I am not familiar enough with this concept to say whether it pays off or not.	3	I support anything that increases pedestrian safety, but I am not familiar enough with this concept to say whether it pays off or not.	5	It has been long proven in other countries and in some US cities that protected bike lanes save lives and increase bike ridership.
2	Scored lower only bc I walk/bike more than I bus.	4	Safer to prevent cars from access instead of trusting them to pay attention to pedestrians/cyclists.	3	Visibility v important to being able to cross streets	5	Proven safer for pedestrians and cyclists - cars are too tall, too heavy, and too fast to be next to without protection.
3		4		4		5	
		5		5		4	
5	More routes needed - in residential areas.	3	Not affect from where I live, but having greater access to all things public is important.	4	I can see this improving lifestyles - and making teh area ore family friendly.	3	There needs to be a greater emphasis on encouraging bicycle useage. Need to find way to compensate bicycle riders. Also need more education for riders and vehicles to share the road.
5	Anything to increase rider comfort and ridership in public transit and people powered transportation and decrease dependence on cars is a good thing.	3	I support anything that increases pedestrian safety, but I am not familiar enough with this concept to say whether it pays off or not.	3	I support anything that increases pedestrian safety, but I am not familiar enough with this concept to say whether it pays off or not.	5	It has been long proven in other countries and in some US cities that protected bike lanes save lives and increase bike ridership.
3	I worry more about traffic visibility around bus stops while trying to pull out on to the street.	5	The more drives the more chances of collisions with pedestrians and cars.	4	It is easier to gauge a shorter distance and timing needed to cross the street.	3	I will not bike on streets. It's way too dangerous. Bike lanes help both bikers and drivers and help keep bikes off sidewalks.
5		5		5		5	

			<p>It's INSANE trying to navigate places like Alpine or 28th, between the wild traffic and the pedestrians and then people who insist on breaking the law and riding bikes (including very fast motorized/assist vehicles) on the sidewalks and coming at you from literally anywhere.</p> <p>This plan would enable bike lanes to be more contiguous and safer while also making driving less horrifying.</p> <p>HOWEVER: we must require BYLAW that all these properties be interconnected inside the perimeter or this means nothing. Each retail jackass with their own little segmented fiefdom is ridiculous. One should be able to drive between all lots and spaces. It is LUDICROUS to have to whip out onto a busy street just to access the place NEXT DOOR to where you just were.</p>				<p>This is the main (and stupidest) thing missing from GR transit options. And the reason (we don't have the right size snow plows like Detroit) is the stupidest thing I've ever heard.</p> <p>While the bike highway thing pictured above is ok for some places, we need many versions of protected bike lanes EVERYWHERE. And the proper plows to handle them. Shouldn't be hard. Shouldn't be something still being at the consideration stage in 2023.</p>
1	Because I'm a competent adult and can walk through or around it. As long as handicap access is handled, it's fine. The only able-bodied people who hate on this are classist pricks.	5		3	You should also ask about your comfort and safety at home. Many of us live where these have helped calm traffic, or are desperately needed to do so. But yes, all of the above as well.	5	
4	Bus bumps make me less comfortable biking due to the infrastructure reinforcing street parking. With the bump out the chance of getting a bike lane without street parking next to it goes away. Since city money has already been spent people would protest if it got destroyed.	5	Bike lanes next to street parking is where I feel most in danger while transiting the city on a bike.	4	Bulb-outs prioritize car traffic above all else. If the road was raised to the pedestrian level, then road speeds would be reduced, and I would feel safer.	5	I commute to work in the city via bike lanes and rely on them heavily. I would not expect my wife or child to ride a bike in the city due to the lack of protection from cars. Riding a bike in the city comes with a high level of danger that I do not expect most people to undertake.
1	Don't take the bus, ride a bike, or walk.	1	Don't take the bus, ride a bike, or walk.	1	Don't take the bus, ride a bike, or walk.	1	Don't take the bus, ride a bike, or walk.
1	I prefer to drive - why no questions on driving preferences?	1	I prefer to drive - why no questions on driving preferences?	1	I prefer to drive - why no questions on driving preferences?	1	Stop removing parking lanes or vehicular travel lanes for pointless bike lanes.
2	I personally have no problems entering a bus where bulbs are not present.	5	Vehicles entering and exiting a roadway are the most dangerous action on the road. Managing vehicle traffic, pedestrian traffic, bike / scooter traffic, parked cars, and other entering vehicles is difficult and demands a lot of attention.	3	These prevent me from biking at a safe distance from vehicles since I have to enter further into the street to pass these. I have also seen them cause trouble for turning busses that ride onto the sidewalk because they need more space.	4	It is nerve wracking riding on major streets with huge cars flying by. You never know if an approaching driver is distracted until after they pass safely.
2	I only take the bus sporadically.	3	I do ride my bike and walk quite a bit in the uptown districts and limiting driveways would be safer for me.	2	It's not a big deal where I walk.	4	Those lanes make me feel much safer when riding my bike.
3		4		5	So needed! I walk around Eastown multiple times a day with my dogs and am constantly dodging cars that drive right through crosswalks and don't yield to pedestrians. So dangerous	4	
4	Good for transit users and accessibility to the bus system.	4	I have have had to many near misses count while riding my bike or walking down the street. Divers are not looking for pedestrians.	5	Improves daylighting for pedestrians, saving lives. If you truly care about vision zero, this is one of the most effective tools. And its pretty cheep un the long run.	5	Less cost to replacing roads, a safe place for people to bike, better mobility, healthier people. I won't get ran over by a car while biking. I can allow my kids to bike to the store with me. Right now that could be classified as a homicide/suicide.
3		5		5		5	
2		3		2		2	
4		5		5		5	
5		5		5		5	
4	More convenient, more space at bus stop, safer.	5	Improved safety. Less fear of being hit by vehicle.	5	Safer street crossings. Traffic calming - safety.	5	Encourage alternate forms of transportation, incentivizes people to use alternate modes.

4			This would be huge for walking, biking, AND traffic, since less driveways means more distance between them, and therefore less stop and go traffic which slows down major roads. 28th Street is a great example of poorly managed driveways.	5		Paint does not convey safety... there are no consequences to drivers entering this area. I do not bike often in Grand Rapids due to how bad the bike infrastructure is, BUT if I had protected bike lanes my commute would be similar to driving a car. I would love to be able to bike to work and to other destinations SAFELY. This is definitely an "egg before the chicken" situation, where you need bike lanes that get you to a destination safely, before you see people widely adopting it.	
5	Comfort ability	5	Comfort	5	Safety	5	Positivity
5	Comfort ability	5	Comfort	5	Safety	5	Positivity
2		3		5		5	
5	Comfort ability	5	Comfort	5	Safety	5	Positivity
4	Anything that calms traffic helps.	4		4		4	
4		3		5		3	
3		5		3		5	
5	Creates more traffic.	5		5	It creates traffic	5	Causes accidents that's what sidewalks are for.
3		5	much safer for pedestrian and more efficient for cars.	4		3	
3	I support shelter for bus riders, as i hope it encourages people to ride the bus. Unfortunately, some are undersized at stops for ridership, leading to people in the sidewalk/pedestrian pathway	1		1	Shrinks available parking and lane size	5	Usage of the bike lanes as near zero in most areas from my experience driving in Grand Rapids. It is a "pet" project that has gone nowhere other than to spend taxpayer money and confuse drivers.
1	I personally do not use the DASH transit system	5	Having less driveways allows for better flow of traffic by lessening the amount of places for a vehicle to slow, stop, or turn, and by decreasing the amount of pedestrian / bike intersections.	4	The curb bulb-outs make it easier to spot pedestrians	3	The bike lanes often remove one lane of traffic which causes more jams, but allocates the bikers into a safe space
3		5	Driveways are important for parking. If driveways are removed than further parking issues will arise.	3		3	
5	The rapid is my preferred form of transportation, over my personal car	5	Cars have made themselves the primary users of our cities. They are not alive nor do they vote, why have you allowed this?	5	Drivers ignore speed signs, they do not ignore physical traffic calming measures	5	
3		3		5		5	
3	I've actually never used a city bus (thought I've used buses in other locations I've lived). My use does not depend on the presence or lack of bus bulbs.	4	Fewer driveways means fewer collisions (and near collisions) with bikes and pedestrians - and cars, too, come to think of it.	2	I'm not a huge fan of these, either as a driver or a walker. As a driver, they make staying in my lane much harder, especially if there is heavy traffic or multiple variables to consider (dump truck causing a back-up, person on a bike passing someone on a stroller, driver on a cell phone waiting to turn left - or are they? etc.). As a walker, they make me feel extremely exposed and vulnerable to any driver struggling to stay in their lane...	5	I've biked the city streets, and I would definitely bike more if there were more protected bike lanes. Certain roads (like Diamond Ave, which for me is unavoidable, unfortunately) are downright hazardous for bikers.
5	Comfort ability	5	Comfort	5	Safety	5	Positivity
1		1		1		1	
5	While I don't use public transit anymore, I did for a number of years. These "bulbs" make it nice to be able to sit down while you wait. It's also nice to get out of the rain.	3	I can't see the picture on my phone very well (I can't enlarge it) but I'm assuming this entails more in street parking. On street parking makes it difficult to see traffic at an intersection, particularly if you're in a car and all the cars are SUVs and trucks.	3	While I appreciate their safety improvements, they reduce the number of parking spots.	5	I like this idea, but I wish there was a physical barrier. So many cars are careless around bicycles.
5	Comfort ability	5	Comfort	5	Safety	5	Positivity
4		4		5		5	
3	I don't drive, so bus space is great	3	I don't understand what this is supposed to look like	3	These are nice, sure	5	Keeping cars away from bikes is good

4	Public transit needs to be overhauled and much more heavily funded.	3	I think I don't understand this one.	2		5	I feel safer biking in areas that are designated for they kind of transportation.
3	I would love to ride the bus more, but the schedules and routes are so inefficient.	5	I often ride a bike and safety is of upmost concern. GR drivers do not pay attention to bikes.	4	They look nice; helps with safety when walking.	5	I commute by bike and am always looking for safer roads.
5	Comfort ability		Comfort	5	Safety	5	Positivity
2	Handicap access needs consideration always as well as the environmental improvement of utilizing public vs private transportation on a more frequent basis.	5	Decreases likelihood of accidents. Positive.	5	We have hazardous weather so better to help both drivers and pedestrians to see one another.	5	Improve safety
3		4		3		4	
5	safety	5	makes it safer	5	slows vehicle traffic makes it safer	5	makes drivers aware that bicycle is on the road
3		3		3		3	
2		4		3		5	Shared bike lanes with no barrier feel extremely unsafe, as an unconfident biker, I avoid shared bike/car lanes as much as possible, which greatly prevents me from biking.
2		3		4		5	I would love protected bike lanes in the city!!! Currently Grand Rapids has great regional bike trails around the city but no good connections between these trails and neighborhoods. Trying to maximize cyclist safety by keeping bikes separate from cars would improve access to these trails and allow many more people to conveniently live healthier lives.
4		5		5		5	
2	I rarely use the bus. I principally drive but occasionally walk or bike.	4	It makes me nervous as a driver when I see bikers not paying attention to traffic pulling in and out of driveways.	5	Beside the obvious increase in crossing safety, the green space of a boulevard offers beauty and calms the senses.	5	Clarity for what each party is to do (including drivers) is most welcome.
5				5	Yes! Use snow "neckdowns" to find space that can be reallocated to pedestrians and bioswells.	5	I would die for a network of 100+ miles to be built. Great investment for future generations.
5	for bus users. This needs to expand in GR, but not at the	5	these are designed properly (do not have parking open	5	INCLUDE CROSSWALKS RAISED TO SIDEWALK GRADE IN	5	however THE CITY NEEDS TO INCLUDE MORE INPUT
2		3		4		5	I would love to commute as much as possible and did for
4	Safety	3	Bike lane	5	Very impactful	5	
5		5		5		5	
5		5		5	That would impact on grandville by the school because	5	I think they should be on the side walk all bikes
5		5		2		5	
2		5		4		4	
5		4		5		5	
4	I do not use this space much but I can see how it would	4	Walkers over cars all day and all night long.	5	Narrow roads reduce drivers speed thus making our	4	These feel great to ride in on the right roads. Alot of bike
3	Nice for waiting for bus in bad weather. Increasing	4	Increases safety for pedestrians and bikes by reducing	5	Slowing vehicles in crowded areas to increase	5	Reduces people illegal bicycling in pedestrian spaces.
4		2		4		3	
3		3		4		5	
2		3		1		1	I am a cyclist and I think we have far too many, mostly
5		5	I commute by bike a lot	5	I commute by bike at least four days a week. Better	5	Safer streets for cyclists please!
1	I don't use the bus. Bus routes are inefficient, and taking	3		4		5	
4		3		4		3	
3		5	As a preferred pedestrian, I would like to be visible to vehicles while ensuring that at least my mode remains enjoyable rather than stressful.	5	Automatically, vehicle-drivers will slow down when their vehicle approaches curbs that are close and their awareness heightens. This reduced speed and increased awareness automatically makes this space safer for auto-free users.	5	The reason I don't bike to my job and nearby errands is because there are no protected bike lanes. I don't feel safe enough and don't trust drivers to pay enough attention to auto-free users. Street development patterns discourage paying attention to any user other than to other drivers. Protected bike lanes ensure the most vulnerable street users (cyclists) are safe.
4	This is more for the bus than the riders. If the bulb is above street level, we will be able to avoid the piles of snow that we have to step over to get on the bus.	5	Creating more walkable space and more reasons for walking will assure that more people walk!	2	These actually really suck for bikers. But I see how important they are for pedestrians and slowing down cars.	5	Protected bike lanes everywhere.

