



# CITY OF BETTENDORF, IA 2010

Report of Open-ended Question

**C O N T E N T S**

Survey Background..... 1  
 About The National Citizen Survey™ ..... 1

Understanding the Results ..... 2  
 About Closed-ended and Open-ended Questions ..... 2  
 Verbatims..... 2

Verbatim Responses to Open-ended Questions ..... 4  
 Please explain why you support or oppose the City's efforts to increase non-motorized transportation to handle traffic: ..... 4  
     Support: safety of pedestrians/bicyclists ..... 4  
     Support: health, exercise, activity ..... 5  
     Support: environmental reasons, support alternative transportation, decreased fuel use..... 6  
     Oppose: financial/budget/tax reasons, users (cyclists) should pay, more important priorities for spending ..... 7  
     Oppose: existing paths and sidewalks are adequate, would not use, insufficient need ..... 9  
     Support: more would use paths, prefer biking/walking, enjoyment..... 10  
     Oppose: inconvenience to motorists, impact on traffic, focus on maintaining roads for motorists ..... 11  
     Support: make community more attractive, appealing to younger people, modernizing city ..... 12  
     Oppose: for safety reasons, bicycles and cars do not mix ..... 13  
     Support: increased convenience of pedestrian and bicycle travel, path/sidewalk connections/network ..... 13  
     Support: general support, think it's a good idea ..... 14  
     Don't know/No opinion ..... 14  
     Other ..... 15

## **SURVEY BACKGROUND**

### **ABOUT THE NATIONAL CITIZEN SURVEY™**

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS™) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA).

The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality survey methods and comparable results across The National Citizen Survey™ jurisdictions. Participating households are selected at random and the household member who responds is selected without bias. Multiple mailings give each household more than one chance to participate with self-addressed and postage paid envelopes. Results are statistically weighted to reflect the proper demographic composition of the entire community.

The National Citizen Survey™ customized for this jurisdiction was developed in close cooperation with local jurisdiction staff. The City of Bettendorf staff selected items from a menu of questions about services and community problems; they defined the jurisdiction boundaries NRC used for sampling; and they provided the appropriate letterhead and signatures for mailings. City of Bettendorf staff also determined local interest in a variety of add-on options to The National Citizen Survey™ Basic Service.

## UNDERSTANDING THE RESULTS

### ABOUT CLOSED-ENDED AND OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Questions can either be asked in a closed-ended or open-ended manner. A closed-ended question is one where a set of response options is listed on the survey. Those taking the survey respond to each option listed. Open-ended questions have no answer choices from which respondents select their response. Instead, respondents must “create” their own answers and state them in their own words. The verbatim responses are categorized by topic area using codes. An “other” category is used for responses falling outside the coded categories. In general, a code is assigned when at least 5-10% of responses will fit the code.

Advantages of an open-ended question include:

- Responses are not prompted, allowing respondents to provide answers that are not anticipated or well known.
- This type of question tends to capture response options that come to mind most quickly.
- The final result can be richer, since verbatim responses are included in an appendix, giving you and others a chance to “hear” the voice of respondents in their own words.
- There is a smaller risk of missing important dimensions.

### VERBATIMS

Respondents were asked to record their opinions about Bettendorf in the following question:

- Please explain why you support or oppose the City's efforts to increase non-motorized transportation to handle traffic:

The verbatim responses were categorized by topic area and those topics are reported in the following table with the percent of responses given in each category. Because some comments from residents covered more than a single topic, each topic mentioned by a resident was categorized and counted for the table below. Those verbatim responses are grouped by the first topic listed in each comment whenever a respondent mentioned more than a single topic. Verbatim comments that contain more than one topic nevertheless appear only once (in the category of the first topic listed), however the analysis in the table below counts each of the topic areas given by all respondents regardless where those topics appeared in the comment.

Results from the open-ended question are best understood by reviewing the table of frequencies that summarize responses as well as the actual verbatim responses themselves.

Please explain why you support or oppose the City's efforts to increase non-motorized transportation to handle traffic:	Percent of Respondents
Support: safety of pedestrians/bicyclists	18%
Support: health, exercise, activity	17%
Support: environmental reasons, support alternative transportation, decreased fuel use	16%
Oppose: financial/budget/tax reasons, users (cyclists) should pay, more important priorities for spending	16%
Oppose: existing paths and sidewalks are adequate, would not use, insufficient need	16%
Support: more would use paths, prefer biking/walking, enjoyment	12%
Oppose: inconvenience to motorists, impact on traffic, focus on maintaining roads for motorists	12%
Support: make community more attractive, appealing to younger people, modernizing city	11%
Oppose: for safety reasons, bicycles and cars do not mix	9%
Support: increased convenience of pedestrian and bicycle travel, path/sidewalk connections/network	9%
Support: general support, think it's a good idea	7%
Don't know/No opinion	2%
Other	7%
Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one category.	

