

APPENDIX B – RAW SURVEY RESPONSES

As of March 10, 2021

Appendix B includes all raw written comments from the open-ended questions received from the Round 2 online survey and interactive map between December 9, 2020 and March 10, 2021.

ONLINE SURVEY COMMENTS

Do you think the draft concept design appropriately balances the project goals and stakeholder priorities? *If you answered *No*, please tell us what changes you'd like to see:

Responses:
Mpls City Council lives in a fantasy world. Vote them all out!
Vote everyone on the Mpls City Council (except Linnea Palmisano) out of office
Overall I approve of the changes, especially to the idea of treating storm water. On Bryant between 31 and 32, there are moats of water after storms. But, I have a concern about parking, of course. Every evening from late spring through early fall the park is filled with people and the streets are PACKED with cars! I don't have off-street parking in my building, and it can be difficult for me to find a place to park. For instance, there's a wonderful community of Somali soccer players that come every night, and I don't want the park to loose their patronage because of parking woes near Bryant Park.
I've heard part of this project is to relocate bus routes off of Bryant and onto Lyndale, which would be detrimental to pedestrian safety. Lyndale is already an extremely high-traffic corridor that is nearly impossible to cross safely for both cars an pedestrians. Adding busses into the already dangerous situations on Lyndale would be disastrous. Take it from me, I walk/bike/drive on both streets daily. Bryant is a much safer place for busses and pedestrians due to Bryant having significantly less traffic. All down Bryant, I can cross the street as a pedestrian with ease. On Lyndale, I have to walk blocks out of my way to cross at a light if I have any hopes of making it across alive. Now add busses into the mix, and people will be trying to run across busy intersections to catch busses. I've seen three accidents at the corner of 42nd and Lyndale in the last year alone. What a nightmare.

There is far too much elimination of parking on this very densely populated corridor. This is probably the most densely populated street south of Lake in this part of Mpls. Many who live on Bryant live in multi-unit buildings and do not have off street parking. People need cars to get to jobs, and to take care of life necessities. One cannot get everywhere on a bike or or foot. Especially if one is transporting and elderly and/or sick person as I did from my apartment home on Bryant for many years. To think of trying to do that while parking blocks away makes me ill. Why create more hardship for the people who are living densely? This may not matter to people with driveways and garages. Removing so much parking from the streets is very Edina-like. This is the city. People need street parking. You are making the city more elitist. Only people who can afford Ubers or Lyfts or or who have someone to pick them up and drop them off will be able to live here without hardship. What you are telling people by removing so much street parking is that to be able to park near your residence, you must have a single family home. This is the opposite of what I thought city policy was aiming for. Also, another reason people like the city is because of how many small neighborhood businesses there are. These businesses cannot survive on just foot and bike traffic. A majority of their customers come by vehicle and need a place to park. These businesses have suffered enough over the past year, don't make it worse for them. Do not do to Bryant what was done to Hennepin from Lake to 36th. That is a ghost town now. People like to go to places when they are *accessible.* If you insist on removing this level of parking, you are going to kill one of the many reasons people like living in the city. You need to balance bicycling with the many other needs of city dwellers. Also, regarding the environment, most people living in this area are "car-lite" people. That is why we live here. We are not driving RT Lakeville to downtown Minneapolis every day as many do. Punishing car-lite people for owning cars is not really the way to reduce emissions. It's the people who live in the further out areas who are driving the most.

I understand wanting to ease traffic for the future idea of bike, bus, etc. However we have seniors who have additional seniors that come to visit them as highest level of visitor with very limited parking and targeting against the senior population is wrong. We should respect our elders not set surveys with computer access they are not able or understand how to complete. We are not meeting the needs of the population you service. Seniors should receive special incentives and support to have the best quality of life. They also have the largest population and should have a strong voice to show what their needs are. With Covid the bus services have decreased dramatically - which we do not know if those services will return with the change in employee and working at home. With civil unrest bussing stopped which hurt lower incomes that rely on the bus service for work. There is current discussions of possible changes with the trial and again putting people at risk for losing jobs and income which means food and housing. Do not move the bus to Lyndale for employee to have to walk blocks to get the bus and not have safe areas to wait. With the changes to MPLS we need to respect the people who live and work here. We need to listen to the majority of people served to meet their needs.

Remove all abilities bike path from the plan. The need is met on park paths. Lyndale already has almost all car and truck traffic, pedestrian safety will be worsened by adding buses - and likely environmental impact with more idling.

Keep transit on Bryant no bike paths !!! You're ruining uptown NO one uses the bike paths. Enough.

Please leave some on street parking. Reading the comments from folks who would have no access/very much reduced access to their homes was heartbreaking! Make sure emergency vehicles can get to these homes! Putting buses on Lyndale will help (use pull out stops only). Lyndale should have been built without the tree median to allow for bicycle lanes.

On-street parking is significantly reduced in plans- residents asked for this to be maintained

<p>Stakeholder priorities need to champion the small businesses and renters on Bryant, both of whom need ample parking and busing. There are more businesses and rentals on this segment of Bryant than there are on Lyndale. For this reason, busing should stay on Bryant, and parking should be prioritized.</p>
<p>I live at 3535 Bryant Ave S. I do not want to see street parking minimized in any way.</p>
<p>Residents need parking. It is unacceptable to take parking away from the homeowners/tax payers on those in favor of bike lanes or chicane. It's chicanery.</p>
<p>Stretches of no parking are not acceptable. Businesses need more parking allotted. Please remember any time you have taken car counts does not reflect the many 5-30 minute stops people make to pick up kids, drop off food for a sick friend, give pet care, unload grocery, supplies, kids, a friend or relative who is recovering or has mobility problems. Considering the number of area residents who use Bryant, assessments should be spread out to more than the immediate residents of Bryant.</p>
<p>Too much street parking is being eliminated, which negatively impacts residents, local businesses, and others coming to visit the residents and businesses.</p>
<p>I feel like the "proposed" plan was created without stakeholder input and certainly as we have provided input I haven't felt heard, rather the project managers were quite dismissive of questions concerns raised.</p>
<p>There are plenty of bike options already. We need to make main streets efficient for cars and busses. Bikes should use less trafficked streets. Parking is vital for business. Take it away and business fails. Look at Hennepin and Lake. Disaster. Please stop ruining our city.</p>
<p>I think taking away parking entirely on one side will make it difficult for those who live on the route. That's a lot of parking to take away.</p>
<p>Leave Bryant Ave as it is. Shifting more traffic to Lyndale , which has already been poorly planned and overly congested, is a bad idea</p>
<p>Resident input is ignored</p>
<p>More parking. We do not need more bike lanes in this city.</p>