1	I do not use public transportation, nor do I walk or bike due to physical limitations	1	I do not use public transportation, nor do I walk or bike due to physical limitations	1	See prior answer	1	See prior answers
5	Would feel safer and be able to maneuver better.	5	It will be easier for pedestrians and cyclists to get by.	5	The street would feel safer and easier to get across.	1	It's much safer to ride on the sidewalks.
2		4		4	Slows traffic and heightens attention of drivers to pedestrians.	3	Can slow traffic, but I still see a lot of drivers ignore these lanes.
2		3		2		5	
4	For commuters it means nicer stay while waiting for a bus	5	as a cyclist, the more intersections the higher the danger of getting hit by a car pulling into my lane	1	Curb bulb outs dont' impact cycling since we still need to ride in the lane absent a bike lane Negatively drivers may expect cyclist to go into the parking lane but we then have to swerve out into the lane so these contribute to uncertainty	5	The one on Turner is pretty great. The switchover from right to left is a bit odd but I understand it. I also like the lanes that were re-done on Alger Between Kalamazoo and Madison- raised bike lane creates a mental block for car drivers who may other wise encroach on the bike lane which I see on Madison all the time
5	They use needed lanes space, the elevated platforms make walking dangerous	5	Impacts drivers. provides constant stream of cars who are funneled to limited areas	5	Makes walking more dangerous as these are unexpected for both walker and driver	5	They occupy too much lane space. Traffic is more congested because of this
4		4		4		5	
5		5	I am very big into improving cycling infrastructure.	5		5	WE NEED THIS.
4	Makes boarding easier, avoids crowding sidewalks, making them more comfortable.	5	Driveways are very dangerous and take away space from street amenities like trees, seating, bike racks, etc.	5	Bulb outs are important safety features, especially at street crossings. They should be mandated at every intersection where feasible.	5	Protected bike lanes are an important safety feature, especially for novice, or less experienced cyclists (children). They encourage biking and act as traffic calming devices.
3	depends on how much sidewalk space it eats up	2	generally that green space could be used better as it is used up in most of the city except maybe 28th	2	usually beneficial	4	can be annoying depending on the lanes
3	Please don't interfere with other alternative modes of transportation such as bikes and pedestrians	5	I Nike nearly everyday in the summer	4	I bike a lot so it forces me into the traffic lane	5	Make it safer for me to bike - if that's what you mean by impact
4	When it gets cold or rains, these bulbs makes the experience of riding the bus more enjoyable.	3		5		5	
3	They are nice...impact for me is limited...I rarely use transit preferring biking and walking.	4		3		5	I bike a ton. In the nice weather months, my bike mileage inside the city limits is at least 5X my driving mileage.
5	Obvious places for pedestrian boarding is important for safety.	4	Will make me feel much safer as cars will be able to see pedestrians better.	3	Bulbs must be an optimal size and allow to see around corners for both pedestrians and cars.	5	Keeping cars in there lane, other wheels in a lane, and pedestrians on the sidewalk is critical.
5	It's much safer than what we have now.	5	Constantly navigating around the possibility of being flattened by a car is stressful.	5	Slowing down the cars will go a long way in making it safer to be outside.	5	Separating bikes from cars and pedestrians is a win for everybody.
4		4		4		4	
2		3		3		5	
4	Noticeable, added shelter from weather	4	Cleaner, less busy look...	5	More area to move around. Feels more open.	5	Safety, conforms to expectations
1		3		2		1	
1		2		5		5	
5	I use the bus frequently, and this would allow a place to sit, protected from elements, farther from traffic. I think these should be made to maximize shade, and, ideally, offer trees. If there's a bench or a shelter and it doesn't offer shade, in the summer I'll find the closest spot to the stop where there is shade and stand there instead, making the bench and shelter useless to me.	5	I ride my bike to go shopping frequently, sometimes on streets such as 28th. I have to be extremely vigilant about cars going in and out, so it is not at all a pleasant experience. Please include lots and lots of trees in any access management plans, because they make a big difference in comfort for pedestrians and cyclists.	5	Slowing the traffic and improving pedestrian visibility are really important. But, often so little parking is being used that the parking lane can be used as a bike lane (I especially experience this on Kalamazoo in Boston Square), so if there is a way to make it so bikes can get across the bulb-out without going around, that would be very helpful. Also, these bulb-outs would allow for more trees!!!!	5	This would make me feel okay sending my kids out on their own. It would be beyond wonderful to be able to ride without constant fear of being struck by a car.
3		1	This approach does not seem to be realistic. Businesses and the economy will suffer when parking options become too limited.	5	Curb bulb-outs seem much better than access management solutions.	5	Protected bike lanes seem much better than access management solutions.

4		5		4		5	We know from studies and observations all over the state, country, and world that if we are going to seriously mode shift: we need to induce the demand for all segments of the population to comfortably ride. When we design our roads for inclusion, it benefits us all. Designing roads for our children and our disabled communities we allow for true choice in mobility. It allows for residents to make the switch to a car-free life and that directly contributes to affordability since cars now cost around \$10,000-\$12,000 annually to own in Grand Rapids. We know the data on the double digit sales increases for businesses with protected bicycle lanes, as well. When we design for people-centered mobility it is good for our economy, our environment, our household and city budget. Finally, if we want to move portions of our city fleet to allow for cargo bike use, we must provide employees with the necessary protections to ensure on the job safety.
3		4		4		5	
1		5		5		5	
1		2		1		2	
1	You have not explained bus bulb well. A signal would be better	1	Roads or main roads	4	Slows traffic down and helps pedestrian crossing	1	Bike lanes are not working in Grand rapids....more people drive
5	Because I care about other people, and there are many in this area who rely on public transport. Bus bulbs are warm and more visible than regular bus stops, so they feel safer.	5	One of the best things about this neighborhood is the walkability. However, riding your bike around doesn't feel the safest, especially for little children. Increased safety and visibility would be a lovely improvement.	5	This would be a welcome improvement as the enhanced visibility and forced slow down would improve safety for pedestrians and bikers.	5	These are wonderful but people keep parking their cars in them, rendering them pointless.
1		1		1		2	
4		4		1		5	
5	Weather is always a factor when being on foot/biking/riding transit. The less elements affect me, the better.	5	My husband got hit years ago biking because a driver wasn't paying attention. The less cars everywhere, the better.	5	My primary mode of getting around is walking.	5	In the summer, instead of walking I do enjoy shortening my time by biking.
3	I don't use the bus and have no idea what a bus bulb is but the last time I took the city bus there was a homeless guy who shit and pissed himself and was sleeping on the bus. Another seat had a shit stain. So no thanks.	1		5	Anything that keeps people safe	3	Great for bikers shit for people living in these houses.
1	I don't utilize the bus.	3	I don't bike on busy streets, so it's not an issue for me.	3	I just don't get them and they seem counterintuitive. They also push bikes out into moving traffic.	3	Not sure.
3	Beside the irritating use of "impact" as a verb (LSSU Banished Words, 1990 and 2024), this question is worded poorly. It's unclear if my answer here means "least impact" or "most impact". Data from this question should not be used because of this lack of clarity. Bus bulbs can make it easier to use the bus, but can make it harder to cycle if the street cross-section isn't designed well.	3	Beside the irritating use of the insider planning jargon phrase "access management", and the use of "impact" as a verb (LSSU Banished Words, 1990 and 2024), this question is worded poorly. It's unclear if my answer here means "least impact" or "most impact". Data from this question should not be used because of this lack of clarity. Access management improvements can affect my comfort for each of these three modes in a variety of ways, depending on the design.	3	Beside the irritating use of "impact" as a verb (LSSU Banished Words, 1990 and 2024), this question is worded poorly. It's unclear if my answer here means "least impact" or "most impact". Data from this question should not be used because of this lack of clarity. Curb extensions can make it easier to walk, but can make it harder to cycle if the street cross-section isn't designed well.	3	Beside the irritating use of "impact" as a verb (LSSU Banished Words, 1990 and 2024), this question is worded poorly. It's unclear if my answer here means "least impact" or "most impact". Data from this question should not be used because of this lack of clarity. Protected bike lanes can make it easier to cycle, but can make it harder to walk or take the bus if the street cross-section isn't designed well.
5		5		5		5	We 100% need protected bike lanes! It makes things safer for both bikers, pedestrians and cars alike.

4	I like bus bulbs, but they also can be unsightly in some locations. Those same locations happen to be areas that the bulb can impede pedestrian activity, especially when snow is on the ground. They prioritize public transit which I love but perhaps there is a way to keep these areas even more pedestrian friendly	4	I have no experience with this in mid-century or modern neighborhoods. I walk and cycle in traditional neighborhoods. Access management makes sidewalks and curbs safer. especially where cars are parked at the curb and drivers have a limited sight range.	3	Ugh, these bulb-outs! Great for pedestrians and transit. Terrible for biking and driving. If you ever ride a bike down a busy street and your trying to keep a safe distance from cars, a bulb-out can put you in a very uncomfortable place and cars do not see the difference. As a pedestrian however, they make me more visible to cars and offer me less time to cross a busy street. They should not be everywhere and their introduction should be considered after analysis of what the area uses for mobility.	5	OMG! YES! the more of these the city introduces the better. These promote environmentally clean mobility. The more protected lanes we create the more cyclists will use them. I would argue that these also benefit motorists and pedestrians. It keeps bikes off sidewalks and creates more obstacles in a roadway slowing driver speeds.
5		5		5	Roadway hazard. Limit parking and greatly impact proper snow removal, which further reduce parking.	5	They are often underused but require a lot of roadway and limit parking.
1						1	
5	gets in the way	1	really	1		5	what bikes?
5		5		5	Roadway hazard. Limit parking and greatly impact proper snow removal, which further reduce parking.	5	They are often underused but require a lot of roadway and limit parking.
3	Since I have a car maybe not as much, however using transit for events downtown would be easier.	4	I would feel more comfortable walking or waiting for a bus.	5	I think this would be outstanding to use for pedestrian safety and even vehicle safety as they would have to slow down to turn.	4	It would make biking safer and easier for car drivers to see them.
3	Please don't interfere with other alternative modes of transportation such as bikes and pedestrians	5	I Nike nearly everyday in the summer	4	I bike a lot so it forces me into the traffic lane	5	Make it safer for me to bike - if that's what you mean by impact
5	As someone who likes to walk, bike, and use transit, I would sincerely appreciate better transit efficiency and bus stop amenities as they will help me get where I need to go, comfortably.	5	If I am more comfortable walking, biking, and taking transit my stress level will be lower, which will improve my overall health. I will also be able to feel comfortable taking trips with my family in an environment that reduces conflicts with cars.	5	They slow down cars, and speeding cars are terrifying.	5	As they stand now Grand Rapids bike facilities are extremely dangerous. They are mostly not more than paint on a road, which does not provide any protection for able-bodied users like myself and especially for children and seniors who would benefit from better connectivity with protected bike lanes.
1	Stop taking away parking!!!	3	Less driveways to cross.	1	prefer separated walking facilities (over or under).	1	Stop removing traffic lanes or parking lanes for bicycle and scooter lanes. I pay taxes for the roads I pay on, and it's not safe to mix modes on narrow roads. Few bicyclists use them anyway.
				3			Bikes need to know and follow the rules.
1	I prefer to drive. This option has negative affects for long-distance commuters that drive.	5	Less driveways to cross when walking.	1	I prefer to drive. This option has negative affects for long-distance commuters that drive. It also results in trucks driving over the curbs and makes it hard for others at the intersection to maneuver.	1	Please stop taking away driving and parking lanes. The city has plenty of bike lanes and paths to accommodate this need.
1		3		2		5	
2		3		1		1	
4		5		3	I'm not sure this will be easily plowable for snow removal.	5	Encourage cycling lane EXCEPT IN WINTER (Is there a way to denote usage in seasonal weather?) I don't think this is needed full year round or even during odd hours. I'm curious if cyclists could use sidewalks if at night or conditions with low visibility.
3		3	People really don't use transit in the winter	3		3	
1	No one rides the bus. I know the rapid says people do. I would love to know what the 80/20 breakdown of regular riders is. How many people account for 80% of the rides on the bus and then see how much that is per rider on an annual basis.	3	The most walkable areas of town are downtown, east hills and east town. All have streets, driveways and other roads. So it doesn't need to change. Perhaps a better question is "why does it work here and not in other places?"	1	Not worried about walking in gr.	1	Not worried about biking in gr. Pay attention, don't be dumb and stay safe. How many bike accidents in GR overall? State total is 1300ish in 2022. So maybe 150 total? Not enough to spend millions of dollars protecting a small group of people. How about we help seniors more? They're a bigger group than bikers and they raised us.

5	these slow vehicle and bike traffic, and it's a "squeeze" on bike safety near traffic lanes	3		5	these put bikers to close to traffic lanes, these also impede Street cleanup and snow removal(reduces parking spots)	5	these make the madness wider and do not allow proper snow removal.
4	why don't you ask about impact on driving through town? Husband has disabilities and cannot walk distance!! Bus bulbs are horrible for moving traffic not to mention snow plows!	3	I generally walk in my residential neighborhood, not commercial areas.	3	again you need to ask about impacts on driving! These are awful for snowplows and street sweepers.	5	this makes it safer for all!
		1	I have been hit as a pedestrian and i can tell you that access management would not have prevented my accident. Improving driver attention and slowing traffic will improve comfort	1	We need to slow traffic and require drivers to slow down. Also making drivers aware of pedestrian safety.	1	I have seen drivers drive down bike lanes so i am not sure that it will improve safety but it will alert drivers of wrong doing
2	As long as they do not impede traffic flow. In 'calmed' areas with minimal lane width these effectively stop traffic flow. That is not desirable or acceptable.	3	minimizing driveways will curtail access for business. Cars will always drive the majority of a business customer volume except is a very few instances.	3	When they reduce lane width and the city requirement of 5' distance for bicyclists creates a high risk encounter requiring crossing the center lane into oncoming traffic this is not safe nor desirable.	2	Protected bike lanes that properly fit within the street width can be effective, however the bicyclists MUST be held to the same traffic laws as other vehicles. Education and enforcement is a must.
3	I don't use transit at this time.	4	I walk most everywhere when I can	5	I walk most everywhere when I can. I see drivers run red lights daily	5	Bicyclists often use sidewalks and ride too fast past pedestrians. A pet peeve and dangerous.
2		4	I think the walkability of some of our major commercial areas like 28th street or Plainfield is terrible and unsafe.	4		4	
1	reduces road traffic.	1	lowers side traffic to main routes, which reduces awareness risks for pedestrians and bicyclists	1	improves pedestrian safety by increasing visibility, improves car safety because parked vehicles are set back from the traffic lane.	1	fewer accidents involving moving vehicles and less risk of pedestrians being hit by bicyclists.
4	It would encourage me to use the buses more in cold weather. When there's only a sign to stand at, it's awful waiting in the elements for the bus	5	It would make me feel so much safer biking and walking around the city	5	Being protected as a pedestrian would make me feel safer and more comfortable walking more places	5	I want to bike this city, but I'm terrified of sharing the streets with drivers. Dedicated bike lanes would make me feel so much better and get me on my bike more
1	I don't take the bus and they don't interfere with my walking.	5	- Important in commercial areas to reduce accidents - new and build commercial developments where redesign can provide access management, should have it - most typical dense urban streets with houses and driveways probably don't have the space to change access. - whereas non-traditional neighborhoods with bigger lots may have opportunity to improve access in areas with access/accident problems	3	I like them though they've taken away some parking. I haven't noticed a change in my comfort however.	1	I'm not against bike lanes for those who want to use them. I don't ride a bike so they don't really impact me. - If I rode a bike I'd be uncomfortable in a bike lane because drivers don't seem to pay much attention to them. I'd take the sidewalk, even though it's not really legal.
1		1		5		4	
1	I do not see myself using this in my transit needs.	1		2		1	
4		5		5		1	
1		3		4		5	
1	Do not take away on-street parking or travel lanes for cars for this type of facility.	4	Why are there no questions for drivers?	1	This makes it difficult to turn at intersections if using a car. Do not like these and would like the city to stop using them in major roads that commuters use.	1	Stop taking away vehicle travel lanes and parking spaces!
1	I generally walk and they don't impact	3	Anything to make pedestrians and bikers safer	5	Would seem to increase safety	4	Should increase bike safety
4	Safety, convenience, stop visibility. On the downside they do affect traffic flow for bikes and vehincles.	5	We have committed to using our ICE vehicle less utilizing walking, biking. Anything that increases the safety aspect of alternative travel means is welcomed.	1	Not the friendliest option for bike riders when the rider is forced more into traffic lanes.	5	Increasing safety for bike riders is a huge want and need.
5	Take up too much space on the sidewalk. Hard to get two or more people passing each other - one person is way too close to the street and can get hit by a car's side rear mirror. These need to sit further from the road.	5	Walking and biking will be safer with fewer driveways interrupting the sidewalk.	5	They are useful and aesthetic. Keeps traffic slower.	5	Definitely need more.