## VERBATIM RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

The following pages contain the respondents' verbatim responses as written on the survey and have not been edited for spelling or grammar. Responses have been organized by coded topic areas.

### PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE CITY'S EFFORTS TO INCREASE NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION TO HANDLE TRAFFIC:

#### **Support: safety of pedestrians/bicyclists**

- As a bike path walker on the river front - I have encountered "rude" bicyclists - its scary sometimes- what would be done to ensure safety, to the Pedestrian the weaving in/out can be a problem.
- Bikers need to have safe places on which to ride their bikes. I've been to many states and countries that have bike lanes on the street.
- Bikes - walker should be safe - they should not compete with other traffic.
- Bikes especially with children, are sometimes a hindrance. I saw an old lady almost hit a small boy on 18th St because he turned in front of her. Her reflexes were not fast enough.
- Do not like bicycles or people walking or belong in street traffic is very heavy and people don't pay attention. In Bettendorf there are very few sidewalks in older part of Bettendorf.
- Encourage non-motorized transportation-safe & environmentally safe. The new bike paths (along Middle, 53rd etc) are wonderful.
- Encouraging ease of walking is a benefit.
- For the safety of traveling in proper speed.
- Good for those using bikes, however my taxes would undoubtedly be increased.
- I am a cyclist - safety, convenience.
- I am a runner & my kids bike so sidewalks are essential to get from 1 point to the next. (I dislike when I come to an area where there is no sidewalk!).
- I definitely support non-car transport, just don't like bikes on the streets.
- I don't drive anymore, so a bike is my primary transportation. More sidewalks would make biking safer, especially on major streets such as state & grant streets, and Devils Glen Rd.
- I feel it is a safety issue - both for bicyclists & drivers of motorize vehicles.
- I feel this would be beneficial for several reasons. 1. Safety. 2. Health benefits for individuals thru exercise. 3. Economically-saving money from not having to buy gas. 4. Recreational. 5. Might encourage more family activity.
- I like to ride my bike, but the streets/sidewalks are not always conducive to bikers.
- I support it, but I do get frustrated when I am late due to traffic issues. Please make detours clear & feasible.
- I think bike lanes are a great idea and would add to the safety of riders-if this is purely recreational. I think they should stick to the bike paths - if used for eco-friendly transportation every little bit helped. I'm on a fixed income and would find the increase in taxes hurtful.
- Increasing safe opportunities for bicycle transportation appears wise health wise as well as for traffic reduction and conservation of resources.
- It will increase the overall safety of the residents of Bett.
- It would be nice not to see school kids bikes pinned under cars at the intersection of Spruce Hill St 18th Street. There are 5 schools along 18th Street and there are areas where the side walk ends or are in poor conditions.

- Just got done with bike ride, Streets are hard to ride & side walks are no better. Bike trails are great, but hard to access from north side of town.
- Keep cyclists safe.
- Many sidewalks are too narrow for bikes and pedestrians.
- Safer for families.
- Safer if they are not on the streets.
- Safety & health.
- Safety and convenience for bikers. Reduce traffic congestion.
- Safety for those on bicycles.
- Safety of children using these pathways.
- Safety of walkers & bikers.
- Safety, exercise opportunities, attract 20 to 35 y.o. Alternative to motor veh. Transp.
- Safety.
- Should be pedestrian friendly & out door activity friendly.
- Side walks should be for pedestrians "only", 2. Encouraging cyclists to use city streets by providing a designated lane is an invitation to disaster, the current lack of police enforcement of speeding in school zones & running stop signs is evidence the city is unwilling to manage traffic today. Placing cyclists in competition with cars will eventually get someone killed, most likely a child.
- The laws of the road apply to bikes and cars, but bikes have no where to go, drivers are not courteous to bikers.
- The more bicycle paths the safer it would be.
- Too many bikers in the street & should use the nice new wide sidewalks.
- With increase in population and various factor concerning each mode and related and criterion of requirements to service each mode - i.e.:- walking cycle skate cart buggy-will require consideration of safety personal safety factors a very close understanding to include all the necessary guide lines for each category mode.
- Would make it less dangerous for walkers & bikers. They would be out of the traffic flow.