Lack of parking on blocks where there are apartments, duplexes and single-family homes is a major problem. Elderly or disabled residents will have huge problems with trying to navigate snowy and icy sidewalks in winter in order to get to their cars parked on a side street. Some residents will be unable to manage this at all, summer or winter. Many if not most do not have their own garages. This plan does not comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, as it hampers or eliminates the possibility for certain residents to live comfortably and safely in their homes and get around the city as needed. Furthermore socializing with guests will be hampered by a plan that eliminates parking, as guests themselves might be elderly or handicapped. Parking should NOT be eliminated in order to create bikeways or greenspace on this crowded, multipurpose street. Although biking is a fine way for younger and fit people to get around the city, many residents of Minneapolis are unable to bike, especially in winter. We have plenty of greenspace in Minneapolis on adjoining streets and in our wonderful parks. Trying to make this street into something it was not designed for is a big mistake. I would anticipate that older residents will be forced to move, because this plan will make living on Bryant Ave. S. unlivable for them. Again, I reiterate, elimination of parking on Bryant Ave. S. is, I believe, a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act. We live on the 4800 block of Colfax Ave. South. If parking spills over from Bryant Ave. South to our block, we will have the same problems as residents of Bryant Avenue. Our single-car garage is inaccessible to us, and we must park on the street. Many neighbors on Colfax also park on the street for similar reasons. We are elderly and neither of us are able to bike. We have physical handicaps that would make parking on adjacent blocks dangerous and a real hardship for us.

Abandon or at least draw back on anti-car, pro-bicycle thinking. This is bad for businesses along Bryant and for residents of the area as well.

Don't move transit from Bryant to Lyndale.

I believe that there needs to be more on street parking for businesses and residents

Need more parking! People need to park to shop, and people need to park to live in their dwellings

Reduction of parking will over crowd adjoining streets.

Needs more on-street parking.

Keep all the on street parking.

I do not see the balance regarding future transit service, green infrastructure benefit in collection of storm water, and with less parking- business and customer access will be reduced, not balanced.

Residents of homes and apartments are also stakeholders but are not being properly considered. Eliminating 70% of available parking is an untenable solution. It is unacceptable to have entire blocks without any street parking planned.

We don't need more bike access I'm this city — look around it's winter most of the time. There are tons of young parents and older people that are not riding bikes at least half the year here. Put the money into low income housing and crime prevention.

<p>there needs to be adequate parking for the people living (including all the multi family housing) on bryant avenue and visiting merchants in the area. Parking should not spill over onto adjacent streets. bicycles have other routes for moving north and south and do not need this artery. seems to me that kings highway and its massive center boulevard could accommodate a meandering trail through it. no parking would be lost, pine trees could be trimmed for the trail to run below.</p>
<p>There are a lot of people who live, work and shop along Bryant. I think we need to keep parking. People are still going to drive and will just have to park farther away. Which is dangerous because of all the crime around here.</p>
<p>Given the project goals, I'd like to see more restriction on car traffic in the redesign, like Dutch autoluw zones https://youtu.be/GIXNVnftaNs. Raised crossings/continuous sidewalks, not shown in the current design, would also improve traffic calming and help to emphasize walking and cycling https://youtu.be/9OfBpQgLXUc.</p>
<p>Maintain on-street parking. Not enough available with this proposal</p>
<p>NOT ENOUGH PARKING. I know your team did a survey in March/April of 2018, but after living on 39th and Bryant for 3 years I never know if I'll find a spot relatively close to my home. I also have neighbors who are elderly and have children that depend on the street parking this plan is taking away. On my street alone, this plan removes over half the available spots. As a young women, I would not feel comfortable parking a block away from my home - especially during the winter when it's dark at 430pm.</p>
<p>If the plan still includes moving busses to Lyndale. Do not redesign Avenue. It was completed in 2016 to have less traffic, not more</p>
<p>Too much priority is given to cars and their storage. Bryant is a special bike boulevard and a great amenity, the design fails to be bold.</p>
<p>Project goals and stakeholder priorities "are appropriately balanced" but we've only been presented with solutions that leave bike lanes on Bryant. Why not move the bike lanes to Aldrich and keep the buses and parking on Bryant.</p>
<p>I think the project needs to include or be moved to Lake St. to Franklin Ave. This stretch of Bryant Ave. S is in much greater need of reconstruction and poses greater safety concerns than Lake to 50th.</p>
<p>Several of the intersections along Bryant Ave. are neighborhood business hubs. These hubs are frequented not only by the neighbors, but also by many folks whether working on local jobs (builders, roofers, landscapers, etc.) , or here for the unique destination of the neighbourhoods. There are also plenty of duplex and fourplex housing complexes along Bryant that need and deserve the existing parking. Though it may be aspirational to ask us all to bike more (and I am one of those people who bike) taking away existing parking is exasperating and disruptive. Adding more biking and bump outs at the cost of this design is too much!</p>
<p>I do not believe that any weight has been given to the last criterion and far too much weight has been given to the first criterion. Bryant is not a wide street and not difficult to cross. I say this as someone who crosses Lyndale Avenue by Hennepin Avenue United Methodist Church. As a neighbor, I think this plan thwarts the parking needs of the existing residents and businesses.</p>