2		3		4	People will drive at whatever speed the road design permits, not the posted speed limit. So, yes, design roads for the speed target.	5	I'd love for my family to be able to get to more places by bicycle, but there are many areas in the city where the whole family does not feel safe being on bicycles due to proximity to car traffic.
1	We need easy access to mass transit to make living in city easier and more convenient.	3	probably reduce accidents getting onto and off roadways but is confusing to walk.	1	Still plenty of space and even more space to walk.	2	Not much impact for sidewalk walking but it does move traffic further from sidewalks.
4		5		5		5	I like to bike to work and attempt year round, this would be awesome!
3	Not so important for me personally (I tend to walk to bike before taking public transit) but valuable to those using PT	3	(I don't understand what this does...)	4	Helps with traffic calming, safety, walkability and bikability	5	Great for me as a biker/bike commuter
1	As long as this does not take away walkable space, there is no impact.	5	This will significantly improve walkability.	5	This will significantly improve walkability.	1	As long as there is no conflict with the sidewalk, this will not impact my movement.
3		4		5	It feels like these slow traffic down which makes me feel safe when I'm out walking.	3	I love the idea of these and I used to bike a lot but I don't feel safe biking in GR most of the time, even with the changes that are being made.
2		2		2		5	Very dangerous. The installation of LED streetlamps make glare on streets much worse. This along with glare from LED headlamps creates situations where you literally cannot see images in front of the light. Streetlamps cause enormous glare on glazed or wet streets. Very dangerous for cyclists as drivers may not see them. Cyclists' visibility also hampered as well. INSTALLATION OF LED STREETLIGHTS WERE A VERY DANGEROUS IDEA AND THE CITY IS ENTIRELY TO BLAME FOR THIS HEALTH AND SAFETY HAZARD.
3		5	This would make walking so much safer - driving too for that matter	1	No impact to comfort - great solution	5	I would like to see the city go beyond painted bike lanes and have curbs to protect bikers.
1	I own 2 cars, am retired and can walk to downtown. I don't have a need to take a bus.	5	I've had friend run over on the way to work by cars turning into them. I'd love to see more bike lanes. I moved here from Coeur d'Alene Idaho where paved bike lanes, connecting to network trails, were a big tourist draw. People want to get outside and cycle - Safely.	2	I don't feel unsafe walking around Heritage Hill	5	See above
1	I walk almost everywhere, so I don't need the bus.	3	Unless we remove street parking, reducing driveways will only increase street parking. Keeping cars off of the street and eliminating street parking might be a safer option.	5	Lots of little kids in the neighborhoods. We need more of this and speed bumps.	3	We need to teach drivers that this is not a car lane. This needs to be enforced by police until the community knows not to drive in this lane.
1	Walking around or on those platforms should not be of concern. As long as there are bike lanes for those biking to safely access the road, that should not be a problem either.	1	This should only improve safety of those walking, biking or using public transport so there should be no issue here.	1	Again, safety is important so this shouldn't be a problem at all.	1	I am all for protected bike lanes and encouraging folks to reduce their carbon footprint in a more safe way.
3		3		4		4	
1	I walk everywhere.	3	I feel street parking is more dangerous than drive ways. I'd prefer fewer street parking spots and would encourage more off street parking.	5	Little kids walking to school will have the most positive impact. We also need speed bumps at intersections. Some many red lights being ran.	3	We need to educate drivers on these lanes, or they will not be safe for bikers.
3	It's good to have bus bulbs, but they will need garbage cans/collection/maintenance.	4	Seems safer for children, so it's good.	5	Seems safer for children, so it's good.	3	This is good, but bikers must be taught to actually obey traffic laws... rather than ignoring red lights as they often do.
1	It doesn't hurt anyone that doesn't use the bus. They are a good thing.	4	It leads to better safety and better use of land.	5	Parking problems at intersections regarding visibility could be solved, pedestrians are safer, and this is a net positive	4	Biking is great when possible safely, but riding on sidewalks almost always feels safer to the average person. Better multi modal use and more bike options would be great

1	I walk everywhere.		I feel street parking is more dangerous than drive ways. I'd prefer fewer street parking spots and would encourage more off street parking.	3	Little kids walking to school will have the most positive impact. We also need speed bumps at intersections. Some many red lights being ran.	5	We need to educate drivers on these lanes, or they will not be safe for bikers.
1	I walk everywhere.		I feel street parking is more dangerous than drive ways. I'd prefer fewer street parking spots and would encourage more off street parking.	3	Little kids walking to school will have the most positive impact. We also need speed bumps at intersections. Some many red lights being ran.	5	We need to educate drivers on these lanes, or they will not be safe for bikers.
1	I walk everywhere.		I feel street parking is more dangerous than drive ways. I'd prefer fewer street parking spots and would encourage more off street parking.	3	Little kids walking to school will have the most positive impact. We also need speed bumps at intersections. Some many red lights being ran.	5	We need to educate drivers on these lanes, or they will not be safe for bikers.
1	It doesn't hurt anyone that doesn't use the bus. They are a good thing.		It leads to better safety and better use of land.	4	Parking problems at intersections regarding visibility could be solved, pedestrians are safer, and this is a net positive	5	Biking is great when possible safely, but riding on sidewalks almost always feels safer to the average person. Better multi modal use and more bike options would be great
1	I prefer to drive. These block lines of sights, especially if close to busy interactions where pedestrians dart out into traffic.		Less driveways to cross.	5	This makes it difficult for larger vehicles to negotiate intersections. From what I have observed, the city takes up existing turn lanes for these things, and that not only creates intersections to queue, but it is very difficult to make turns.	1	Can we stop taking away parking and traffic lanes for these things?
5	Parking lots have lights and so should bus stops.		Safe streets allow people the choice not to drive, giving them a safe, efficient, healthy and affordable option to moving around our city.	5	City roads should not be designed for car efficiency, but should instead be designed for the safety of pedestrians. Slowing down vehicle is step one in fixing our car-dominated city.	5	Safe bicycle infrastructure is the only way to empower our community to feel safe commuting without having to drive a personal vehicle.
4				5		3	
5	This is the most likely of these options to affect my commute. Buses and bikes are the most likely alternatives to auto travel, and that's our biggest objective in my opinion			1		2	This is the most likely of these options to affect my commute. Buses and bikes are the most likely alternatives to auto travel, and that's our biggest objective in my opinion
2				2		2	
4	SA provides protection from elements & aesthetically pleasing, comfortable.			3		4	
4	need shelter for those waiting for the bus.			4		4	Reduce risk for pedestrian accidents
							Always a good idea to protect the vulnerable
1				1		1	

3		1		2		3	
	Trick Question!!		Trick Question!!		Trick Question!!		Trick Question!!
1		3		3		5	I hate bike lanes, hardly anyone uses them and they are everywhere. A waste of tax payer dollars.
3		4		4		2	
2		2		4		2	
	5 give more options for parking outside to commute in	4		5	Love this, easy to see where to park and safety	2	too many risks w/ drivers who don't pay attention
2		3		4		1	
5		3		3		1	Don't see bikers. Can't bike 7 mos of the year due to weather.
5		5		5		5	

4		2		4		5	
3		3		4		4	
1	I don't have a lot of public transportation, little exposure	5	seemingly improves walkability	5	safer, slower; more space all seem important	5	safer, slower; more space all seem important
2		3		3		3	
1		2		2		2	creates safety for pedestrians
4	More public transportation requires less parking spaces	3	of course we want safety. But the biggest problem isn't the engineering, it's people not paying attention.	2	I don't think these work. From the pedestrian standpoint, they don't slow people down.	3	I'm indifferent. They are highly underused in our community.
2		4		1		1	
5	and enforced bus lanes or abc lanes	5	reduce speeds	5	burn outs with bowards as well		paint is not infrastructure. Must be protected or its own lane off street.
2		3		4		2	
4		4		4	slower is safer	2	Until commuter cycling increase I don't believe they are as important

4	If comfortability is sus[ended suring waits	4		2		2	
3		2		4		2	
2		3		5		5	
4	warmth in winter for longer waits	4	alpine & plainfield	4		4	
5	makes public transportation more accessible	3		5	less traffic accidents	5	less traffic accidents
5	Would make me feel safer and encourage me to use transit.	5	Would make me feel safer and encourage me to use transit.	5	Would make me feel safer and encourage me to bike, walk, and use transit.	5	Would make me feel safer and encourage me to Bike
4	Easily identifiable, with a decent amount of shelter, and help coordinate residents to transit options by providing a clear station for buses.	1	Either the driveways are all on the interior of larger neighborhoods, which removes the ability for some to have a sense of private property, or they spill into whatever road is nearest them, as they almost always do.	4	Would be nice to have. They can take a larger road that may feel more dangerous to walk along and turn it into a more community friendly area, one where even kids can manage comfortably walking within their own neighborhoods	5	As a biker, these would help keep drivers from becoming upset with bikers, and make cyclists feel more encouraged in their role as a transit option.
4	Transit routes must be timely, service multiple locations and accessible	4		4		4	
3	If it is late at night, they will make me feel more comfortable. Otherwise, if the sun is out, there is no need for the lights.	3	It doesn't really affect me, but I think it's a good idea to propose.	3	It doesn't affect me a lot, but I think it's a good idea to propose.	2	It doesn't really affect me, but I think it's a good idea to propose.
5	Dedicating space to transit users offers them dignity and legitimacy. The use of space for transit users over more space for cars shows that these users are just as important as those driving in their cars.	3	Probably depends on the roadway. I like the strategy, but guess I am prioritizing the others more.	5	Definitely helps to slow cars, make pedestrians feel safer.	5	Protected bike lanes are the way to go to get more people riding bikes. Less daring users need that vertical separation to feel safe.
1		4		4		3	
5	Provides a place for riders to wait out of the elements.	5	In highly congested zones (e.g. Bridge Street by the highway), pedestrians are at risk due to too many driveways, traffic congestion, cars stopping to park in lanes, and people walking out between cars.	5	Slows traffic	1	These do not work. Cars are constantly in the bike lanes. Bike lanes are not safe due to the drivers.
3		5		3		3	
3		3		3		3	

5	If it impacts bike lanes, it would be a negative impact. Its so dangerous in the city to change lanes back into a driving lane on a bike- cars get mad or don't expect you to do so even with a bus bulb ahead (cars are often unaware of objects blocking bike lanes). Speaking from someone who was hit by a car in the city and hospitalized.	3	Not sure what this is	5	If it impacts bike lanes, it would be a negative impact. Its so dangerous in the city to change lanes back into a driving lane on a bike- cars get mad or don't expect you to do so even with a curb bulb ahead (cars are often unaware of objects blocking bike lanes). Speaking from someone who was hit by a car in the city and hospitalized.	5	Yes please! More of this for safe bike commuting - more visibility and clear expectations!! Coming from a household who commutes by bike within the city daily.
4		3		4		5	I often bike-commute in the non-winter months. There has been a lot of education efforts but I still encounter cars all the time that want to drive in the dedicated bike lanes
1	I think bus bulbs make it much easier to use public transportation and I would like to see more of them.				I do not like curb bulb outs while driving		
1		4	In heavy buisness districts/shopping centers would be huge	5	ped safety #1	5	complete routes, cleaner definitions for micormobility around.
3	who's using the bus? Is the bus really our future?	5	walkability is enhanced with more & better sidewalks & crosswalks & curb ramp.	5		4	yes, more please!
2		3		5	would like to see more of these	5	more!
5		5	I am in favor of the access management proposed. Less conflict will be better for everyone.	5	They help pedestrians be seen by cars, reducing collision.	5	We should develop protected bike lanes throughout the city. This would be a much more efficient use of space for transporting people. Driving can be miserable, biking is much more enjoyable.
5	The city has already given too much priority to large cars which are deadly when they hit a person. This provides a safer and more affordable way of transportation that does not require one to own a car and inherit its costs which can be \$10,000/year or more in some cases.	5	Encouraging more walking and other means of transportation other than cars will create a safer and more inclusive city where you do not need to rely on a car for everything.	5	This is important because it will hopefully encourage more people to walk more often and make streets safer for everyone, not just those in cars.	5	The protected bike lane needs a physical barrier. The picture for the description above is not a safe bike lane. This will encourage more people, and families to bike safely around, promoting a healthier lifestyle.
5	The city has already given too much priority to large cars which are deadly when they hit a person. This provides a safer and more affordable way of transportation that does not require one to own a car and inherit its costs which can be \$10,000/year or more in some cases.	5	Encouraging more walking and other means of transportation other than cars will create a safer and more inclusive city where you do not need to rely on a car for everything.	5	This is important because it will hopefully encourage more people to walk more often and make streets safer for everyone, not just those in cars.	5	The protected bike lane needs a physical barrier. The picture for the description above is not a safe bike lane. This will encourage more people, and families to bike safely around, promoting a healthier lifestyle.
3	It takes too long waiting then you have to transfer buses and it can take 90 minutes getting from the Westside to Alpine or Standale and by car it takes 10 minutes. A lot of people do rely on the bus for transportation so keeping it running is important	3	I don't use public transportation that often maybe once every 2 years	3	I don't use public transportation that often but some people do and it should be safe	3	I don't ride a bike however some riders think they can ride in the middle of the street which is a safety issue. Whoever thought of bike lanes on a main street with businesses didn't think it through because businesses need parking in front of their business which in turn eliminates the bike lane
5	I walk, bike, and use the Rapid daily.	4		4		5	I bike a lot and it can be scary and dangerous.