### **Support: health, exercise, activity**

- Anytime an effort is made for increased physical activity and decreased driving would be supported by me. We are becoming a much too non mobile (physically) society.
- Bettendorf is a very convenient city. I can walk to Hy-Vee, the Y, the post office etc. if necessary. It promotes physical activity. It can also be a golf cart community with the excellent sidewalk system we have. It works at the villages but of course would be seasonal here.
- Better health-environment-slow traffic-recreation.
- For a population we need to be more physically active. Bettendorf has not considered the pedestrian when plans are made regarding streets and traffic lights. Try walking to Schnooks. This mess was built with Tiff money. It is a frightening experience dodging cars with no lights, sidewalks or access areas were needed.
- Getting people out of their houses and into the neighborhoods fosters exercise, knowing your neighbors and community, inspires overall well-being.
- Gives people more reason to exercise safely. 2. Safer lanes for walkers/riders & less chance for cars to veer & cause an accident. 3. Fewer cars & less environ.
- Great exercise, good for environment great family fun.
- Health and pollution control benefits (air, noise, etc.)
- Healthy activity
- Healthy life style, less carbon foot print, but maintain tax level don't increase taxes suggest amalgamating pleasant valley & Bettendorf minimize bureaucracy a maximize efficiency.

- Heather living
- I enjoy bicycling as a hobby & for exercise. Bettendorf & the QC's have great bike paths, but they are not easily accessible. I live near Devil's Glen and it is dangerous to ride to Duck Creek. Development & traffic along Devil's Glenn seems out of control.
- I support for 2 reasons: 1) Increased physical and mental health from exercise and 2) Better air quality and lower reliance on fossil fuels.
- In my opinion there are no downsides to a healthier, greener and cleaner way of travel. It also allows people to enjoy their community at a more relaxed pace then flying through it in a metal box!
- In today's world, many people are motivated to walk for exercise. It is inexpensive with no time restraints.
- It is a healthy option, 2. It is better for the environment to reduce use of fossil fuels, 3. Makes the community seem friendlier in general to have more walking, bicycling.
- It will help to keep our city healthy.
- It would be better for everyone to get out and do something.
- It's healthier, environmentally beneficial, and if more people are outside it brings with it an energy that naturally attracts youth! Currently the streets & sidewalks pose a hazard to potential bikes & walkers to some degree because they don't really promote consistent use of bikes & walking due to their smaller lanes, etc.
- Support-better for the health of the people and helps the environment.
- There are health and recreational benefits to non motorized transportation but current conditions limit the feasibility for safe cycling to and from work.
- This will increase the overall health of the population and the city. It will also draw the 20-35 yr old crowd desired by the city. Madison and Minneapolis MN as well as Denver CO are good models.
- Walking & cycling are healthy and environmentally good.
- With obesity rates being high, people can definitely use the exercise. Secondly, this would/could mean less consumption of fuel, which is good for the environment.

### **Support: environmental reasons, support alternative transportation, decreased fuel use**

- Better air quality prefer to walk or bike.
- Ease of walking/biking creates a more environmentally friendly, sustainable community. Better livability-attracts more families while allowing ease of access to grocery, businesses, restaurants, etc.
- Eco friendly; health & exercise.
- Good for environment, health and city atmosphere way too much reliance in cars need safe routes for kids to bike, walk to school.
- Good for the environment.
- Green for environment allows more socialization-population density studies show people stay where they can work & play & have things to do.
- Green.
- In the future we will need other modes of transportation to help conserve on gas & cut costs.
- It is more environmentally sound.
- It would improve air quality and health of residents and provide for more low cost family outing opportunities.
- It's the direction energy costs including Gas is going. (Auto fuel)
- Just the obvious reason that we could conserve fuel.