Concerned about the large loss of parking
Is the move of buses to Lyndale ave temporary? Lyndale ave is a family neighborhood NOT a highway & we have enough noise, speeding autos & traffic.
While I would love extra green space and a dedicated bike lane on Bryant Ave, I think the reduction of parking especially the closer you get to Lake St is not meeting the stakeholders priorities.
Must have more parking
I'm 76, been living in neighborhood since 1979. HATE HATE HATE the bike lanes abd the curb bump outs. I work 40 hrs per week and drive to work. On average I see 2 people in bike lanes over a month's period of time. The very most stupidest over the top stupid are the bike lanes on 28th and the stop light in middle of block. I have seen one person in that bike lane and I have driven down that street literally thousands of times. That was worth the \$millions spent on the lanes. My time to work and home again is slowed down tremendously because of stupid bike lanes. With the bump outs you put the biker in the traffic lane. Have you all lost your minds? Do you live and work in this area? Seriously are all council members and city planners on crack cocain?
I would like to see more on-street parking even if it's just on one side. As a tax payer, I want my family and friends who visit to be able to easily access my home, without having to park far away.
Sorry, parking is still necessary.
keep the buses on Bryant Ave, that's more important.
Sounds like they don't want to have parking removed.
Preserve and enhance all possible parking. Shift bicycle lanes to Aldridge Ave So for fewer vehicle encounters and safety.
This design looks very similar to Hennepin Ave. That has been a disaster. It has created limited parking. The blocks look so empty as well. People park on curb. It does not make for a comfortable walking area. People have cars. That is not changing fast enough.
This looks like Hennepin which I think has been a disaster. No parking and creates a lot of idling of cars.
Please do not remove so much parking on Bryant. Older people who live in apartments, I am 62 and cannot take a bus to work at the MSP airport. It's unreasonable to expect that people can do biking and bus only, and especially when this city wants HIGHER DENSITY yet taking away Parking!! That is asinine.
The parking analysis was done in Summer but the busiest times are Winter during Snow Emergencies and when parking is reduced by incomplete snow removal. As a resident on Aldrich, the impact to me and my neighbors is not fairly captured

The stakeholders are not clearly defined in the documents, but they seem place a greater importance on bicycles and pedestrians than residents who live on Bryant and/or people who use cars. Removing hundreds of parking spaces and adding chicanes is not a good idea. Residents in our city are not going to stop driving cars because you remove parking spots. If anything as urban population density grows, the need for more cars will grow. These create all sort of current and future problems. Plowing snow is already done poorly in Minneapolis. Adding chicanes will not make it better.

we need lots of parking on this block. There are apartments and business'. the street will be too narrow for traffic after snowfalls. Who will clear the pedestrian paths or sidewalks? is there room to put the snow? If you dig up the street do you know that there are old streetcar tracks buried below the street? How much more will I pay in taxes? I am on a Fixed income.It may force me to move. Do you know that speculators are calling me about selling? Is my property value going up or is it gong down?

This proposal does not seem to appropriately take into account the stakeholders priority to maintain on-street parking.

Terrible idea. The traffic is minimal on the street as it is. There are very few bikes that even utilize the designated bike lane. I used to live in the Loring Park neighborhood. It was a daily nightmare to park anywhere close to my apartment bldg on Lasalle Ave. I would never live there again because of that. Eliminating 70% of the parking is simple ignorance. This idea would only cause more traffic as residents circle the neighborhood over and over again to find a parking spot.

It is difficult to imagine who stands to benefit from this plan. Pedestrian safety definitely takes a hit as they are required to share the sidewalk with bicycles (motorized and non-motorized) and scooters between 40th and 50th. This puts pedestrians at increased risk and certainly does nothing to promote their safety. I thought riding a bicycle on the sidewalk was a violation of city ordinance. It seems this ordinance exists for good reason and should not be brushed aside. Requiring pedestrians to cross Lyndale Avenue to access transit again puts them at greater risk as opposed to catching transit on Bryant. Given the traffic levels on Bryant, it is difficult to imagine that city planners have concluded there is a problem for pedestrians. Rarely does one find it necessary to even wait for a vehicle. Crossing Lyndale on the other hand is an entirely different matter and is avoided at all costs. The biggest problem a pedestrian faces on Bryant is the placing of trash containers on the sidewalk several days a week, so residents do not have to block their driveways. This is a problem on all city sidewalks and should be addressed by the council to keep this pedestrian venues clear. It is difficult to see how bicycles would benefit from using the sidewalk between 40th and 50th. At intersections cars rarely stop at stop signs, but pull up just to clear the cross street. Drivers cock their heads to the left when making right turns. Cyclists are supposed to cross in front of them? Who would want to take such a risk? It would seem that being in the street is much safer where cyclists are more visible. If cyclists require additional protection make a protected bike lane out in the street. Putting pedestrians at risk is not a solution. A serious problem was created for transit users a few years ago when MTC and the 13th Ward council member split the Number 4 bus route to operate on both Bryant and Lyndale between 46th and 50th. This alleviation of the "bus burden" on Bryant has made it extremely confusing for riders, especially in the winter, when buses are late and one does not know whether to move to the other street or hope for the best in one's current location. This splitting of the route also makes it difficult for passengers transferring from the number 46 bus. Does one transfer at Lyndale or Bryant? Which street will the next No. 4 be on? Putting all the busses on Lyndale will help in this regard, but if stops are eliminated and the service is moved even further east, it will no doubt discourage ridership. There already is a bus route on Grand. Why is the No. 4 being shifted closer to this No. 18 route and even farther away from the No. 6 route on Xerxes?