4		4		3		3	
4		3		1		4	
1	So long as bus bulbs are only installed on multi lane roads, I see no negative impact	5	This is key for cycling commuter. Driveways alone are not too bad, it's when there are driveways AND on street parking that big hazards are present.	3	While it's a nice idea, the current bump outs sizes are only creating issues. We see drivers pull up and past cross walks so they can see past parked cars. As a resident that walks the West side every day, it's a constant fear. Crossing Walker Ave at Powers is a great example of limited vehicle visibility	5	CRITICAL if we want real opportunity for cycling commuters. Even the "designated" bike lanes on Walker Ave, and on Bridge Street in front of Condado show people simply use that space for parking. To be EFFECTIVE bike lanes, some kind of protection is necessary or vehicle drivers just don't care.
4	Not enough people use public transit and this won't make more people do it. Trying to force public transit down our throats is not a solution.	3	Are people walking or riding their bikes in this area at all? Isn't that more important to figure out instead of assuming this is a solution?	5	If people are actually walking and riding bikes this doesn't seem like a bad way to improve safety.	5	How are you going to find space for these? Sure they would be fine but are you going to take land to make them?
3	Having a semi-enclosed space is a nice addition.	4	My primary method of transportation is walking, so access management would increase my level of safety and comfort.	4	My primary method of transportation is walking, so curb bulb-outs would increase my level of safety and comfort.	4	I don't personally bike around the city, but this seems like a great option to keep bicyclists safe and encourage biking as an alternate to driving.
3	When people have to go somewhere outside of walking range, public transit provides options other than cars. We can incentivize bus use by making bus stops nicer and safer. This has benefits listed earlier, including safer infrastructure, lower emissions, and decreased traffic.	1	For people with cars (which is a significant amount of the city right now), they need somewhere to park. If they don't park on a driveway, they'll park on the street. This clutters bikelanes and impacts visibility when you're trying to turn onto a road. Driveways have a minimal impact on pedestrians and cyclists.	4	It creates a more apparent safe-zone, and decreases the time a pedestrian spends in the danger-zone on the driveable road.	5	Protected bike lanes similarly create more apparent safe-zones for cyclists, keeping them safe from cars.
5	It's still unclear to me how it would impact biking or walking. I am unable to use public transit because there is not a route that is anywhere close to my work. But I would much prefer infrastructure that prioritizes public transit and cycling over cars.	5	I love bike commuting. The places I feel the most unsafe are places where I'm forced to interact with cars. Drivers do not see me, despite bike lights and reflective clothing and a lot of vigilance on my part.	5	I love that this would force cars to slow down.	5	I love these. I feel the safest on a bike with more separation from cars.
3		4		5		5	bike paths become too large and slow car traffic
3	Get to work					3	
3	Helps separate the uses and mobility of pedestrians and bus riders.	5	Because we are raising families and want safety while we enjoy a walk in the neighborhood	3	Helps with access to the streets	4	Keeps safe people biking.
2		4		4		5	
2		3	I dont understand this	3	indifferent	4	
4		5		3		5	I ride my bike a lot and I think we need more bike lanes!! The separated bike lane on Turner Ave is awesome. It feels so much safer than riding in the road.
3		3		3		3	I don't know that any of these impact me (I'm not good on a bike) but I'd like our city to be safe for bicyclist and pedestrians even if that means a little inconvenience for drivers
1	Because I rarely ever use public transit.	3	it could impact me if foot traffic, and bicycle traffic are in the way of vehicle traffic. I don't want to hit someone who isn't paying attention.	5	It cramps traffic flow and commutes take much longer.	5	Bikes lanes should have their own separate sidewalks out of vehicular traffic lanes. They are ugly, in the way, rarely used, and confusing, ridden on by most anyways.
1	I only drive. I don't use public transportation because it's too confusing and inconvenient.	1	Since I only drive, I don't see much impact unless it improves or hinders the flow of traffic.	5	It will make turning for large trucks/trailers too difficult.	5	This is a waste of space and bicycles will still be too close to traffic. We should focus on bike paths off the road that provide efficient shortcuts through the city that are not accessible to cars.
3	An improvement for sure, but minor optimizations in transit efficiency do not come across strongly to the average person.	1	this is a temporary solution to the bigger problem of too much car traffic. If pedestrian traffic is increased and roads narrowed (for protected bike lanes!) this would not really be a necessary investment in infrastructure.	4	Nice and a good improvement where applicable, yet many roads are just built too wide for this to be a realistic option in the exact places it is needed. I'd love to see it though.	5	I love biking but absolutely do not feel safe biking in an unprotected lane next to cars. An extensive, well thought out protected bike lane network will greatly increase mobility and decrease car traffic. Paint is not enough!

2	I rarely take the bus	3	It is hard to understand the graph but many large streets (ex: 28th) feel very dangerous to walk along.	1		1	I rarely bike. Bike lanes are a great idea but are often parked in or otherwise obstructed. better to have separate bike paths.
4	Efficient transit is important to me. The reduction in service of the last few years has dropped my ridership to zero. The elimination/consolidation of westside routes has made any trip via the Rapid an hour or more.	3	I regularly commute by walking mostly through residential communities. This would have little impact on my day to day.	5	I commute regularly by walking. Lack of crosswalks at most intersections and the failure of turning drivers to even slow at stop signs makes it very dangerous. Any devices to slow traffic and increase visibility would lead to me walking even more.	4	I love to bike but the lack of connected bike routes makes it difficult for me to commute by bike. The bike lanes that do exist are often filled with debris and parked cars making them unusable and increases the danger of riding. I love the protect lanes on Monroe and Turner but there's no good way to get to them.
3	Feels safer	5	Anything that can be done to improve bike safety!	4		5	Yes!!! Don't make bikes compete with cars!
5	The city has already given too much priority to large cars which are deadly when they hit a person. This provides a safer and more affordable way of transportation that does not require one to own a car and inherit its costs which can be \$10,000/year or more in some cases.	5	Encouraging more walking and other means of transportation other than cars will create a safer and more inclusive city where you do not need to rely on a car for everything.	5	This is important because it will hopefully encourage more people to walk more often and make streets safer for everyone, not just those in cars.	5	The protected bike lane needs a physical barrier. The picture for the description above is not a safe bike lane. This will encourage more people, and families to bike safely around, promoting a healthier lifestyle.
1		2		3		3	
		5		5		5	
5	Bus stops make my travel easier. I need more bus stops to allow me to travel to more parts of the city. I find that there are far too few bus stops in the west side and we need a metro.	5	Improves quality of commute.	5	Very helpful .	5	Very helpful.
4		4		4		5	
5	Easier access to bus routes.	5	Reduce pedestrian death and injury.	5	Reduce pedestrian death and injury (and insurance cost for drivers?)	5	Allow me to safely bike around when the weather is nice!
5	This will make me feel more comfortable waiting for the bus.	5		5	Safer walking conditions are very important to me, I walk to many locations.	5	I do not bike as often as I would like for fear of traffic, this would make me feel more comfortable.
1		5		2		2	
4		5		4		5	
1	They are necessary and I don't see why they would have any adverse impact.	4	I do walk/bike and reducing driveways would make transport more safe	2	I have mixed feelings about curb cut-outs. They can be dangerous for drivers if drivers are not aware of them.	2	I do not bike in the city and again, they can be more dangerous for drivers.
2		1		3		5	Takes away parking and valuable street space. Should be used in a limited way.
5		5		5		5	
5		5		5		5	
3		3		5	Traffic calming equals safety	1	Very few bikes commute
1	I don't ride the bus.	1		1	People should pay attention and cross when it's safe.	1	We are NOT Amsterdam!! I heard the lady trying to pass this at the meeting. Please think of the City Plows in the winter. They don't fit in these separate bike lanes. Think of those that live in those areas taking the trash bin out over 2 curbs, parking and their safety. We need parking not bike lanes. Do what's best for those that work for the City and live their. Not for the group who is promoting it and probably not using them!

4	It's great to have a space protected from the elements.	4	I love the idea of reducing friction between cars and everyone else.	4	I feel like these make high foot traffic areas feel safer for pedestrians.	5	As a cyclist, I love dedicated bike lanes.
1	I don't use public transit	4	Too many driveways into main roads	4		1	Bikers don't follow traffic laws and endanger themselves and drivers
3	They would help more than not, so long as they're not occupied by someone sleeping, littering, or being dangerous.	4	Having shared parking lots can definitely help reduce needed driveways. However, proper flow needed to be heavily taken into account as some roads can take far too long to wait for a cleaning or to get into the appropriate lane.	5	They need flashers AND something intermittent in the path, as no cars stop for pedestrians here, even when flashing.	5	Though people don't understand the rules of sharing the road (from both sides) it would ultimately lead to a healthier community, less emissions, and more commute opportunities.
3	I don't use the bus, but I know it will be helpful for those that do.	5	I'd rather limit street parking than driveways. Cars parked in the streets cause blind spots and are more hazardous.	5	Definitely needed in walkable cities. They, with speed bumps, help reduce speeding which allows for a safer walking experience.	3	These already do not work as drivers do not follow the bike lane rules. I'm not against these, but we need to also add traffic enforcement and driver education for these to be most effective.
4	While I do feel comfortable using existing bus stops, the bulb is a great way to have people awaiting buses out of the general sidewalk flow, making it easier to walk around busy downtown areas and occasionally narrow sidewalks. I see bulbs as especially important for folks who use mobility devices and stops with more foot traffic.	5	Reducing possible collision points improves the walkability of our city streets, and hopefully will allow for greater visibility of pedestrians when cars zoom into business driveways	5	Curb bulbs would be amazing for pedestrian safety and crosswalk visibility! Especially in areas like Uptown with lots of street parking, it can be hard to see pedestrians waiting to cross the street. Added bonus: narrow streets naturally reduce vehicle speed!	5	I dream of a Grand Rapids that has an interconnected and protected bike lane system. People driving cars often cross over or ignore unprotected bike lanes, so infrastructure that coaches drivers to expect cyclists and scooters would be a major asset for behavior change.
2	Only have to move around them.	4	So much safer for the pedestrian.	3	Me personally - mostly walking around downtown	4	Bikers deserve a safe lane to use.
4	So many people rely solely on public transit, and they need these spaces.	4	More walkable communities by their nature force motorists to slow down, that makes it a safer environment for everyone.	4	Bulb-outs make walking safer, and they create opportunities for bio-swales to help with storm water management.	5	No matter how negligent or well-meaning, motorists aren't as vigilant for cyclist safety as they should be. Protected bike lanes are absolutely essential, especially since far too many motorists (including law enforcement, other municipal employees, and private citizens) don't respect unprotected bike lanes.
5	It snows a lot here in the winter and folks need protection from snow, wind, rain, and sun if they are walking, biking, and using transit. It helps keep people safe.	5	Anything that reduces conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists with vehicles and improves safety is an investment worthy of prioritizing.	5	It always feels unsafe to cross streets and Grand Rapids, especially streets that are busier. It also feels more unsafe the higher the speed limit is to cross as a pedestrian. Having a shorter distance to cross streets will aid in pedestrian safety.	5	This is where humanity is heading. We need walkable, bikeable cities that center people over cars and other vehicles. It will help our city and community reach our goals of reducing GHG emissions from the transportation sector. It will also contribute to healthier air and water, as more bikes means less pollution from vehicles. And it means healthier people who get out and move more, and breathe cleaner air thanks to the improvement in biking infrastructure. It also keeps everybody safer and reduces potential bodily harm to pedestrians and bikers alike.
3	Public transit and non-motorized transit lanes could be more useful	5	We all deserve to feel safe walking down our neighborhood streets from fast moving vehicles. Wider sidewalks, 25 mph, And more pedestrian-friendly policies	3	Design them with bicyclists and scooters in mind, yes!	5	Drivers in Michigan are still not paying attention to cyclists. Neighborhood business districts sidewalks should be for people walking and for kids. Too many cyclists and scooters on the sidewalks & row.
5	These are far more inviting and dignified than a sign on a pole in the parkway. These bulb outs make transit feel like more considered mobility option rather than an option of last resort.	4	Eliminating driveways ensures an uninterrupted path between side streets. This makes walking much safer and more enjoyable.	4	Bulb outs are great for helping to signal to car drivers that other activities are happening and slower speeds are necessary.	5	My preference is to bike whenever possible but without separated or protected facilities I don't believe it is safe to cycle in most of the city. I would also like my kids to be safe cycling to school. Even though they are teenagers I don't believe our infrastructure is currently capable of supporting them safely.