- More eco-friendly than motorized transportation. Current set-up of streets/sidewalks in Bettendorf not ideal or safe for bicycling.
- More greens safer.
- Needed with increased gas prices
- Reduces pollution, increases health thru exercise. We love living in Bettendorf and appreciate the excellent services, parks, cleanliness, safety of residents, etc. We don't like when our taxes are invested in Boondoggle things like the Isle of Capri, Mini-Mall, Old Eagle Grocery Store, land where the salt dice was by the river that cost more than it was worth.
- Save gas. Get exercise.
- We need to make sure all types of transportation is available safety to our residents.
- We need to use more alternative transportation & decrease dependence on oil.
- You need to make the city more "Walk able" from on environmental & health standpoint.
- Ease of pedestrian traffic is essential to enable a good option to always driving. Bicycle to work & play & exercise a great option. Access and connection to neighboring areas.
- Hopefully it will minimize the traffic flow because of the construction since 2000.
- Reduce traffic - safer for citizens - more healthy for individuals - cleaner air - reduce amount of gasoline needed - quieter.
- Support to decrease traffic flow-things in Beltane within bike & walking range if made easier & \$s for to do so.
- To reduce traffic and pollution.
- Traffic congestion. Quality of air. Price of fuel. Exercise.
- Traffic might be less on roadways.
- We need to encourage the use of less cars to the grocery stores, schools, parks, at work. We need to change the way we live. Promote a healthier life style and be less energy dependant. I am over 50 years old!

### **Oppose: financial/budget/tax reasons, users (cyclists) should pay, more important priorities for spending**

- 22.c. "Changes May increase the cost". At a time when fiscal responsibility is weighing heavily on the minds of voters, politicians that can effectively acknowledge and demonstrate fiscal responsibility will more than likely avoid the swelling ranks of unemployed politicians in November.
- A waste of tax money.
- At what cost?
- Auto's buy insurance, high dollar tags, pay full taxes to build & maintain these streets, when bikes pay there fair share then share the road until then stay on the side walk where pedestrians belong!!!
- Better use of tax payer funds. User fees should be implemented.
- Better ways to spend money.
- Concerned about budget.
- Cost during these economic times.
- Cost for repair's. City's cannot keep up with the streets repair & cost now. Why add more. Stay with the streets repairs are having now & keep up.
- Cost. Don't want to increase taxes.
- Costs too great for the increase in bike use on roads & sidewalks. (My viewpoint very unknowledgeable or uninformed.) Hopefully they would be used though). (bike paths & road)
- Don't think this is the right time given the economy to create this additional luxury.
- During difficult economic times it seems inappropriate to spend money in this regard.
- Economy cannot support it.

- Gas tax is from gas sale & consumption-do not mess up the very good traffic flow system (Just look at Davenport to see why !) If you want to leave streets the same & take peoples lawns for bikes & non-motorized vehicles-go for it!
- Good idea, but not in this economic climate.
- How will this effect city budget? Can this money be used for education? Can this money be better spent else where?
- I cannot afford increase in costs, but feel it would be good to separate motorized and non-motorized traffic for safety.
- I do not believe that this is the time, in view of the economy, to add additional taxes or property costs to people's budgets.
- I value "green" means of travel and would love to see expanded access to such, but in an economic climate where funds are tight, I would prefer to see this happen when we can afford more easily spendier, borderline - essential projects.
- If the bicycle folks want more space let them pay the bill; license!
- In these times of economic stress. I think we should concentrate on paying our bills. Do not decrease police or fire fighter teachers. No doggie parks!! entertaining pets is off the chart of necessity.
- Increase cost of construction or reconstruction of streets is why I oppose.
- It costs enough to live in this city. We don't need you to look for more ways to spend money. Let people who use bike trails pay for them.
- Money is needed worse elsewhere.
- My issue would be - would say property taxes go up even more? It would be crime to have these, but, may be we should consider that you already have the average household to their knees with taxes & charges
- Need to watch the cost to do this.
- Not the time to add to the budget now.
- Oppose - fear of increase of taxes.
- Pay enough taxes, we need street repair over extra cost of this, need less discrimination and more thoughtfulness of information without police harassment. I know people that won't even come to Bettendorf because of the ridiculous harassment by better Police.
- Refrain from all non essential spending. This will add little to the city. Spend the money on economic development, Streets, police, fire etc.
- The cost-how many would actually benefit out of entire population for what it would cost citizens in increased taxes. I will be retired in next couple of years & need to keep my overall costs as low as possible. I feel other items would benefit more citizens. Also, bike lanes would make it harder to get around town on traffic by cars.
- The state and its citizens are in an economic crisis. Any project that could raise taxes or negatively impact our local schools and programs is wasteful and irresponsible at this juncture.
- There are other areas that funds should be spent such as re-beautification of down town (74 bridges to police station).
- You have no money. Taxes are too high.