<p>The only reason I answer no here is in the spirit of objection to the stakeholder priorities being used as a counterbalance to the project goals. Engagement such as this will always prioritize people who have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo, and gives wildly disproportionate voice to property and business owners.</p>
<p>If I have to cross Lyndale to catch the bus, this plan does not increase my pedestrian safety. If bikers and walkers use the same sidewalk my pedestrian safety is not increased.</p>
<p>By removing parking on Bryant, you are putting the greatest hardship of this project on the many renters who live on this street. Bryant is densely populated with many apartment buildings. We do not have driveways or garages. The city claims it wants people to live densely, but now we will be punished. Many blocks are parked up now. These are older buildings, not fancy new ones with underground garages. And then you are taking the bus away as well. Talk about making us less safe. Biking would be safer and more enjoyable on Aldrich, and fewer lives would in be put in upheaval. You say the bike lane cannot connect with the bike bridge at the creek from Aldrich, but it can. It is a very short distance. It is a shorter distance to bike from Aldrich to Bryant than the added distance you expect bus users to go if you move the buses from Bryant to Lyndale. At 36th street a flashing light could go up with signage. It CAN be done. This would be a better BALANCE of all the priorities. It would provide more safety for EVERYONE, including people who live on Bryant and must come home late, often after dark</p>
<p>I believe that the balance went too far toward bikers needs and doesn't sufficiently incorporate the needs of residents who live on the street. We live on the south half of Bryant and all/almost all the parking has been removed from most blocks at the south end of the street. This is going a bit overboard in the direction of supporting bike infrastructure. We have a shared driveway and so need to part on the street some. Also our guests need to park on the street. As do our contractors. So we need to put back some of the parking. I recognize that the design creators said they could walk from the next block, but let's be realistic. If you had to park on the street where you lived, would you always want to walk 1 block just to get to your house? I recognize there are trade-offs to be made in the design but I think what's happening is the project is trying to meet too many goals. We need to make some choices about what's most important. Bryant can either prioritize biking and pedestrians or transit and still be livable for the residents on the street. Since the city is prioritizing biking, then all transit should be moved to Lyndale and other streets to allow narrower lanes on Bryant give more space to other priorities.</p>
<p>The current plan does not give enough consideration/priority to the parking needs of local businesses along Bryant Avenue.</p>
<p>We need to keep ALL the parking places we have now.</p>
<p>No parking removal, not enough parking as it is</p>
<p>I don't understand where people are going to park with these changes? It is challenging enough to find street parking on my block and this will take away a huge number of spots. Combined with the car jackings and mugging in this area I'm not trying to walk 4 blocks at night in the winter just to get home</p>
<p>Do not decrease parking!</p>

Take the buses over to Lyndale and leave everything else the same. You are not taking into consideration the people that live on Bryant. It's all about people walking and people biking as far as I can tell. It's obvious you don't want people to have cars, same as downtown. You want people to take the transit/lightrail or bike. People will always need and want cars. This isn't New York or Chicago. With so many rentals, businesses and Walker Care Facility, we need all the parking we can get and to reduce it by that much is insane. You people don't think of the impact of the residents. All you want to do is destroy the neighborhood by tearing down and building "affordable housing" which is a joke and definitely removes all character from the neighborhood. Your motives are bottom line \$\$\$\$\$. This proposal is insane and just wrong on every level. Can you just leave something alone for a change. There's enough going on right now and then we have to think of this on top of everything else.

Bike blvd on Dupont, where the overall project would be less disruptive. Also, with all of the multi-unit dwellings coming up, reducing street parking seems like a bad idea. Even if those folks use public transit instead of their car, they'll now have to walk to Lyndale to catch a bus and in our current environment, they'll probably be mugged on their way down the street.

A real honest design valuing the needs of the taxpayers over the social engineering overreach of the government. The use or real, relevant data like the US DOT survey that shows that lower Speed Limits do Not increase safety or lower traffic speeds. Create a real honest Pro/Con list for the design features where the city acknowledges that chicanes will make snow plowing even more difficult than it is now instead of the gaslighting list the city currently uses.

I am very concerned about the parking available to residents and near commercial nodes

I think that it is not a good idea to reduce on street parking by that much. You talk about pedestrian safety when actually people will end up parking a block or more away and having to walk to his or her residence alone at night or in a snowstorm or trying to get their little ones inside quickly while also carrying groceries. Speaking of snow, parking is far reduced when a snow emergency is declared so this is going to make it even that more difficult to find a spot that is not far away from one's home. Also, speaking as a single female, I would not feel safe walking in the street for a block at night when I am just trying to park and get home. The crime in this city has increased astronomically and it is scary enough to even have to cross the street and walk less than a block to enter my residence. I would like to see parking available on both sides of the street. I am thinking of moms with babies/kids, elderly people, single women, and families who have kids to watch out for. They should not have to walk farther than a block to get to their home for both safety and functionality.

Business and homeowners not served by more automobile restrictions.

Too much bike.

I think that bicycles are giving an inordinate amount of attention. I drive and bike Bryant often and the shared lanes work perfectly, given the amount of traffic on the road. Also, maintaining parking spaces is critically important to small businesses and to the elderly and differently-abled who live and work near and along Bryant. Please, I beg you, do not hamper car traffic on Bryant. It is one of the few north-south routes that is accessible. If you really want to help pedestrians, please add marked crosswalks to all of the intersections and add the flashing pedestrian crossing signs in high traffic areas. Dismiss those ridiculous bump-outs and free-standing cones that just clutter up the streets.