2	We have nice walking spaces that we can use to get downtown.	4	We walk quite a bit to get around, and in the summer even more-so on our bikes. I think it is important that we plan with bikes and e-transportation devices in mind as we move forward.	3	I'm not 100% sure, but they do help differentiate crosswalks. That makes me feel that a driver is more likely to see me when I cross the street.	5	This is huge. I have epilepsy and cannot drive atm. (hopefully if these brain surgeries work I will get mine back), but when I ride my bike I have had some close calls which I think are distracted drivers. Carving out a space is so great.
3	I anticipate a time when I will be using the bus more frequently as I age.	3		3		2	I no longer ride a bike.
4		5		4		3	
4		2	Of those options, good bussing is best for me and this seems better for walking and bicycles	4		3	I don't plan to bike
3	They don't negatively or positively affect me	5	I appreciate the added safety when cycling and also for my spouse and kids when they cycle to school and work	4	these push cyclists out into car space, which I don't love. I do appreciate the greater visibility they offer when I'm walking	5	Please, please let's have protected lanes to show GR is serious about cyclist safety and to make people feel safe biking to work or to entertainment etc
2		2		4		4	
2		3		4		4	
5	The promote people using public transport as they can sit in a comfortable space while waiting for the bus rather than stand out in the rain or other wild weather.	3	Street parking is also a huge concern for cyclists and pedestrians, where will cars go if we no longer have any driveways?	5	Makes roads more safe for pedestrians is an accessibility concern and matters greatly to promote walking as a form of safe transportation	5	This would be fantastic, people would be more willing to bike to work if they could do so safely.
4		4		2		3	
3	It's nice to have shelter when waiting for the bus.	5	I prefer to walk when possible!	5	People in cars can be so impatient and being a pedestrian can be dangerous. I appreciate increased safety measures as I walk to work every day.	3	I still feel biking is too dangerous! I'm not comfortable with it so I just won't.
3	Because walkability is already so low in the city, this wouldn't impact my current status much. But I could see it being a net good longer term if we invest in the walkability of our city.	4				5	I myself do not bike, partially because I feel unsafe doing it in the city. Protected lanes would help me feel more comfortable as GR drivers become more accustomed to cyclists.
3		5		4		5	
1	More things to bike around. The bus stops next to you anyway.	4	This should be done for businesses. I hate Fuller just north of Leonard for all the people going into all the businesses without a proper turn land.	3	More visibility is good, but it doesn't slow down cars.	5	The bike lanes on the shoulder get used by cars all the time. I see people using the bike lanes as turn lanes everyday. Delivery vehicles use and block bike lanes. The bike lanes became the parking lanes when we had snow. It's ridiculous. Bike lanes should be separated for safety.
1		1		1		1	
1		1		1		1	
4	These are great, but not as helpful if the lines aren't running or regular	3	Less driveways always help, but it could create issues getting in/out of busy stores, which becomes a barrier for pedestrians and bikers.	3	These create issues for biking - choke zones with cats. This should be done in a way that keeps cyclists safe.	5	Biking is my preferred transit mode. This makes a huge difference, especially if maintained in winter
5		5		5		5	Bicycle safety in Grand Rapids is fairly low compared to other cities. I would bike to work if we had safer streets.
3		5	I have to be honest - I have no clue what "access management" means in any practical way. The picture is not helpful (too small) and the engagement board doesn't give concrete examples as to where the driveway reduction might be, what it might look like, what the downsides are, etc.	4	These make crossing streets at crosswalks very a lot nicer, and when they are frequent enough, are a good reason to seek them out to cross rather than crossing at a wider part (and therefore more potentially dangerous)	5	Protected bike lanes (that cars can't park in, turn across, swerve into, etc.) would be tremendously helpful to have throughout the city. I bike somewhat regularly and even streets with nicer bike lanes (e.g. recently renovated portions of Hall St.) feel dangerous.
5		5		5		5	
5		5	We should invest in more walkable areas to promote healthy living and then we can also develop better public transportation (trams!!)	5	As a driver it improves visibility and helps so much to see the pedestrians.	5	Bike lanes should be protected by cement dividers to protect the bikers.

3	They will not impact my life until protected bike lanes allow me to travel comfortably from bus stops to destinations which is to say I will not use the bus until my ability to bike safely is assured.	5	YES!! When everything is outfitted to benefit Cars and their fastest, least-impeded motion/travel, I know that I as a pedestrian am in danger.	2	I like curb cutouts and they certainly seem to slow traffic. But without protected bike lanes they are still a calming measure that doesn't ultimately provide me protection while biking.	5	IF they are actually protected! By concrete berm, grass, set BEHIND PARKED CARS, or with bollards.
3	Unsure	4	Safer = good	5	Naturally slow traffic is ideal for bike integration.	4	Encourages new cyclists to try by providing safe feeling routes.
4	It's much nicer to have a spot to stand and wait rather than just being along the side of the street.	4		5		3	
5	A visual and physical bus stop is safer and more perceived permanence.	5	Safer	5	Safer for pedestrians, easier for drivers to see where they are.	5	Keeps bikes separate from cars, but can cause conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians.
4		1		3		5	
4	It allows more space for people instead of cars. it keeps a space between the cars and pedestrians	4	It will make it safer since there aren't as many opportunities for cars to hit pedestrians	4	makes it safer	2	I don't ride a bike on the street but it feels dangerous to me since cars don't pay attention - they're not used to looking for bikes right next to them. Especially turn lanes
3	Public transit isn't used by me or anyone else I know. However, they make it more appealing when there is a place to sit and have coverage from the weather.	5	In terms of walking which is my main form of alternative transit this would make it much less of a stressor when walking and more efficient to walk to places.	4	Reduces chances of being hit by a car when walking. Not much change in terms of biking and transit.	5	
5	It will encourage walkable communities, and we believe in that!	3	This is a weird one! If driveways are visible at the end, I believe they are beneficial, especially in traditional neighborhoods. As for conflicts for walkers and bicyclists, there are a lot of other issues to solve outside of driveways.	5	I think this is great. It's super impactful and genuinely makes a difference towards a walkable community.	5	It's pretty self explanatory, if anything I'd say this is impactful and moving towards walkable communities but needs to be even MORE protected than just a dotted line. Drivers are vicious.
2		3		1	Curb bulb-outs seem less effective than hoped, and can disappear entirely with snow cover.	3	Only if the bike lanes are actually protected! Walking comfort is always tenuous threats from bikes as well as motor vehicles.
1	I just don't use transit.	4	It is hard to walk places where there are lots of driveways to watch for. It is also hard/dangerous when the drives are between buildings that are close to the road. Cars pull out into walk ways before they can see pedestrians.	3	It does tend to make drivers more aware of pedestrians.	3	If it's a physical barrier it works. Painting the road doesn't always work.
1		3		1		5	
4		4		5		4	
3	I don't use the bus often	5	I hate driving on Alpine or 28th street because all the driveways plus high speeds make it feel very unsafe	4	It would help to see pedestrians trying to cross	4	Would be much more likely to use a protected bike lane. The current bike lanes don't feel safe with how a lot of people drive in the city
3	Have never ridden the bus	3	Not sure	5	Reduced crossing distances	3	I don't have a bike
5	With proper implementation, the bus bulb aides the efficiency of public transportation while not impacting the surrounding pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.	5	All public infrastructure should be built primarily with the consideration of pedestrians, bicyclists, and ease of access to public transportation. Reducing exposure of pedestrians and bicyclists to vehicles will make these modes of transportation more practical.	5	Curb bulb-outs increase pedestrian safety and make walking a more practical transportation option.	5	The main impediment to bicycling currently in the city of Grand Rapids is the danger caused by exposure to motor vehicles. Protected bike lanes would greatly increase the practicability of biking.
5		5		3		5	
1		4	Could be helpful if implemented well.	3		5	Most safe way to bike
3	Currently this would not affect me much but if I was an avid user of public transit, I would say it would be more impactful and meaningful to me.	4	I choose not to ride my bike in the city except for on trails for the reason of interacting with traffic. This would potentially make riding less stressful and make me more likely to ride often.	5	Yes! This would protect pedestrians and is a positive thing.	5	I do not ride bike in the city except for on trails because of traffic, intersections, etc. This would increase my likelihood of riding my bike in the city.
1	Personally I walk in my neighborhood, I don't bike anymore and never use public transit						
5		5	Will make things so much safer for pedestrians	5		5	

1	I just don't use transit.	4	It is hard to walk places where there are lots of driveways to watch for. It is also hard/dangerous when the drives are between buildings that are close to the road. Cars pull out into walk ways before they can see pedestrians.	3	It does tend to make drivers more aware of pedestrians.	3	If it's a physical barrier it works. Painting the road doesn't always work.
1	I'm indifferent.	1	Driveways aren't as big of a deal as large, fast moving thoroughfare traffic.	4	These are nice features at crosswalks, improving visibility of pedestrians.	5	
1		4		2		5	
3		3		3		3	
4	Will feel safer for kids to take the bus	3		4	More emphasis on pedestrian	5	I and my family bike to every neighborhood destination
3		5	Stroads are bad for people and cities.	4		5	Let's make cycling safe
5	Encouraging people to ride the bus is a good idea.	3		3		5	We should be encouraging more people to use bikes to get around
1		1		1		5	
3		4	I do a lot of biking to get around, and driveway access/curb cuts are especially hazardous. I also worry about them a lot when walking with my young son.	5	Shorter crossing distances and better visibility for pedestrians and drivers is a big plus.	5	I bike around the city frequently. Protected bike lanes are hugely important for making me feel safe, particularly when I have no choice but take a major road. I believe this would not only be a massive win for me personally, but could significantly reduce car use requirements for many Grand Rapidians.
1		4		2		5	
2		3		3	I think it would help increase visibility/awareness of walkers	4	Separation for safety please
2	I personally would be unaffected by these but I think they are a big quality of life improvement for existing commuters	4	I don't like biking in high commercial access management areas bc visibility for bike lanes tends to be low	5	I live near a new cross walk and feel like the bulb out makes a big difference for visibility, when it doesn't impact car safety turning off of busier corridors	2	Cars tend to ignore these
3	As long as there are protected bike lanes, bus bulbs should not cause any significant difficulties for pedestrians. If we have more bus bulbs without bike lanes, then there may be more risk for collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.	1	I love this idea. It will significantly help pedestrians and cyclists to have a safer commute.	1	As long as there are bike lanes, this should not significantly impact my comfort or commute.	5	I would feel safer to move through the city on by bike! This could positively affect my quality of life, health, happiness, and pride in my city. It would also lessen pollution caused by fossil fuel cars.
5	Encouraging people to ride the bus is a good idea.	3		3		5	We should be encouraging more people to use bikes to get around
5	I use busses, and transit stops are extremely convenient.	3		4		4	
1	Safety related to better lighting	1	Generates traffic flow	3	I've not experienced long outages	5	They improve traffic flow
1	Do not utilize public transportation	1	Do not utilize public transportation	1	Do not utilize public transportation	1	Do not utilize public transportation
5	Making transit better is always the best long-term choice for our community. We keep taking steps toward the tipping point where transit is more convenient than driving for the sake of safety, equity, choice, and cost.	5	Making alternative modes of transportation better is always the best long-term choice for our community. We keep taking steps toward the tipping point where walking, biking, and transit is more convenient than driving for the sake of safety, equity, choice, and cost.	5	It reduces traffic speed and increases safety for children and adults using the sidewalks.	5	It reduces traffic speed and increases safety for cyclists, who have an equal legal right to the road as vehicles. We must design for equal and safe participation for both cars and bicycles.
1	Do not use the bus often.	4	Constantly worrying about cars coming out of lots/driveways when walking. They never see pedestrians.	2	They interrupt bike lanes, forcing me into the street.	5	Separating pedestrians and cyclists from autos with a median is the best idea. Cyclists are more aware of pedestrians, so they can co-exist. Cars are too unpredictable to cycle with.

1			Access management is particularly important for people who have disabilities; disruptions along the sidewalk make it more difficult for people with disabilities to exercise their right to navigate cities safely along the sidewalk.		Research shows curb cuts promote walkability and increase safety. Curb cuts help slow traffic and make it safer for pedestrians to cross the street.		Feeling safe while riding a bike is one of the primary determinants of whether or not someone will bike rather than drive. Protected bike lanes increase safety, which in turn increases biking and decreases traffic congestion. This is important for promoting health among residents (both from a physical activity perspective and from a decreased air pollution perspective).
1	Safety related to better lighting	1	Generates traffic flow	3	I've not experienced long outages	5	They improve traffic flow
1		1		1		1	
3		5		4		5	This would have a massive impact! Having a safe way to bike through the city would be incredibly. I'd be happy with my tax dollars going towards projects like this!
5	Makes it safer and more accessible for those who ride the bus.	5	Less pedestrian hazard, less cross traffic hazard	5	Reduce the amount of street the pedestrian need to cross, improving safety. Also slows cars down	5	Would you let your kids ride in the painted bike gutters?
5		3		5		4	
5	Bus bulbs should be standard at every stop. Protection from	5	Keeping cars away from pedestrians and transit stops should	4	While I don't necessarily need them everywhere, I am sure	1	Any bike lane without a physical bike lane puts cyclists in extreme danger, as paint does not prevent cars from drifting or parking in them.
5	I think these are brilliant and should be implemented. I do	3	I don't have an opinion at this time as I haven't seen	3	No opinion.	5	Great idea. It's important to encourage biking in this city with safety.
4		3		4	These do slow cars and where there are crosswalks make	5	I regularly commute to my office on the opposite side of town by bike. Having protected bike lanes will make that travel much more comfortable and hopefully encourage others to do the same.
2	https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/protruding-r	4	Does this mean more sidewalks?	5	Protect pedestrians	5	I use the sidewalk still because drivers are rude and try to kill you.
1							You still have people in cars speeding in residential streets, roadways (ie Plainfield), looking at phones while driving, cars sway into the bike lane. Until people behavior changes, you will continue to have crashes of bike riders, walkers.
2		4		4		5	

How important are the following design elements to the development character in your neighborhood?