## **Oppose: existing paths and sidewalks are adequate, would not use, insufficient need**

- Bike paths and sidewalks seem under-utilized bike lanes in other cities seem confusing for turn lanes.
- City doesn't have grasp on how many people would use these services just think it's not worth money. Look how many cars in PV High! Bettendorf High parking lot!
- Do not need.
- I am handicapped and unable to use most of these services. I do believe that these changes would provide more ways for people to enjoy themselves.
- I do not believe the traffic is at; or will exceed capacity, in the near future.
- I don't think enough people will take advantage of it.
- I don't think major changes are necessary. I also feel it would not be cost effective.
- I feel there is plenty of places for biking & walking now - money could be put to a better use.
- I feel we have ample bike paths & walking areas! Concentrate on all the vacant buildings that sit empty for months. Even better, the backed up water in the streets when we get a recent rain!
- I log a lot of hours walking every week and feel the sidewalks we currently have one more than adequate. Just need to fill in spots where sidewalks haven't been put in yet. 53rd needs a continuous sidewalk on both sides. Also, there's never so many people walking that warrants a wider sidewalk.
- I rarely see cyclists on the road and do not believe there is enough demand for a designated bike lane.
- I think it's unnecessary. Not best use of financial resources. City government is short-sighted. Don't seem to see far enough into the future of Bettendorf.
- I think our streets are good. We just let residents use our streets as parking spaces & that causes all kinds of problems, It cars had to be off the public streets you could mark what we already have for bicycle traffic.
- I think the present infrastructure of city is very good including the non-motorized transportation. I have travelled to many parts of the world including Asia and Europe and I realized that the USA is the best place to live. Infrastructure is mind blowing. Bettendorf city is a very good place to live.
- I think we have many nice areas to take a bike and walk in Bettendorf.
- I'm not a bike rider & I walk on the river path which is fine. I think the river path is sufficient, and who walks around the city any how 2. I only see people done to the mall.
- I'm not sure there is demand by folks biking to work, may be just recreational cyclists - doesn't seem there are enough of them around to justify. I'd like/prefer you to do a better job keeping up the streets - they are a disaster!
- It seems sufficient except bike trail thru city of Riverdale.
- It's quite adequate as is. I do not want my taxes raised!
- Most of this is recreational not really a cost saving type of transportation.
- Never walk or ride a bike.
- Not a lot of people would use it.
- Obviously there is very low bicycle use in the winter, so a major overhaul is not necessary. Bike-friendly & bike-safe are important though. Safe sidewalks are crucial. Find away to encourage parents to let kids walk to school. 40% of PV parents drive kids to school
- People will go and do what they want creating designated areas will not mean that people will use it, people like to take their own path.
- Remember we live in a seasonal climate. Non-motorized transportation is really only a reasonable option for a limited number of months throughout the year.

- Sidewalks are used so little, don't see need for more, let alone wider walks.
- Some areas are justified to do this, but not all areas. Safety of residents should be the determining factor.
- The usage won't outweigh the cost.
- There are plenty of places to ride bikes and/or walk in our area. The little bit of use it would generate does not justify the cost. Plus the roads are for vehicles & it is a safety hazard no matter how you set it up.
- We already have great bike paths & sidewalks do not want to pay increased taxes to cover cost. Too few people will use for the increased cost to provide. Let users pay if they want it.
- We don't need it.
- We have adequate facilities at the present time.
- We have bike paths. For riders-only support it if on main arteries to bike path.
- We have bike trails - that's where bikes belong!!!
- We have bike trails that need to be expanded not sidewalks.
- We have enough bike paths. Cyclists are hard to see-more would only compound problems of watching for them every minute. Don't think you can justify the cost.
- We have enough room for walking & bikes.
- We have good bike paths around here, bikes should stay on them, not on roads. Connect up Bett's Duck Creek path with Davenport's/Moline's River path. Widening sidewalks is a good thing to do. I do ride my bike for exercise a lot, when I do I stay on sidewalks and the bike path. You also need to evaluate the timing on some of your lights. They take up to 4 minutes to change. (Devils Glen and Tanglefoot).
- We have great bike trail, I walk it every day, it is far from being over crowded I know no one who used bike for anything other than excessive. Spend money on things of most people will use.
- We have very good walking: Bike paths-would not be apposed to a separate bike path next to the existing to sidewalk-not in the street. We pride ourselves in the bike path's we have. Most bikes do not observe the laws of the road-Don't stop at stop signs-lights.
- We would not use at all.
- Where this has already been done (i.e. Middle Rd) it doesn't seem to be of much use. I very rarely see bikes/walkers/etc. On that path.