First, I think you should hold off on ANY planning and changes until we learn what the world will be like IF and when the Pandemic is under control. I would suggest you look at how dramatically all travel on the street has been impacted by the pandemic. Daily I watch completely unoccupied buses travel past my house. I estimate the bus ridership has decreased by at least 90%! Perhaps, most businesses will continue with on-line remote working and POV traffic will decrease. And I am completely opposed to this pompous, elitist view of what YOU think is good for me! Why don't you just come out and be honest and state that you hate privately owned motor vehicles (POV) and want to ban them entirely from your rosy-eyed, pie in the sky concept of what you think is good for us. This plan glorifies the most outrageous law-breakers the city has--bicycle riders. They pay no attention to any traffic laws, endanger themselves and others with their wanton lawlessness. If you want to fix the problem, ban them! Or, since the city of Minneapolis has decided the Police should no longer enforce laws against felonies or arrest felons, putting them to work stopping and arresting bicycle law breakers would be a good use of their time! This part of the city was laid out over 100 years ago, and simply is not designed for a European world view and operation. It was designed to transport horse-drawn and then private motor vehicles. You want to change this into Belgium or some other European city where virtually no one had POV until well into the 1960s through 1980s. And why pick on just my block to ban on street parking? Such a determination is arbitrary, unreasonable, and an abuse of discretion! Your anti POV bias just leaps out at everything you have been doing on Bryant and Lyndale for many years! You deliberately reduced traffic capacity by 50% by closing off one lane of traffic for most of Lyndale--a route which for nearly 80 years was the main route south out of this city and down to Iowa. You have prohibited my next-door neighbor from erecting a garage and NOW you plan to bar him from parking on the street! (This would be a taking in violation of the Fifth Amendment to the US Constitution [made applicable to the city by the Fourteenth Amendment]. Tell your lawyers to be prepared for such lawsuits!) You have continued in your derogation of private property in your malfeasance in the maintenance of Bryant Avenue, because the coats of tar you put over the road cause a drastic drop-off between the tar and the concrete edging of the curb driveway, causing my cars and my neighbors to smash the front ends when entering our driveway--and you have barred him from self help to adjust the drop off! You persist in this anti POV bias as exemplified by the relocation of Walgreen's Drug to 5424 Lyndale Avenue south. The driveway entrance to their parking lot is too narrow for two monster SUVs to enter and exit at the same time! I asked the store manager why the driveway was so narrow, and he responded that the city of Minneapolis would not let Walgreen's enlarge the driveway! (By the way the operation of the monster SUVs violate state law if a vehicle in excess of 700 lbs gross weight is operated on other than truck routes--if you want to ban POVs, why don't you start with enforcing that law?) You have continued with your anti POV bias by creating and allowing Kowalski's Grocery to have a driveway mere feet away from the intersection of 54th Street South/Diamond lake and Lyndale Avenue South. The traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians is blatantly apparent to anyone who has ever tried to drive or walk on that portions of the street or sidewalk. I think you are deliberately encouraging accidents and personal injury by that flawed decision. In short, I think your vision of the future is dramatically flawed, and should be stopped!

Eliminating over 50% of on street parking specifically on blocks with multiple apartment buildings is only going to make business accessibility more difficult and less safe.

The decrease in parking is absolutely unacceptable, particularly around the Walker Methodist Health Center, where staff and visitors to the Walker already must share existing parking with residents on and around Bryant Ave. To cut parking on this block by over 50% will create a major problem for residents who need service and delivery vehicles to be able to access property, as well as making it impossible for visitors of the both the Walker and of residents to find adequate parking.

<p>No Parking removal. No bump-outs, no jogs. I think the project fails to recognize the main use of this road is car traffic. I'm not opposed to making pedestrian and bike improvements but what we have here is implied mandate to do and spend whatever the city wants. The cost of this project is too great. According to the city's own studies. Most of the use of Bryant Ave is by cars. Failing to recognize this point is failing to suit the needs of the community. What is needed is better public transit and all the funds you are spending could be better spent elsewhere.</p>
<p>Move the bike lane over to another street keep the busses on bryant Avenue. Lynndale ave would totally need to be replaced to allow busses on lynndale ave. Car traffic is to heave for the busses.</p>
<p>I am a business owner at the corner of 43rd and Bryant, and I am extremely concerned about the reduction of on-street parking. Both my clients and I use the on-street parking currently available. Some of my clients are not able to walk far distances due to physical limitations. Presently, there is usually parking available, though often I must park a ways down the street to allow my clients (and the patrons of the other businesses on the corner) convenient parking in front of my office building. The proposed plan eliminates most of the parking on Bryant between 43rd and 44th. Where am I and my clients (along with the residents on the street and the patrons of the other businesses on that corner) supposed to park when this project is complete? Are you trying to kill the businesses on this corner?</p>
<p>The multi-use path is ugly. It will be blacktop and will not hold up over time. Plus it's a danger when a person is doing gardening/yardwork. The bicycles need to be moved to the street where they belong!!! Having a multi-use path adjacent to my grass does nothing to improve the value of my property!!!!</p>
<p>on the west side of 45th , there is no driveways drawn in on your design. We must have access to our backyard parking spaces ! re.4548 Bryant .</p>
<p>There would be a great deal of sacrifice of parking for the sake of a few summer bikers. This is not democratic. Bikers can use side streets, not this important main thoroughfare. Also, the sidewalks are wide enough, they shouldn't be widened to narrow driving lanes which is dangerous.</p>
<p>Remove the chicanes and bike lane to increase vehicle parking</p>
<p>As a stakeholder and resident on Bryant Ave South at 36th St. for 37 years I have observed that there has never been adequate parking on my block and the increase in density of housing over that period has only exacerbated this problem. During snow emergencies we observe people driving around the block for a long time trying to find a place to park.</p>
<p>Not a hard no. Mostly I like what I see but I do worry about lack of parking for businesses and residents between 36th and Lake on Bryant. Would like to see parking allowed fully on one side of the street, with bike lane on opposite side. Am concerned about bikes and pedestrians sharing lanes or having little separation...feel this is particularly dangerous with people walking dogs on leashes: dogs are often fearful and might lunge at bikes, blades, skateboards or distracted people might let their dogs wander into bikers area. Would like to see clearly separated bike path from sidewalk (physically separated with curb or elevation, not just visually separated) with bikes not next to yards (dangerous for gardeners or small children in yards, both whom often end up on sidewalk as part of their activities.)</p>
<p>Parking on both sides of the street. Drop the separated bike trail and instead have bike lanes or bike boulevard.</p>
<p>Too much space is dedicated to cars. For a major bikeway, the space allocated is too narrow.</p>