Architectural Features	Exterior Materials	Bulk and Height	Parking
3	3	1	1
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1
4	4	4	5
1	1	5	1
3	5	3	3
2	2	3	4
1	3	3	3
4	4	2	4
1	1	2	2
1	1	1	1
2	2	5	5
5	4	4	5
4	3	3	2
1	4	5	5
2	2		2
2	5	3	4
5	4	3	1
1	1	3	1
4	3	5	5
4	4	4	4
5	3	5	5
2	3	2	4
4	2	4	4
1	1	1	5
5	2	2	4
4	1	5	5
5	3	5	4
1	4	2	2
5	4	3	3
2	3	3	3
3	3	3	5
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	5
3	1	2	4
2	2	2	2
4	4	3	4
1	1	1	5
5	5	5	5
4	4	4	1
2	3	4	5
1	2	4	5
1	1	1	1

1	1	1	1
2	3	4	2
2	2	2	3
1	1	1	2
1	1	4	3
5	4	4	3
1	1	4	2
2	3	1	1
1	1	1	1
2	2	1	1
2	4	3	3
1	1	3	1
4	4	4	5
1	1	1	1
2	4	2	1
1	1	1	1
1	3	4	5
5	5	5	5
3	1	4	3
1	1	3	2
1	1	2	3
4	4	3	2
4	2	5	5
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1
5	5	3	1
1	3	1	1
3	3	3	5
1	2	4	5
3	3	3	4
5	1	2	2
5	5	5	5
1	1	1	1
1	5	1	5
1	1	1	1
2	3	2	3
3	5	3	2
1	2	1	2
3	5	1	3
1	3	1	5
1	1	5	1
1	1	1	1
2	2	3	3
3	3	5	5
1	1	4	4
3	3	3	3
2	2	1	1

3	5	2	1
1	3	4	3
1	1	1	3
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	5
1	1	5	1
1	1	1	3
3	4	5	1
1	2	1	5
4	4	5	2
4	4	4	4
1	1	1	1
3	3	2	4
2	3	4	4
1	1	1	1
5	3	1	5
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1
1	2	5	5
1	1	1	3
1	4	5	1
2	3	2	3
5	3	2	1
3	3	3	3
4	4	3	2
1	1	1	1
3	3	3	4
5	5	5	5
2	2	3	5
5	5	5	5
3	5	2	1
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1
2	4	2	1
2	3	4	2
5	3	2	3
2	2	1	3
3	1	1	3
2	3	2	4
1	3	1	1
3	3	5	5
5	3	5	5
3	3	4	4
5	3	1	1
4	5	4	1
3	3	3	1
5	3	3	5

4	3	4	1
4	3	3	1
1	1	2	3
1	1	5	1
2	2	1	1
4	2	4	1
2	3	3	1
1	3	5	5
3	4	4	3
4	3	3	3
3	3	5	5
3	5	3	3
1	1	2	1
5	5	5	5
1	1	5	5
5	5	4	4
4	4	2	4
5	3	3	2
2	2	3	2
2	2	3	2
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	5	2	1
4	4	4	1
3	3	3	3
1	1	1	1
4	4	3	2
1	2	5	1
5	5	2	2
5	5	2	1
3	4	3	3
5	4	4	5
4	3	3	3
5	5	1	1
3	2	1	1
1	1	1	2
2	3	3	4
4	2	4	3
1	1	2	2
3	5	3	3
1	1	1	1
2	4	4	2
5	5	5	5
2		4	1
2	2	3	3
1	1	5	5
5	4	2	3

1	1	1	5
3	3	2	1
1	1	1	3
2	2	3	1
5	5	2	4
3	4	5	5
2	5	1	5
2	5	1	5
4	2	3	5
3	2	2	4
4	2	1	2
2	2	4	4
2	2	1	1
5	5	5	5
3	4	3	4
5	4	3	1
3	5	4	4
4	3	2	1
1	1	1	5
1	1	1	5
4	3	3	5
3	2	2	5
3	4	3	1
4	4	4	4
3	3	4	3
4	4	2	3
4	4	2	3
3	3	1	5
1	1	3	3
4	3	4	4
1	4	4	2
5	2	5	3
2	2	3	1
2	3	3	4
2	3	4	5
4	3	2	1
1	1	1	1
3	3	1	1
1	1	3	3
3	2	3	5
3	4	5	4
4	4	2	2
1	1	1	3
5	4	4	3
5	5	4	3
3	3	4	4
5	5	4	3

5	5	2	4
1	2	2	5
1	1	1	1
5	2	5	3
1	3	2	2
2	4	4	3
5	5	5	1
2	3	3	2
1	3	3	5
4	3	4	3
1	2	2	3
2	2	3	2
3	4	3	2
3	3	5	5
4	5	3	5
4	3	2	1
1	4	4	1
2	2	3	4
3	4	3	1
3	5	3	2
4	4	1	1
1	1	1	1
5	4	4	2
4	3	2	4
3	3	3	3
1	4	1	1
3	3	3	2
4	5	4	4
5	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
1	1	3	3
3	3	3	5
5	4	3	4
3	3	5	5
2	2	5	4
1	3	4	1
4	2	5	3
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1
4	4	4	4
2	5	5	2
3	4	1	1
2	2	5	3
1	2	1	4
5	5	2	1
3	2	4	4
2	1	2	5

4	2	5	4
1	5	1	4
1	1	2	3
3	3	3	2
2	4	3	4
5	3	5	5
1	3	2	3
5	5	5	5
2	3	5	4
1	1	1	5
1	1	1	1
1	1	3	3
3	4	1	2
2	3	3	4
5	3	2	3
1	1	3	4
5	5	1	1
1	1	3	3
1	3	4	2
1	2	3	5
		5	4
4	5	5	5
5	5	5	2
4	3	3	2
3	5	2	4
4	4	4	2
4	3	4	3
2	3	3	2
4	4	2	3
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	2
5	5	5	4
5	5	5	3
5	5	2	4
1	5	2	5
3	3	2	2
4	2	2	2
4	3	5	2
1	1	3	1
1	1	1	1
2	2	1	1
4	3	3	
5	4	3	4
1	1	3	1
5	5	4	4
5	5	5	1
5	4	3	5

1	1	1	1
1	3	5	5
1	1	5	5
3	1	2	4
4	4	2	2
5	5	5	5
1	2	2	1
4	5	1	1
4	4	3	2
4	3	3	4
1	1	1	1
2	4	3	5
1	1	1	1
5	5	5	5
5	5	5	5
5	5	3	4
5	5	5	5
2	2	2	2
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1
1	5	5	5
3	4	3	2
2	4	2	5
1	3	4	1
1	1	1	5
1	1	1	1
5	5	3	3
2	4	3	1
5	5	5	5
5	1	5	1
4	4	3	4
5	5	5	5
2	2	1	1
1	1	3	3
3	3	2	3
3	3	3	3
5	5	5	5
5	5	2	5
1	1	2	3
5	5	5	1
1	1	1	1
1	2	3	4
2	2	2	1
3	3	2	4
5	5	3	4
2	5	1	1
2	3	5	1

4	1	2	3
1	5	5	5
3	3	3	4
5	5	5	5
4	5	4	5
5	5	5	5
5	5	5	5
4	4	4	5
5	5	3	5
4	4	1	5
3	4	4	3
5	2	5	2
3	5	1	5
3	3	4	5
5	4	4	5
1	2	1	1
4	3	3	4
2	2	2	4
1	1	1	1
4	5	5	5
1	1	3	2
1	1	1	1
4	2	2	3
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	2
4	5	4	4
3	4	3	4
4	2	3	2
2	2	2	4
2	2	2	2
5	5	5	5
1	1	1	2
5	5	5	2
3	4	3	2
2	2	2	2
5	5	5	5
2	2	3	5
3	3	5	3
3	3	3	1
1	1	3	1
4	4	2	3
4	4	4	5
5	5	5	3
5	5	5	3
5	5	5	5
2	2	3	1
5	5	4	3

2	3	2	1
5	5	5	3
1	1	1	1
4	4	4	3
2	3	4	5
5	5	3	5
2	4	4	3
5	5	5	1
1	1	3	1
4	4		5
1	3	3	1
3	3	3	3
1	5	5	4
3	4	3	1
3	5	5	5
3	1	3	1
5	5	5	5
3	5	5	5
2	2	3	3
5	5	5	5
3	3	1	1
1	1	5	5
5	5	5	5
1	1	5	5
2	4	3	4
5	5	5	4
4	4	4	1
5	4	3	2
1	1	1	1
4	3	4	3
5	5	5	5
5	5	4	5
5	5	5	4
5	2	1	3
5	5	4	3
5	5	5	3
3	3	2	4
5	5	5	5
5	5	5	3
5	5	5	5
1	1	2	5
2	4	2	4
1	1	5	5
5	4	4	4
5	5	2	3
3	4	3	5
3	3	3	3

5	5	3	4
2	5	4	4
5	5	5	5
1	1	1	5
3	2	3	3
5	5	5	3
5	5	4	3
5	5	5	5
5	5	5	5
3	5	2	1
1	1	2	1
5	5	5	5
3	5	1	1
1	2	3	3
3	3	3	1
3	5	1	1
3	5	1	1
3	5	1	1
3	3	3	1
1	1	5	5
1	3	1	1
4	4	4	4
4	5	2	5
4	4	1	1
2	3	5	5
4	4	4	5
5	5	5	5
5	5	5	5
4	4	5	5
2	4	3	2
1	2	3	2
1	1	1	1
2	1	4	4
1	1	1	1
4	4	4	1
1	3	3	1
5	4	4	4
2	1	2	1
5	3	4	5
2	2	5	1
5	5	4	1
2	3	5	3
4	3	3	5
5	5	3	5
2	2	2	2
4	4	3	3
5	5	5	5

4	4	3	5
4	3	4	2
1	1	1	1
3	3	1	1
3	3	1	1
4	4	4	5
3	3	2	3
5	3	4	3
1	1	4	4
5	5	3	5
1	1	4	1
4	3	2	1
5	1	3	5
5	5	5	5
2	1	1	2
5	5	5	5
4	4	4	5
1	2	2	1
5	5	4	2
4	4	1	1
1	1	2	1
5	5	5	5
1	1	1	1
2	1	3	5
1	1	3	5
1	1	4	3
2	2	3	2
2	3	3	4
3	3	1	1
2	2	4	3
2	4	2	3
5	5	5	1
3	3	1	2
1	1	1	1
3	3	1	1
5	5	4	3
3	2	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
5	5	5	5
5	5	5	5
1	1	1	3
4	4	5	4
5	4	1	3
3	3	3	3

3	5	1	1
5	5	3	3
1	1	3	4
2	2	2	2
1	1	1	1
5	5	5	1
1	1	1	1
4	5	4	5
2	3	4	2
4	4	4	4
2	2	2	2
4	4	3	2
4	4	4	4
2	3	2	2
1	5	3	3
5	4	1	2
4	4	5	2
1	1	1	
5	5	2	2
4	4	5	3
3	3	1	3
3	3	1	3
1	1	5	4
1	1	1	1
4	4	4	5
1	1	1	1
2	1	3	2
2	2	2	5
2	2	2	3
3	3	3	3
5	3	4	4
1	1	1	1
2	2	3	1
3	3	5	4
3	3	5	3
4	3	4	4
5	5	5	5
5	5	5	5
4	4	4	2
2	2	2	3
2	2	2	5
1	1	1	1
3	3	3	1
5	5	5	5
3	3	4	3
4	5	5	5
2	3	2	1

5	5	5	5
3	4	2	1
3	3	4	4
3	5	4	4
3	3	3	1
3	3	2	2
1	1	5	5
1	1	2	2
3	3	4	4
4	4	3	3
5	5	5	3
4	3	5	3
3	3	2	2
3	3	2	2
5	5	5	5
3	2	2	3
2	3	2	1
1	4	3	3
5	4	2	1
5	5	5	5
5	1	5	3
1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1
4	4	3	4
2	1	2	1
2	2	4	2
3	1	3	1
4	5	5	5
4	4	5	4
3	5	1	2

Comments on Butterworth ASP	Comments on Southtown ASP	Comments on Creston ASP
Improvements for people vs cars would be a huge help in this area. More housing density needed!	Stop installing parking meters if you are not investing. Stop taxation of clients from businesses whose start up you did not support!	Increased housing density please! Support strengthening the business districts
		I would like protected bike lanes down Plainfield. If we had more protected bike lanes to key areas like downtown, millennium park, etc. We would go out more and contribute to the economy more. I don't care as much about design guidelines if they aren't cost prohibitive to potential businesses
This is a mixed use space - very industrial but neighborhoods that are primarily low income housing. Investment in cleaning up and beautifying this space shows our care and investment for this neighborhood.		
Please connect Oxford trail with Seward and/or Turner bikeway with safe lanes and signs		
Important to reroute heavy trucks away from Butterworth. Provide more opportunities to provide bike paths.	Agree strategies to prevent gentrification are important	Great neighborhood. Increasing pedestrian pathways would greatly improve access. Hopefully would attract new businesses
		Any discussion around river access?
		Every neighborhood/ward should have a community center for kids: tutors, structured activities, walking distance. Our kids need stuff to do.
Agreed - should be safer for cyclists. So odd given the proximity at GVSU and millennium park		
If housing is the main issue, it will be great to create affordable housing that includes apartment buildings and houses so low income people can live in more decent areas. Parking can be minimized to create more open zones. What about "meeting areas"/community areas in which we can build community among neighbors, garden community centers, work out areas too.		
Please do not allow more surface parking (especially by the new office buildings on Monroe). Need more high quality, but affordable housing	Need more affordable but high quality housing. There needs to be more house inspections of rental housing.	Restaurants along the river. Love riverside park, and it seems well used.
Agree with comments on board	Please figure out where Adams Park residents will go before you tear apartments down. Please hold Amplify GR accountable to avoid displacing residents	Agree with comments on board, especially re Leonard and Plainfield intersection
I strongly support the emphasis on bicycle transportation on Butterworth and Wealthy, strongly support reuse of Padnos site		Strongly support activation of Plainfield. A protected bike lane along Plainfield is essential. Increased transit frequency (10 min) along Plainfield is essential for decreasing automobile usage and parking space
	Affordable housing needed, keep Mulick Park School open	
		Intersection at Plainfield/Division/Leonard is horrible. Needs fixed for ped/cars/bikes/everybody
		Please fix Leonard/Plainfield intersection! It's very dangerous, even with a car. As a cyclist I've almost been hit nearly every time I've biked through

<p>Higher density housing in the middle of Butterworth corridor with retail of greater scale to east and lesser scale to west. Focus on reducing anticipated traffic congestion as a result of anticipated destination venues - amphitheater, zoo expansion, soccer field, GVSU growth. And focus on parking solutions as it likely will be taken up by visitors. Driver and semi traffic at Butterworth no a truck route. Develop zoning code so secondary business uses (doctors office, real estate, offices, etc.) don't need SLU. Cluster these uses (not interspersed with retail</p>		
		<p>The Plainfield corridor, especially the main corners, could start growing taller with mixed use buildings. The business and residential buildings have grown organically over such a long time the style of the neighborhood is eclectic. That is what makes it great</p> <p>I love creston! Covered transit stops would be great.</p>
		<p>Connecting the Creston and Cheshire business districts in a meaningful manner would go along way for the business and residents - improving access to businesses and requiring less car trips. Protected bike lanes at least but more permanent infrastructure would be nice. More connectivity between Creston and downtown along Monroe or Division would be nice. Upzoning, if it is not happening city-wide, should be prioritized in Creston - we have the "bones" and culture that people would like to live near, now we just need the rules to allow for houses and businesses to be built by right, without parking requirements.</p>
	<p>Many of the neighborhoods in this area were originally developed with neighborhood stores and buildings that directly abbut the street. This style of commercial development should be preserved and encouraged.</p>	
<p>looked for this info and only found presentation boards with comments from other gatherings. Wealthy is not a 'neighborhood' street and should be given emphasis for truck traffic, arterial, rather than cyclist use. Butterworth is more neighborhood oriented.</p>		
<p>Prioritize green space over zoo parking lots at John Ball Park. The zoo has plenty of places it can park and plenty of residents ready to help with alternative solutions if the zoo would just listen.</p>		
		<p>Intersection at Plainfield and Leonard should be high priority. Pretty unsafe for drivers and pedestrians. Confusing for out-of-towners</p>
		<p>I think this neighborhood is so unique because it has a wide variety of different commercial centers, mixed with residential and I would like to keep that</p>
	<p>South side neighborhoods are neglected in terms of bicycle and pedestrian safety. I want to feel connected to the rest of the city without needing a car.</p>	
		<p>Proud of my neighbors' feedback.</p>