### **Support: more would use paths, prefer biking/walking, enjoyment**

- Bettendorf is a city of walkers cyclists - also if a goal is to attract young people/families this is critical.
- During good weather, more people would walk to facilities/stores instead of driving. Also, families would spend more time outdoors exercising if appropriate, safe environment.
- I am an advocate of walking/biking when possible (instead of driving). This would make it much easier to do so.
- I come from Germany and was used to ride my bicycle to do many things; commute to work or train station, go shopping, go to the restaurant. This is not that easy here!
- I make Bettendorf more bicycle friendly-pedestrian friendly it would enhance use of alternative transportation-bicycles walking etc. Enhance tourism-visitors who want to walk on bicycle around city!
- I somewhat support the city's efforts to increase non-motorized transportation, As long as it does not take needed moneys for motorized traffic needs.
- I support the city's efforts because I like to take bike rides with my family. We also like to take walks.

- I think more bike paths will encourage locals to use walking or biking for transportation. Also, encourages exercise.
- I think more people might walk or bike to events/destinations in Bettendorf, if it were easier and safer to do so.
- I think wider sidewalks would be good for bicycle we have a lot of people cyclist in my neighborhood. I think we need to keep them off the roads.
- I would be more likely to ride a bike if I didn't have to do it in traffic.
- I would bike more places if I had safe way to get to stores and parks. People tend to be more friendly when out on bikes or walking, rather than in their cars. It's good exercise.
- I'm a bicycle rider.
- It Would encourage citizens to walk & cut down obesity.
- Like to run and bike.
- More people might take up bike riding.
- More people need to walk and bicycle.
- My family cycles quite often so bike lanes would be a huge positive for us.
- People need to walk more often to places than they are able to safely do now.
- Seems like it meets the needs of many citizens - however it could be expensive and a pain in the ass for Autos-make sure you have a large demand for it.
- This is a huge opportunity and we have the room along all of Tangle Foot Lane. I would ride my bike more (commute & recreation) if there were paths not shared by cars, Bettendorf is about 20 years behind the national trend for bicycle-friendly communities and this would draw more 20-35 year old Guaranteed. Do this now please.
- With gas on the rise I would commute back & forth to work if had bike lanes.

### **Oppose: inconvenience to motorists, impact on traffic, focus on maintaining roads for motorists**

- Any reconstruction would cause inconvenience like we now have.
- Backs up traffic, makes known routes confusing, causes accidents & traffic tie ups.
- Because too many bicyclists are using 18th St, Middle Road and now Creek Road, etc to travel upon & constitute a hazard with the auto slow going 30-35 mph.
- Bettendorf is a car dependant city and to focus should be on improving vehicle traffic flow.
- Bettendorf needs to fix and maintain the streets before focusing on non-motorized transportation.
- I'm only somewhat supportive as I feel that street repair comes first and some streets are patched year after year, which is more costly in the long run. Tanglefoot Lane & Valley Drive are two good examples of this & I avoid them if possible. Poor survey. Bettendorf should be rated a part of quad-cities rating.
- Inconvenience of construction, but a positive change.
- It will cause problems during the construction.
- Need road work done not sidewalks.
- Need street repairs first.
- Non-motorized traffic causes slowdowns. Let them use sidewalks and bike paths charge for bike licenses to pay for this sustainable development is code for telling owners what they can do with their property advocates should pay double property taxes.
- Painting bike lanes - lane closures - traffic problems I don't think enough people would use the lanes to warrant creating them sidewalks are already large enough.
- Rock Island has bike lanes and at some intersections it is awkward.
- Simple - look at Davenport and do the opposite! You can drive anywhere I - Bettendorf is just minutes - Drive the speed limit in w /almost no stops. Keep it up. Thanks.

- So far the imitative seems to be for recreational purposes. Car and truck traffic will not be reduced by the imitative. If the jobs are not in Bettendorf then max transit (interurban rail) might be a better answer.
- The city needs to repair the residential streets before worrying about bike lanes.
- There is already so much construction on area roads during the spring/summer months its hard to get straight were you need to go without detours.
- Traffic is already their! Having walked many miles on city sidewalks I would like to see them looked at properly Drainage is needed in places-mud slides area a problem, in places snow & ice cleaning force people into the streets at times. Widening where it won't destroy or harm the look of a home is part of a cure.
- Usually bike traffic for streets mean narrowing the lanes or removing lanes for bikes and then causing congestion as in Dav. Jersey Ridge.