<p>Removing the buses permanently from Bryant makes no sense. There seems to be an excessive need to restrict vehicle flow on Bryant</p>
<p>Obviously the City does not consider people who need parking for themselves, their visitors or for business as stakeholders.</p>
<p>I believe the proposed design will impede Transportation on the street and inconvenience residents</p>
<p>Moving transit to Lyndale Ave will create tremendous congestion on a already congested street. It already takes a very long time for vehicles to clear both directions if you are crossing Lyndale at an uncontrolled intersection. It is already dangerous for pedestrians.</p>
<p>The decision to keep Bryant as a bike boulevard, is coming across as a bit preordained from a budget standpoint. The \$1-6mm price tag to change Aldrich to a bike boulevard doesn't hold water when it could effectively be accomplished by moving some stop signs. Aldrich has less traffic, better shade, and less change in elevation. I typically use Aldrich and make a shift at the park near Lake instead of Bryant, and often count more bikes on Aldrich than on Bryant.</p>
<p>It seems that parking of zero on certain blocks is not a balance. Also, reviewing the plan for Bryant does not give a realistic indication of the effects on surrounding blocks if transit is shifted to Lyndale.</p>
<p>We still are bending over backwards to maintain auto infrastructure (free parking that contributes to runoff and urban heat island effect, continues to make driving the most attractive choice in the corridor) instead of rebalancing space for peds and bike users. The 10' path on the southern portion is a terrible design choice that makes redevelopment up to the right of way more difficult in the future and pits cyclists against walkers/rollers. Having a two-way cycle path on one side for the northern portion is, again, a design that does not follow international best practices for design.</p>
<p>I live at 2840 Bryant Ave. S. I'm extremely disappointed that Bryant Ave. S from Lake St. to Franklin Ave. is NOT part of this project. This is the stretch of Bryant that needs as much if not more attention than Lake to 50th. I've called and sent emails to the city council numerous times about the danger and challenges of Lake to Franklin. 1) It's a 2-way street. 2) Cars drive too fast. 3) Cars park on both sides of the road. 4) It's also an official bikeway with an entrance/exit to the Greenway with a high volume of bikers using Bryant. 5) Two cars cannot pass without one stopping to let the other go-by 6) There are numerous accidents on Bryant where cars are side-swiped and sideview mirrors are knocked off, and 7) Numerous delivery trucks, food delivery cars, garbage trucks and city vehicles often block the road making passing impossible. Based on these reasons, it's uncontainable that Bryant from Lake to Franklin will not be upgraded. I argue that this stretch should be a higher priority over Lake to 50th. Please reconsider your Bryant Ave. S reconstruction plans and switch or include Lake to Franklin as a project with much more benefit to ease congestion and improve safety.</p>
<p>I like the concept and feel it will bring value to our properties but I'm extremely concerned with the amount of parking being eliminated at 43rd and Bryant.</p>
<p>I don't understand why the most prominent stakeholders are property owners along Bryant who want to maintain the status quo for their private cars. Minneapolis needs to live up to its Complete Streets promises, and prioritize pedestrians and people biking / rolling somewhere in the city so that we can get around safely. Bryant should be the gold standard for people getting around under their own power.</p>

1) Do not move the buses to Lyndale. Bryant is a reasonable alternative: people don't have to walk more than two blocks to catch a bus, either from Lyndale or from DuPont. People on Fremont or Girard can now walk to Hennepin; under the current setup, the only bus riders who have to walk more than two blocks live in Emerson. 2) Do not reduce parking on Bryant: this will only add congestion to neighboring streets, which are already full. The shared car/bike concept works just fine; a bike lane is only useful a few months a year anyway. If you want to improve Bryant, trim back tree limbs that block street lights, and add MORE street lights.

Any traffic studies done during 2020 reflect the realities of street usage in typical times. The project should not be moved forward until traffic patterns return to normal. Specifically, my concern is that putting buslines on Lyndale, which already has rush hour gridlock, is only going to move more speedy traffic onto Bryant to try to bypass the heavy Lyndale traffic.

On-street parking should not be a priority over any of the other space needs in the ROW.

I have lived at 47th/Bryant for 22 years. We only have 1 parking stall, but 2 adults and often visitors. Having no parking on a residential street where home owners do not have other options is not a solution.

The goals for Bryant avenue make sense, and the solution is good for Bryant, however, the effect it will have on Lyndale only creates new problems.

My main concern is a bike path shared with pedestrians, to me, that's not safe for pedestrians. Too much boulevard and not enough parking. It's great that traffic is moving to Lyndale.

The path is nice but why are we enabling polluting, GHG emitting vehicles that remove space for additional businesses and housing? Can we create a low-carbon area here and eliminate motor vehicle traffic? Seems like this plan suffers from trying to appease everyone rather than actually make a difference in the transportation system.

Since this will be the design for the next fifty years, I think we need to act big and provide more space for storm water treatment and cycling

I think that by moving transit to Lyndale Ave it is going to create more headaches in facilitating traffic movement. Bryant is ideal for transit because it is not a thoroughfare for trucks and cars. On the other hand, Lyndale is a Hennepin County State Aid Highway meaning it is designed as a thoroughfare for cars and trucks. When Lyndale was reconstructed a few years back it was designed with this purpose in mind, meaning curbs were not designed for bus stops. With the exception of a few intersections, there are no dedicated right turn lanes on Lyndale meaning every time a bus needed to stop it would stop all traffic. With this increased congestion, it would not only delay travel times for cars and trucks but also delay travel time for transit users as the buses would be caught up in the delays. It is important that Bryant and Lyndale continue to coexist and carry different functions, with Bryant catering to pedestrians, bikes, and transit whereas Lyndale works with cars and trucks. I would rather Bryant become like Nicollet Mall where only transit (and local homeowner traffic in this case) is allowed to use it for traffic and then it is geared towards pedestrians and bikers than see transit added to Lyndale.