<p>Improving the river front would be great. It should be accessible to all people.</p> <p>Car/truck traffic is becoming an issue, and new developments are going to increase that. A comprehensive look at traffic needs to be done. Parking is going to be an issue with the amphitheater, and the zoo is making parking a problem. Coordinating with shuttles, maybe with GVSU and the Rapid will be important. The Butterworth dump has potential for parking if the EPA and the management group allow it. There have been similar projects approved by the EPA.</p> <p>Lack of public restrooms is an issue in the neighborhood.</p>		
		I love creston! Covered transit stops would be great.
<p>Respect for traditional neighborhoods. Where people can have a driveway & small yard for space for a family. I am more concerned with crime & safety in all neighborhoods</p>		
<p>Agree with need t reroute heavy truck traffic. Need to protect Bike traffic as there is alot of Bike trails that need appropriate access in area.</p>		
		I LOVE how Creston is getting built up. I am excited to see all of the new opportunities for businesses who will want to move in once the apartment complexes are finished.
<p>These planning sessions include many people who claim to care about diversity, inclusion, and equity and yet very rarely actually represent the community they are making plans for. They are more representative of the individual/s that have gentrified these areas making them less affordable to the people who were previously living in this area. This meeting was a stark reminder of this. Having panel discussions are great but if itâ€™s always people who donâ€™t look like the community making decisions for the community, all of this is null and void.</p>		
<p>One major nuisance is that access to/from the east is rather limited - only fulton, wealthy, and pearl cross both the river and 131, and the traffic at those bottlenecks makes it difficult to get across by car or bus (since the busses run in mixed traffic).</p> <p>This makes some sense.</p>		
		The Leonard and Plainfield intersection is one I frequent by bike and on-foot quite often. It is very hostile to anyone outside of a car. I also ride up Plainfield by bike quite often and would like to see the bike lanes made protected and continuous.
<p>I believe the potential re construction of the areas mentioned in the Butterworth area are great. This area has tons of potential not only as a great neighborhood hub but also due to its close walkable proximity to downtown.</p>		
	Build houses we can actually own.	

These planning sessions include many people who claim to care about diversity, inclusion, and equity and yet very rarely actually represent the community they are making plans for. They are more representative of the individual/s that have gentrified these areas making them less affordable to the people who were previously living in this area. This meeting was a stark reminder of this. Having panel discussions are great but if it's always people who don't look like the community making decisions for the community, all of this is null and void.		
Density, sustainable transportation, affordable housing, great schools.		
	Main streets need protected bike lanes or alternative routes need to be available. Having bike removing redundant car interactions and replacing it with a bike only crossing could provide a safe alternative without the cost of protective lanes.	
Definely would like to see a portion of electricity sales maybe go back to beautification of this Oxford trails area There is so much potential !!		
	Many of the neighborhoods in this area were originally developed with neighborhood stores and buildings that directly abbut the street. This style of commercial development should be preserved and encouraged.	
	Protected bike lanes.for busy roads, zoo traffic directed to wealthy/Butterworth entrance instead of using Lane	
	I live in this community and my biggest concern is the gentrification that is happening. White money in and causing an increase in property riders and soon the older residents is being pushed out because of the rise in taxes as the property value increases	
Wealthy St - don't put bike lanes on Wealthy. Put them on the streets on eitther side and teach bikers to use them - much safer on streets with less traffic. Use Padnos area for a mix of low and middle income, singk=le and multitenant houses and retail	Create a tool kit that shows people living in the area, a path to home ownership. Start with training lids in high school, single moms, etc. Develop partnerships of financers, real estate, churches, and community organizations to make it happen. Tools and education/training and mentorship when needed	I liked all the ideas for this area. Can the diversity (income, race, lifestyle, etc.) be increased?
The statement should be that it should be nearly guaranteed safety for cyclists and pedestrians, use speed bums at intersections	Homelessness should only be addressed by increasing wraparound services and looking and funding more upstream solutions to prevent homelessness. Guarantee pedestrian and cyclist safety with wider sidewalks and barrier protected bike lanes	Same here as Southtown
Repurpose old manufacturing buildings for commercial and housing		Same as Butterworth - repurpose old manufacturing buildings for manufacturing, business and housing. Add housing on bus line
	Parking is very important/the price of ret more affordable better relations with the police officer in this area	
		Safe streets for all users. Make it fair, car drivers must share the roads. Vehicles on MLK near Eastern drive insanely fast because the road allows them to
More green space, transit accessibility, and affordable efficient housing	Same	Same
This is a neighborhood that has some potential for residential, greenspace and work hubs. Good to ha ve improved transportation alternative options - bike lanes, bus routes, etc.	This is the closest to where I live and I'm eager to see ongoing improvements to my neighborhood and surrounding communities. I appreciate opportunities for different housing (affordable) and expanded pedestrian safety	Such a vibrant neck of the woods and these improvements will only have a psitive impact

		Be creative with existing buildings. I think Madison Church turned some of their extra space into housing units. The CRC headquarters is for sale and would be a great location for this
Always improve bike and walking accessibility		How can we home the homeless? So that they are not perpetually displaced
	Proritize investment in Franklin and Eastern business district	Give more options for affordable housing for people who don't necessarily fall into "low income" but still can't afford to rent/buy
	As a historically underinvested area, development for this area should focus on access and affordability surrounding business districts are booming providing connections across the 3rd ward with the right developments. More mixed use (ground floor retail with dwellings adove)	
There is a lot of focus on pedestrian and cyclists. For all 3 areas maybe the focus is on the wrong thing		Plainfield, the street is just terrible to drive in
	Connect all bike lanes city-wide. Enforce truck route/no trucks ordinance. I have seen a steady increase in heavy truck traffic (dump truck, double bottom trailer, semi trucks) on streets in residential areas - these streets are not designated on a truck route	
I enjoyed the discussions re a more robust transit sstem that will encourage people to bike/walk places out of traffic, connecting home to fun, beautifully		
Thank god you are trying to protect that neighborhood		
	Focus on development without displacement	
Place a cap on rent, so rentals are affordable	Place a cap on rent, so rentals are affordable	Place a cap on rent, so rentals are affordable
	More programs so that businesses sustaian. More variety of businesses. Walk to bar/grill within my neighborhood	
The ability to reach millennial park by multiple walkable and bikeable routes is important. Also, the large electric/power plant is very loud and aesthetically cold and unpleasing, making the neighborhood less appealing		Riverside Park floods a lot. Are there any solutions to this problem?
Yes to all the comments about making the area more bikeable. I don't live there but frequently move through the neighborhood and walking/biking safety is definitely a concern	Green space! And zoning so residences aren't by factories	BIG YES to cyclist and pedestrian safety on Plainfield and elsewhere in Creston
	I love the southside i believe we need to add some positive features there or everywhere for that matter. More foliage to promote clean air also affirmation billboards to help our people who having a hard time mentally.	
		Building/increasing density on Plainfield just makes sense. A roundabout at Knapp/Plainfield would be interesting! It's not addressed in the ASP, but I would also like to see some of the homes on Plainfield that are situated directly between businesses rezoned to be turned into places. A cafe inside an old house? Sounds great!
		I believe itâ€™s important to continue to better our living situation overall together and also continue to foster our relationship with nature as well and a flourishing community. One that has safety in mind and can strive to improve not just the lives of everyone but the longevity of the world as well.

		This neighborhood is located so close and conveniently to downtown and also hosts a great main street with business and provides the city a great opportunity to connect this neighborhood with transit and build much higher density homes to make it a very peaceful, yet dense and walkable area for residents. It would be great to see some sort of dedicated bus lanes that connect this neighborhood to downtown or other vital commercial areas, as well as have an expansive network of bike lanes so that commuting on bike is safe and easy for all residents, including families and elderly residents alike.
Butterworth has high traffic areas that need to support the highest level of off-freeway traffic for medical, educational and commercial downtown access.		
Needs safer biking and walking conditions. Add more small businesses, especially restaurants or other services those working in the area would use. We need more diverse options.		
More density, public transit, and bike facilities, please		
Um, these are our only choices? West Side Fulton, Lake, Butterworth, Seward, the main streets can stand to have more pop up apts lining the street and I don't care if they be modern looking. If JBP Zoo wants parking, make them build affordable housing on stilts above a surface lot or better yet a parking garage. Hey here's an idea - give businesses like the DQ or QuiknEZ incentives to replace their existing building with multi use apts. They can keep doing business there with apt spaces above. Allow surface and parking for the business under the apt floors. Butterworth Street is so dangerous for everyone- the angle, the cars parked too close to corners the lack of turn abouts or actual 4 way stops and inconsistency on that from one intersection to the next...		
		Creston is a wonderful neighborhood that has not been ruined by the ill-advised development of the sixties and seventies, but could still be enhanced by improvement of its main street (wider sidewalks, bike lanes, trees, etc) and by sensitive infill development of the residential area (missing middle housing, etc).
Padnos should be relocated/reused. Almost everyone seems comfortable with all middle housing so that should become by right	While some people oppose mixed use and apartments, those are necessary to a thriving neighborhood this close to downtown. How can you address homelessness without building apartments	Redevelop the Kent Country Club. It should serve everyone, not just the wealthy. Townhomes should be by right. Issues with parking should be ignored
I like that bicyclist safety is a priority for both Wealthy and Butterworth. I can see why trucks prefer Butterworth Ave to the bumpy and windy road conditions of Wealthy. Wealthy has blind spots for pedestrians and drivers in my experience. Cleanliness is important	Living spaces should also come with green spaces for people to exist outside of their homes. Green spaces can also be made more friendly to the unhoused population, with pavillion and bench designs	I'm all for increasing bike and pedestrian safety :) Adding more stores and better visibility should encourage more pedestrian traffic and safety
Remove on street parking to improve pedestrian or bicycle safety and infrastructure	Add more bicycle facilities, secure parking for bikes and protected bike lanes to encourage more use	Ad protected bike lanes along Plainfield to improve walkability and activate the street to encourage more businesses to fill vacancies
	Convert Madison nd Eastern to one way boulevards. Increase housing density and improve neighborhood business districts to be more pedestrian friendly	
Would love to see at least 1 public restroom (for all: cyclers, walkers, homeless, visitors, residents, etc.) on the west side!		Plainfield needs a lot of work to make it safe to walk and bike. Glad to see that mentioned several times
Walkable communities are important with safe like paths and parks	Same as above	Same as above

		Creston really need to activate their "downtown" area. Make it a desirable place to visit, and walk around. More connected to the different things they offer in the area.
		Important to focus on putting people first. Additionally, neighborhood character is important. We can still address housing issues while keeping an architectural theme in mind
If I would improve one thing in GR, I would improve public transit. The bus system works but it is not efficient or accessible for most individuals. In addition, GR is not a bikeable city. Though bike lanes exist, they are not enforced, making it unsafe for bikers to commute or even ride leisurely	To address the increase of homeless population on Wealthy, increase affordable housing units or add a new emergency shelter. The population of individuals experiencing homelessness is growing. The current shelter do not have the capacity to effectively help these individuals	
I often bike on Butterworth and Wealthy, even Wealthy as it meets 131st. Would love to see better non-car infrastructure including protected bike lanes and slowed car traffic. Also, make the connection to Millennium Park safer.	Allow for missing middle housing by removing single family zoning exclusive. By right duplexes.	No roundabouts. Allow for increased heights and remove all setback requirements. Remove parking requirements
Ideal area for use for solar energy fields, large-scale pollinator gardens, and increasing urban forestry. Some lots could also be used for warehousing a food hub/distribution center for local agri-business and food entrepreneurship	Any lots that are not compatible for new residential due to pitch should be considered for urban agriculture or native landscapes (pollinator gardens) that are owned by neighborhood associations or BIPOC neighbors	
Create a cultural center with housing mixed		
I think making Butterworth safer for cyclists and pedestrians is particularly important, since a large chunk of it is residential	I am a bit concerned about where the thought of community hubs changing come into play. The term "change" seems too vague. Is it talking about gentrification, building missing middle housing, or something else? I don't really know what to think	Traffic calming can definitely help create a more pleasant environment for pedestrians and cyclists. Road (?) seem like a pretty good idea here.
Haven't seen these - but support increased density in housing - adding urban agriculture/community gardens as possible, reduced mowing in parks		
Increase housing density by any means possible		
		There are still many unused storefronts that make the neighborhood feel seedy. Some of the buildings need updating.
Agree with the engagement board.		
		I wish the city would provide this service for all areas that would like to have this type of plan.
	Stop gentrifying my neighborhood! It's already expensive as it is and it's hard to make ends meet in this town.	
Don't gentrify my neighborhood. Stop any plans with narrowing wealthy street. Why does the city never listen to us? They just assume that after we stop sending emails after 6 months, then everything is fine.		
	Housing and mixed use development will revitalize much of this area. Add some transit oriented development in here and you have an economic utopia. We need more housing in this area very badly. People are worried about the effects of gentrification in this area, especially BIPOC communities, but those same people are getting priced out of their homes as we speak. Gentrification is here. We can either benefit from it or fall to it, and this area is falling.	