### **Support: make community more attractive, appealing to younger people, modernizing city**

- A park like atmosphere is better than all the traffic!
- Bettendorf has always been at the forefront of leading by example. I feel that this will also help keep the image of Bettendorf as a premier city at the forefront. As we continue to lead by example. I love living in this city! (Born & Raised in Davenport).
- Bikable communities are an important part of attracting young people to the community. It is also beneficial to older citizens who are participating in cycling as a form exercise.
- Economic development; in line with national "peers" community health; active community - healthier community "Green" options for citizens.
- I enjoy biking and would like to see Bettendorf become more like the Minneapolis area with its Green way. I think it would be an asset for me and the community.
- If this is a trend, then Bett. Should participate to keep up with other cities around the country. Otherwise, - don't.
- If you're going to attract younger people this is what they want.
- I'm going to be 87 in June, so it's not something I would need, but it should be available if we want the younger generation to stick around. I've lived here for 43 years, so I feel I've "grown up" with the city.
- Improve quality of life for resident.
- It is a family area and this makes our city more desirable.
- It is nice to see that people can go out and be able to move freely. It brightens up the over all look of the community and people.
- It will attract active people in the 20-35 age groups and will help our designation as a "premier city" and as progressive active community.
- The plan would modernize streets and sidewalks as well as to provide more & safe recreational walking and biking.
- This plan appears to make the municipality of Bettendorf attain to the atmosphere of charming cities like Savannah, GA and Lincoln, NE, but seems to require rather large allotments of city resources for several years. I support this, if you are willing to follow through. (keep the bus hub where it is now.) -This creates convenience and good use of city property.
- This would likely attract younger residents.
- To attract new/any new people to Bettendorf starts w/jobs. The more new people attracted to Bettendorf means more income taxes paid to do road work later. You can't hardly go down any street where I live and not hit construction, example parkway driver Hawthorne Summit Hills Dr. Lincoln Rd & 14th, and 18th.

- Would go to attracting 20-35 go to city. Works in other cities. Green good for healthy lifestyles. Good for families.

### **Oppose: for safety reasons, bicycles and cars do not mix**

- Although bike paths are good, getting to there is hazardous from major streets. Bike lanes might encourage more cyclists & keep them safer sidewalks are used now by cyclists who don't yield to walkers.
- Bicycles are not cars, They should not be on the streets.
- Bicycles do not belong on sidewalks also-this is a stupid survey-the citizens of Bettendorf should be able to state in writing their real feelings about how things are really done here in our city. Many things are unacceptable.
- Bikes do not belong on the streets with motorized vehicles. They do not follow the same rules of the road they are required to.
- Bikes should only be allowed on bike paths not city streets. Bikers do not need a license or license plates and do not obey traffic lights or stop signs.
- Do not think bicycles where more motorized vehicles are the answer, So dangerous in traffic. Most people use the car to go any distances and will not work to grocery store etc.
- Don't feel it would be safe.
- Don't want bike lanes on the street. Several bike riders on middle road between Devil's Glen and 53rd don't use bike paths provided.
- I am strongly opposed to allowing bikes on the road with cars. It is very dangerous. Bike paths & walking paths are great - but no bikes on the road.
- I feel the Bike should follow the same lanes as cars - I see them run stoppages - stop bikes - the bike & motorcycle cause me concern. I hit a biker & it is sure death - I have lofty concerns!
- I think it is dangerous for bicyclists to ride on many streets.
- I'm a little fearful of pedestrians and cyclists using the same paths or sidewalks could cause accidents.
- More dangerous to people & cars - more accidents!
- Motorized & non motorized people don't respect the rules. Residential areas would be more respectful of the rules than in more business & congested areas. My thinking is there will be children or to tweeters w/ no common sense in the busier areas. They do it now in my residential area. Riding mopeds, bikes & motorized scooters without any regard to traffic or crossing streets.
- The busy streets should not have a bike lane due to hazards - should have a wider sidewalk.
- To get cyclists off city streets put a tax fee on cyclists.
- You need to get the bicyclists off the roads they muss up traffic & not many follow the rules of the road. They are too slow for the roadways. Traffic not licensed & shouldn't be on the main through faces. I've seen one guy ride down the middle turning lane, drive-on accident waiting to happen.

### **Support: increased convenience of pedestrian and bicycle travel, path/sidewalk connections/network**

- As a former bicyclist if the opportunity presented itself, to use a bicycle around town, I prefer to do so, although Bettendorf has done a great job with bike paths, they don't go everywhere, at age 87, it's a moot point for me.
- I am a biker & walker and cannot get the bike to a path without riding on busy streets, walking is ok.
- Lot of areas in Bettendorf don't have sidewalks along state street so the have to walk close to the highway.