<p>This is a monstrosity. Repave the street; add a few amenities; recognize we're not building a new city corridor on raw land but working within the existing physical and social system. Bryant is a snow emergency street. People own cars. We have winter. Bikers are a small minority. They cannot be allowed to drive a project that adjoining owners are expected to pay for by special assessment. Mixing commuter bicyclists and pedestrians on the same path is literally crazy. That's not even done on the parkway paths.</p>
<p>Move all bus routes off Bryant to be shared on Lyndale, Aldrich and/or Colfax, providing transit access distance further for some, while closer for others. Parking in front of homes on 4700 Bryant is vital, especially on the east side where private driveways are absent. Speed bumps, as well as Stop or Slow signage at 47th St intersection are advisable, while a one-way street is undesirable & unnecessary; with buses out of the way, congestion & confusion will be reduced for bicyclists, motorists & pedestrians. Bryant will become quieter & safer for all involved.</p>
<p>There is already too much traffic on Lyndale. Adding buses will make it dangerous for pedestrians & the men who collect garbage & recycling in Wednesday morning. Has anyone given thoughts to their safety?</p>
<p>70% parking is removed between 49th and 50th</p>
<p>Almost 70 % of parking was removed between 49th and 50h, in front of businesses, which leaves no parking left for customers.</p>
<p>Combined bike lane and walkway is not safe for the walkers or bicyclists. There is not enough room for the snow from the street and the bike path to fit on a 5.5 ft boulevard, which will make the path even more unsafe in the winter. Lyndale traffic is already congested and dangerous so adding more bus traffic just exacerbates that problem. The bike lane running right up on people's front yard presents dangers for residents trying to use their yard and for bicyclists. Eliminating all parking on some blocks is certainly not serving resident stakeholders - not likely that the steady stream of delivery vehicles will park and walk a half block with deliveries so they will be parking in and blocking the bike path/walkway and making that unsafe. With this plan I don't feel that any stakeholder is well served. This should be better thought out and a new design created that might provide some actual improvements - I honestly can't see who is well served by this</p>
<p>I would prefer that the sidewalk and bike trail are not at the same level. I've noticed on other streets (like Washington) where this is the case, there is WAY too much potential for conflict between those two modes - bikers zooming way too quickly past someone walking, and walkers in the bike lane. I am a regular biker and am thrilled about these new permanent facilities - but someone's going to get hurt unless the design is changed to better separate the trail and sidewalk. Either make the trail slightly lower than the sidewalk or have some more buffer (plantings?) between the two.</p>
<p>I am a stakeholder. I live on 47th and Bryant and the project goals do NOT prioritize my objectives. I am so angry that there will not be on-street parking. Our alley does not allow parking for our vehicles and our neighbor's vehicles. We are elderly. We will have to move if we cannot park on the street. We've lived here for decades.</p>
<p>I think the project still provides most of the right-of-way to automobile traffic and storage. For a project that will likely last half a century or more, we need to be thinking about a world beyond cars. We know cars contribute significantly to climate change and even MNDot is talking about the need to reduce VMT. The need to maintain wide travel lanes and</p>

<p>parking means that the pedestrian and bike facilities are needlessly cramped. And some blocks still do not have boulevards, despite the widely known benefits for runoff and air quality that come from green space and trees.</p>
<p>This project is a waste of money. Bryant Avenue has worked well for buses, cars, pedestrians and cyclists for decades.</p>
<p>Maintain the parking for businesses and residents, they should be able to park in front of the business/home. I live on Aldrich, I am an avid walker. If you spend anytime in this neighborhood you would notice most people do NOT walk on Bryant Ave. It is a busy street so most folks rarely walk on it. I cross Bryant several times a day, but never walk on it. So what presently exists is sufficient.</p>
<p>It doesn't seem that all of the potential stakeholders priorities were taken into account during the public engagement session. The ripple effect of transitioning transit to Lyndale would also affect Kingfield residents, and there is no indication that stakeholders along Lyndale's east side were engaged. There also doesn't appear to have been a neighborhood presentation for Kingfield residents, who already have multiple transit corridors in the neighborhood.</p>
<p>Taxes are high enough. Now an assessment to the homeowners for changes they don't want? Are you kidding?</p>
<p>I don't think that buses should be rerouted onto Lyndale. I don't think we need more bike lanes. I think we have plenty of bike lanes, most of which I have seen not being used very much. I think the city is just going crazy with these plans, and they will not serve the community well. Putting the #4 bus on Lyndale would mean it's 2 blocks closer to me, but I just do not think that's a good plan at all. And I think that traffic on Lyndale will be worse than it is. I just do not understand this obsession with bikes above all else and don't think it's healthy for Minneapolis and its residents.</p>
<p>Lyndale is very busy at all times. Adding a bus route will increase congestion significantly especially during rush hour.</p>
<p>Lyndale is not a good bus route. Keep buses on Bryant.</p>
<p>I would like to see all street parking eliminated on this street in favor of much wider walking and biking paths.</p>
<p>I think it's important to remember that people, families with young children, older people, all live here, both on Bryant Ave and Lyndale Ave S. There was already a recent redesign of Lyndale Ave S and a new bus stop installed at 48th/Lyndale. Currently during most times of the day, not just during rush hours, there is practically gridlock between 54th and 46th street on Lyndale. Many people try to bypass this traffic by flying down neighboring Garfield. I know the report says a traffic survey has been done, but how recent was it performed? There is SO much traffic on Lyndale from 18-wheelers, city busses, cars, delivery trucks, etc. Residents on Lyndale cannot safely exit their driveways into traffic as they are blocked by traffic congestion and drivers don't "see" incoming traffic within the block. Again, please remember that these streets are not just thoroughfares, but streets where people live and raise their families. We support transit opportunities, but we cannot be a catch all for all vehicular traffic in the area. It's fair to balance traffic across Bryant, Lyndale and Nicollet.</p>