		I would love to see more businesses interspersed throughout the community. This clearly was the norm in previous eras, when you look at the architecture. There are a few of these now (for example, Five Star Window Coatings on the corner of Ann St and Coit Ave, and Wing Kingz on the corner of Sweet St and Diamond Ave), but we need more! If we're going to successfully reduce the number of cars in neighborhoods, we need to increase the number of corner stores so people can walk to get their necessities. This means: grocery stores, produce stores / farmstands, butcher shops, pharmacies, dry cleaners, banks, medical offices, day care centers, etc. Creston has a lot of vacant businesses. Can't something be done to lure businesses to these buildings?
	I don't understand that "Parking" item on the previous step, "how important is parking" to neighborhood development, with the comment about how it takes away yard space. Does answering "important" mean "it's important to me that parking doesn't take away yard space" or does it mean "it's important that there's more parking"??	
	Safety, neighborhood pride and neighborhood improvement is crucial to the improvement of people's progress and the cities progress as a whole.	
Increase density in entire Butterworth area. Make it a high density zone with any an all sizes of housing allowed. Even giving some kind of bonuses for higher density buildings		
	Comment for all 4 directional quadrants of the city: I would like to see a community farm in each quadrant with both gardens and livestock for the food benefit of the residents that participate in it's operation.	
		I like transit oriented development. I like a variety of homes, not just single family homes. I support making brownstone homes legal. I support making it legal to build a coffee shop in a LDR area. I support mixed use development. I want a vibrant and walk-able city, with abundant housing and a diverse economy. Having abundant housing means (1) the neighborhoods must accept change and (2) we must allow the full diversity of housing types to be constructed without being beleaguered by bureaucratic nonsense.

		<p>Ann and Leonard river crossing is a death trap unless you are driving. This, like all the river crossing roads, can benefit from the suggested layout GR Bike Coalition/StrongTowns have shared (one lane each direction, center overflow lane, and separated bike/ped lane on the sides). Plainfield and Knapp and Ann and Leonard are generally car-centric with very little space for cyclists. The fact that the Kent County Club occupies such a massive footprint limits any pedestrian/bike friendly access thru this part of the neighborhood, which impacts the businesses north of Knapp on Plainfield as walkability from center of Creston is limited.</p> <p>Allow ACTUALLY AFFORDABLE housing in this neighborhood, as it currently is poached by large developers and slumlords for college student housing (which are either low quality homes packed full of students, or modern developments that are not affordable). The Coit/Plainfield area has 2+ developments and I highly, highly doubt they will be less than \$1200 for a studio apartment, driving up prices around this area. People are priced out of this area constantly, so this needs to be monitored. Additionally, developers are buying homes in this area at rapid rates. I have lost 5 bids on homes to cash offers from out-of-state companies that immediately list them at over 2x the mortgage I would have paid. This removes my changes as a first time home buyer, wishing to use as my primary residence, to put roots in GR after moving here.</p>
		<p>I want to see Grand Rapids grow into a city where I can sell my car and better connect with my local community. Our destruction of cities as part of the 1960's "Urban Renewal" has devastated communities. It's time we push back and build our neighborhoods for the people the reside in them. More housing, local restaurants, public spaces, and dedicated bike/transit infrastructure will all assist in achieving that goal.</p>
I love my neighborhood! Would love to see improved public transportation so fewer cars were needed in my area		
	I support the development of high-density and mixed-use buildings without parking minimums anywhere in the area.	
		<p>Stop destroying the typical single family dwellings and character of single family home with smaller, taller homes that draw more people in less space causing tons of other issues like parking, crime, congestion, noise etc.</p>
	<p>Improvements to alternate-mode transportation infrastructure is critical to moving toward the 15-minute community in Southtown neighborhoods. Less on street parking, more bus, bike (protected bike lanes>>>striping) and sidewalk improvements are needed.</p> <p>Increasing/improving green & blue spaces is also something that will benefit the community; having our large parks (e.g. Garfield Park) is great, but not entirely accessible to the whole community. It would be great to see more pocket parks, improved streetscaping and trail systems that connect neighborhoods & business districts.</p>	
All neighborhoods		

<p>Unless its a historic neighborhood like Heritage Hill or perhaps a few select streets that have an agreed historic relevancy, most of the city should not have so many restrictions</p>		
		<p>The Creston Neighborhood is experiencing a boom in both economic and residential expansion but there are pockets that require attention, especially the area above Knapp on Plainfield. There are many abandoned storefronts and the storefronts that do exist, do not reflect the needs of the neighborhood. I would like to see more recreation, and more activities for the younger population that exists in the community.</p>
	<p>As for neighborhood character, I think it's wonderful if a skilled architect can create something interesting and new--in cases like this, let them make something that isn't "compatible" with the neighborhood. But I don't want to see poorly designed, poor quality buildings put up, regardless of whether they can somehow mimic the character of the neighborhood. The Mid-Century business photo example (building with parking lot in front) is NOT character I wish to maintain. That is horrid and can be improved upon greatly.</p> <p>Also, if a duplex or quadplex is well-managed and well-maintained, with respect for the neighbors, I don't really care where they go. But so many are not. Can something be done to make a multi-family not drag down the rest of the neighborhood?</p> <p>In modern-era neighborhoods, we need to improve upon connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists with sidewalk cut-throughs to make it more convenient and easier to avoid busy streets.</p>	
	<p>Comments apply to most neighborhoods</p>	
<p>There are so many new apartment buildings in the area and as such more crime. I don't appreciate a neighborhood I've lived in for 22 years being overran by a lot of people who don't care about speed limits, littering, noise pollution etc.</p>		
		<p>Creston seems to finally be on the move.</p>
<p>What is "ASP"? Why do you assume members of the general public are experts in local urban planning jargon? Why was it so hard to spell out "ASP" and add a comment like "(neighborhood plan that we're focussing on in this master plan update)"? When will you stop using the horrible and redundant term "Area Specific Plan" and just say "Neighborhood Plan" and/or "Neighborhood Business District Plan"? Why just these 3 neighborhoods in this survey? By the way, all the questions on the previous page were confusing and the data shouldn't be used. For example, in my view, parking is important because REQUIRING lots of it hurts the character of my neighborhood, and parking is also important because NOT REQUIRING it protects the character of my neighborhood.</p>		
<p>Any help in removing vehicles traffic would be much appreciated. This way people could walk and enjoy the amenities offered in the area.</p>		
		<p>The Creston neighborhood is uniquely poised to develop into a thriving urban community thanks to having several busy transportation corridors that all have space to add high density development that compliments and diversifies the existing neighborhoods.</p>

Don't remove parking and don't narrow roadways. Wealthy street is an important east and west road. We don't need to narrow every road in the city. Stop doing that.		
Do not make this area like downtown. This is a great area that has various land uses, and is a great place to work for those that commute by car. Do not limit their ability to drive by removing traffic lanes, parking, or making the road width very narrow. Be respectful of those that drive and work in your community and pay income tax!		
	Affordability is so critical right now. All of our housing assessments (taxes) are going up and values are skyrocketing which is really hard for families who don't have the generational wealth or access to opportunity to stay in their homes. Everyone is being priced out or lured away by the possibility of selling. My house in Eastown has nearly quadrupled in value since I moved in and I really struggle with knowing how to "refute" or "dispute" the tax assessments.	
Parking is always going to be an issue. Housing is always going to be an issue. One is more important than the other. People need housing.		
ASP is jargon, please be clear. I live in Heritage Hill, which is not on your drop down list.		
		Stop removing parking spaces in roads and businesses. Do not narrow roads or take away travel lanes. Some of us use a car to get to places of employment, which is far from home. Us commuters pay taxes for the roads we drive on and shouldn't be punished for simply going to work and paying city income tax. Not all small towns have same employment opportunities like Grand Rapids, so we drive to get to work. Doesn't make us bad people.
	Thank you for providing this opportunity to give input.	
		I live in Heritage Hill- the neighborhood comment were related to that, but other comments apply to Creston
	The business district on Eastern between Burton and Hall could benefit from some revitalization work. I'd love to see a dine-in restaurant or a cafe in that area.	
		Installation of the bright, hazardous, glaring LED streetlamps were a big mistake by the city. Numerous complaints were registered at the inception of the installation but the city ignored ALL citizen concerns. All the LED streetlamps should go back to LPS (low-pressure sodium) lights, or if this is impossible, the LED lights should be no higher than 2700 Kelvin. This was all well known in scientific literature well before installation of these hazardous LED lights, yet Grand Rapids officials stupidly and arrogantly ignored all scientific and citizens concerns. Given the debacle of LED streetlamps and the ridiculously hideous 5G towers plastered all over the city, modern Grand Rapids officials have managed to create a dystopian hellscape. Add in the planned HUGE LED BILLBOARDS and it's truly clown-world in Grand Rapids.
	I live in Heritage Hill	
I live in Heritage Hill, so I believe this would be the closest area to me.		

I kindly request that the City work directly with Heritage Hill as a state-recognized historic area. In addition, this survey must be modified. Not all areas of Grand Rapids are made the same. Butterworth, Creston and Southtown have their own ethos and should have the right to better inform the City on their unique communities.		
	I live in heritage hill close to ward 3.	
	I live in heritage hill close to ward 3.	
	I live in heritage hill close to ward 3.	
	I live in heritage hill close to ward 3.	
Division avenue is important. Stop narrowing the road, along with other major roads, like Franklin.		
		Creston is in the perfect location to develop as a dense and walkable community.
Extend the boundaries all the way to Garfield (vs. east side of Marion). Keep bike lanes clean and don't randomly end them! (comment from butterworths area notes), would love to see this!		
	more density	more density
I lived on Gold SW between Butterworth and Watson for many years. The college Grand Valley has changed the dynamics of the neighborhood over the past 25 years		
I live in near West side, therefore I can not make educated comments on other neighborhood needs.		
Is Padnos going to sell to the city or a developer? How do you propose implementing a plan when Padnos owns the area? Plus who would want to live in an apartment or condo right by Exodus place and a major homeless thoroughfare?		
		I'm unsure that my answers for the previous section reflect my actual thoughts. My preference is for neighborhoods with architectural variety. I dislike the trend in new developments for all the buildings to look the same. I think variety is important and goes a long way to helping a neighborhood develop its own character. I do not regulations that force all the buildings to look the same.
	more development needed	
I dont understand this		
	I feel that no. Matter the location, no new development should exceed the demographics of the neighborhood surrounding it. If all of the historic homes of the area are 2 story duplexes then match that. If they are 1-1/2 story homes, all future construction should match. No new construction should stick out like a sore thumb. It will ruin the quaintness of each neighborhood vibe.	
N/A		
We need a metro downtown through east town and west side.		
	I live in Alger heights and walk to as many businesses as possible. I use the bus to get downtown and would love an option to bus to the airport when needed. Bike infrastructure would be nice to make more places bike friendly.	

Not sure what ASP stands for. And I'm not commenting for a particular area, I'm commenting for all GR areas.		
The NW side of Grand Rapids has already been severely compromised with the US-131 project from many years ago.		
*This survey should be remade. It does not clarify if higher or lower numbers are for or against the point being made. More than once, the example image contradicts the question at hand.		
*Finding parking is incredibly hard. Most meters are bagged. Too many loading zones, fire hydrants (though reasonable), driveways, etc. In the downtown area. Money is a barrier for paid parking lots and makes public events and normal downtown ventures much harder. Maybe expand dash routes closer to neighborhood junctions. Like a Bellknap Park or Highland Park pick up. Or an abandon lot that can be repurposed. I suggest looking at made parking lots in Lacey Washington that are right off the highway exits. Those buses run through multiple cities and back as well as connect to train routes.		
	I live in heritage hill.	
	The Southtown Neighborhoods (Baxter and South Hills, specifically) need a legitimate grocer to be a vibrant and livable community. The Wealthy Market is not satisfactory for a neighborhood of this size, and as a liquor store with some grocery items, barely prevents the area from being a food desert. A walkable, full service grocer like the Bridge Street Market would be a major asset to the area. I would also love to see more placemaking efforts south of Wealthy along Eastern, Charles, Henry and Diamond. Visitors and locals are drawn to the Wealthy Street corridor, but the immediate surrounding areas could use a boost to entice folks to meander down a side street, take their coffee and pastry to a park bench, and feel happy to park further away from the Wealthy Street bustle and walk through the neighborhoods.	
		We also need a food hub with an incubator kitchen, incubator business startups, training programs, and events that support and connect local agriculture, including urban agriculture and community gardens, with schools, the community, grocery stores, hospitals, etc.
		Plainfield Ave NE: Please change the speed limit on Plainfield Ave NE between Three Mile and Knapp Street NE from 30 mph to 25 mph. The average speed of drivers on Plainfield is at least 40 mph through the business districts, high speeding vehicle traffic creates a scary walking environment.
		Creston needs much more housing choice and diversity. There are too many expensive single family homes that most people can no longer afford. Creston needs more ADUs and small apartments so that singles can actually afford the rent without having to take on 2 or 3 roommates.
NA		
I would love for GR to have more plants and trees and green spaces as well as thridplaces that your can exist in for free. I would enojoy more community gardens, and lawns without any grass.		
		I'm commenting on all areas, but I live in Creston.

		Force Realty Predators to re-develop existing buildings: the Baker Furniture Building and the old Van Belken Library two prime examples. These predatory realty companies are allowing these buildings to rot so they can justify tearing them down (ie, Charley Crab). Quadruple the taxes on these owners of the buildings unless they are re-developed to something contributing to the community.
		Force Realty Predators to re-develop existing buildings: the Baker Furniture Building and the old Van Belken Library two prime examples. These predatory realty companies are allowing these buildings to rot so they can justify tearing them down (ie, Charley Crab). Quadruple the taxes on these owners of the buildings unless they are re-developed to something contributing to the community.
		Creston needs more pedestrian and bicycle safety infrastructure.
This area has so much potential for more density!		
		Thank you for offering a survey to express my opinions.
		In the spirit of keeping Creston Funky - all new businesses should be required to paint a mural on a portion of their building by a local Grand Rapids artist.
		Really picking up as a neighborhood for families with young children. Let's keep that momentum going!
Thank you for including my opinions. Hope to hear of getting river access for kayaks		
	Burton/Plymouth - Burton/Breton area (Indian Village neighborhood)	
	Thank you for including my opinions. Hope to hear of getting river access for kayaks	
		Dedicated and protected bike lanes on Coit Ave would be great! As would making the main business strip friendlier to pedestrians and cyclists (instead of cars).
	More incremental development and multi-modal transportation options.	
	Drivers have no education on using these mini roundabouts that are everywhere. Hall and division for a long time was known for gangs and drugs same with Franklin and eastern. Hall and Madison or even Kalamazoo are more community hubs esp hall and Madison has library line up and a big parking lot that gets used. Also huge issue with drivers driving in bike lanes both just going down the street (Kalamazoo) and entering into to create a right turn lane as happens with hall and eastern	