- Need to get bike path to river from Northeast Bettendorf.
- Some areas are difficult to bicycle because of traffic intersection and no bike lanes.
- To make places to go ease of getting there for young & old especially disabled people.
- We are a very active family and enjoy biking-however we live miles from bike path so we have to have bikes on carrier to go to path as drives are not very safe to bikes on streets a sidewalks.
- We need more bike/pedestrian access. Biking to 53rd (Hy Vee area) is impossible. Please help!
- Would make our city accessible to a wider age group and add to our community feel that we already have.

### **Support: general support, think it's a good idea**

- Bettendorf needs to expand non-motorized areas like the city of Davenport has done recently.
- Great idea. Green is Good!
- I do think bike lanes on streets would be great but the sidewalks are fine. I think cleaning up the 2200-2300 blocks of Grant St. & surrounding area, & the whole area surrounding Magnolia Dr. Should be of more importance than widening sidewalks.
- I support non-motorized transportation, because it's good for the environment and good for people's health.
- I support this idea as long as it does not slow down the flow of motorized transportation. But I think that recent additions of bike/walking paths has been beneficial.
- I think it's a very good ideas.
- I would support - however - I find bike lanes on city streets can be dangerous and confusing for drivers. I do not care for the lanes in Rock Island (I am a former resident).
- I'm a cyclist and support any improvements in that area.
- It sounds like a good plan - but I am 85 yrs old - so I will leave it up to the people that would benefit from such a plan!
- It would be good, but not sure if cost is worth it in this economy.
- Some what support-city needs bike paths for those who are "extreme" bike riders-It's somewhat scary to have a biker pass you going extremely fast. Distinction between lei surly walks & bike rides vs. those "in training" & are more intense.
- Streets too narrow-need bike paths.
- Supporting non - motorized transportation is a very good idea, but not very realistic because to many people are working in Illinois and Davenport making driving a car necessary.
- Support-Pedestrian & Bikers do not belong on the public roadway - Not all are safety law oriented.
- There is room for everyone! Walking and biking are great activities for families and for individuals. It is important to provide safe areas for these activities.
- These offerings are great- just wonder the % of people these would benefit.
- When I go for walks in my neighborhood; I share the sidewalk with many other walkers, pet owners, runners, and families who ride bikes on the sidewalk instead of the street. Bike lanes would be great, especially along Devils Glen.

### **Don't know/No opinion**

- At my age and limited ability in moving I don't have an opinion on non-motorized transport.
- Because.
- Do not know enough about the subject.
- Don't have enough information. Property taxes are too high, it depends on the cost.
- I am retired. I have lived in a condo community who uses its own services for a variety of needs. I have lived here 3 1/2 months.
- I have no opinion either way.

- They have been very good in city services, keep up the great job they are already doing.
- You are not focused on the correct issue.

### Other

- A traffic light is needed on 18th Street where it meets crow creek road. There is a cross walk & a crossing guard but non school times it is very difficult to cross 18th while walking or riding bikes.
- Certain roads like Devils Glenn are difficult to merge onto, like of Jonathan Rd. The new apartments will make this even worse please fix some how.
- Good to have options - flexibility
- I don't think that there is enough employment in close proximity to housing to make a substantial difference in the amount of traffic by providing bike lanes.
- I find cyclists obnoxious with little respect for motorist.
- I had no idea such an effort was underway. To make things like this happen, vision must be concrete and outcomes must be robust, Accompanied by a high-profile PR campaign.
- I walk for my health for a distance or to two miles per day I believe that better bus service would reduce traffic on our streets. More & better sidewalks are needed.
- Must always be reasonable, sensible.
- Not practicable.
- Only good for 6 month. Raise city speed limits by 10-15 MPH on Devils Glen/Middle, 53 rd.
- Sidewalks need to be wider to accommodate motorized chains that the handicapped use to allow for better passage of their & other pedestrians.
- The clients are encouraged to live here above the point that often after they reach the point where they reach their the respect the neighbors lives less enjoyable.
- The poor quality of the sidewalk on 53rd between Devil's Glen & Middle Rd. Repairs are also terrible!! Contractor or who even designed this should be thrown out!! This must have been a friend of a friend or same payback. Terrible waste of our taxes!!!
- There's nothing close enough to walk to. I want to decrease taxes.
- Too much speeding on city streets.
- Until we have a better job market in Bettendorf. I'm hesitant to favor this. I am not in favor of taking private property for this type of development.