<p>I am a walker, biker, transit rider, and driver on these streets. As a biker, I would prefer the bike path to be on a quieter street than Bryant or Lyndale - Aldrich or Colfax. Lyndale is already a backed-up mess. I don't think Lyndale Ave bikers will relocate to another street, no matter what plan succeeds in being approved. It doesn't have the hills that Bryant has. I do not want to see more buses on Lyndale. We already cannot cross the street to get to friends in Lynnhurst neighborhood or to the park. The children who walk to and from Burroughs, Washburn, and Justice Page schools have a terrible time crossing at 49th St. The track teams have to wait forever to get across. I know they should go to 50th or 48th, but those are long blocks. The delivery people on Lyndale wait endlessly to get across for deliveries. I'm sure you have done measurements, but my family's observations are that Bryant is far less busy than Lyndale. Please do not make Lyndale a disaster. It is not necessary.</p>
<p>Already limited car traffic on Bryant is organically conducive to keeping buses on Bryant, upgrading bike lanes and reducing car traffic further.</p>
<p>I think that on-street parking has been reduced a bit too much.</p>
<p>The southern multiuse trail is a really bad design and I expect better. This is a full re-construction, so if we make mistakes now, they're locked in for decades. Bryant is the main North-South bicycle route in Southwest Minneapolis. It is the only continuous corridor. Relegating bicycles and pedestrians to a narrow shared space to maintain space for car parking and driving runs contrary to the city's modal hierarchy. Shared paths are okay for lightly-used recreational facilities, not high-volume bike transportation routes. It's impossible to maintain speed for transportation purposes when you're sharing a path with people walking side-by-side and dogs on leashes. I would ride in the street here instead of using the path, and this design will likely make drivers aggressive and angry at me for not using the path, worse than the present condition where I can ride in the street with some expectation I be there. This isn't an all-ages-and-abilities facility, because it doesn't provide a safe facility for people to do ALL trip types. Only the most able and fearless like me will have the privilege of using this as a high-speed bike corridor by continuing to fend off vehicles in the street. Please consider using the full ROW here. Sure, it's gonna be hard to deal with encroachments and what have you. But this temporary discomfort will result in a multi-decade better outcome. I live on Bryant and absolutely support using the full ROW.</p>
<p>The "Stakeholders" are Not Equally Valued, those that agree with the city council's agenda are greatly valued, those that disagree are dismissed as people who don't understand the big picture.</p>
<p>Need more car parking not less.</p>
<p>i guess I really think parking should have been part of the goals, for businesses and for people. You want density -- you need parking for that density.</p>
<p>Buses should not be added permanently to Lyndale. Of course it's fine for a temporary re-route during construction but buses should go back to Bryant once completed.</p>
<p>As many cyclists have seen on the Richfield 66th st. cycletrack automobile traffic doesn't stop at cross street stoplights. They cross the cycletrack and then look for automobile traffic. This puts cyclists in a dangerous position since drivers aren't anticipating someone approaching from the cycletrack at 15+ mph which can lead to bicycles hitting cars broadside or getting t-boned. I think the best option would be to eliminate parking on one side of the street, move transit to Lyndale so that there is increased space for a sharrow on Bryant for bicycle traffic.</p>

<p>There is not enough parking to support businesses and residences on the corridor. The changes to Lyndale have not been effectively studied or presented.</p>
<p>I do not see sufficient evidence that the stakeholder input gathered & represented so far is broad enough. Where are inputs provided by residents and businesses on Lyndale?</p>
<p>Stakeholders on Lyndale get more traffic in order to make things greener for Bryant. Their gain is our loss.</p>
<p>How, exactly, can transit possibly work well on Lyndale if you move buses to that avenue? That street was fully reconstructed in an earlier city phase to "calm traffic and reduce anxiety." Moving buses to this street will not benefit that corridor but will instead destroy the physical street, add shelters and bike stations, and interfere with garbage pick up and traffic flow. The benefit of moving buses to Lyndale is the space it gives you to create options on Bryant. Again: the city executed a major project when it installed boulevards on Lyndale and now the suggestion is to add buses onto a county highway already bustling with large truck traffic; this would break down the street's infrastructure much more quickly. You are proposing to take away street parking, yet the 2040 Plan calls for more dense living in the city. I walk my dog, bike, bus, and drive frequently on Bryant and enjoy the many transportation options already available to this community. This project appears to be detrimental to the goals of previously executed plans. In conclusion: the challenge is to improve the safety of Bryant Avenue without doing harm to its surrounding communities.</p>
<p>My home has no parking besides on street. I NEED parking for myself, my family & anyone that comes to my home</p>
<p>Understanding that there is a fixed right-of-way width, I believe that the current design compromises pedestrian and cyclist comfort and limits green space, which are project priorities. I think a reevaluation of full bidirectional vehicle circulation should be undertaken. Full or partial one-way circulation, perhaps with through movement restrictions at certain intersections would not seem to conflict with the goals of maintaining vehicle access and accommodating business deliveries and customer access. In addition, if there are concerns about the amount of parking that is offered, limiting bidirectional vehicle circulation would allow selective addition of parking. As stated in the project documents, the choices today will cement the direction of this corridor for the next 50 years. If the modal priorities as laid out in the 2040 plan and the TAP are fully respected, generous pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be accommodated so that they do not become artificial restrictions as the mode shift begins to take effect.</p>
<p>I'd like to see this moved off Lyndale. How are pedestrians going to cross the street with dense traffic and buses? Clara Barton Elementary is one street west and small children will need to cross this busy street with buses everyday. What are you doing to ensure these children will be safe?</p>
<p>My block is showing zero on-street parking, yet that is our only option for a house in the middle of the street. This is not a reasonable option for the homeowners to have to take to add in more bike lanes.</p>
<p>I currently live on bryant and like not having to walk to the bus.</p>
<p>I don't think that placing bike lanes next to the sidewalk makes it safer for anybody, and I think that removing transit from Bryant and reducing stops damages inclusivity. Bikes and busses on the road together on Bryant should be the priority.</p>

Strongly dislike moving transit off of Bryant Ave S given transit has been there for many years and we moved onto Bryant specifically to be close to transit. We're not getting any younger, moving a bus stop off our corner will make life much harder for us.

Almost all of have cars, and we have friends with cars. We need to have adequate parking! We need to have our walls and outdoor steps stay in place.

move bike route off bryant. Lyndale is not appropriate to add more bus transport. I'd like to see you post the details of the lyndale study. Lyndale is one of the few through streets in the area. It is very crowded now. With changes coming to grand and bryant it will become even more crowded. It is a residential street. You have not been very transparent about the changes proposed for Lyndale. I couldn't find anything when searching for changes to Lyndale ave. I had to look it up by searching for changes proposed to Bryant ave. Also, when was the user data that was gathered suveyed? You should use an appropriate sample which would include measurement from both winter and summer time periods and in rain. That would better reflect usage across a full year and more accurately reflect pedestrian and bicycle usage. We shouldn't be building to false usage numbers.

My perspective: transit-oriented cyclist and dog-walker who uses Bryant regularly for both purposes, both south and north of 40th street. First, the good: separating bus transit from the cycle-way is a great idea. Putting transit onto Lyndale fits the goals of the project very well. However, I don't understand why, if buses are being moved off Lyndale, the City doesn't just add some planters on a couple key intersections so car traffic is reduced, and the existing bicycle boulevard concept is thereby vastly improved. This would be *so much cheaper*, and would work better for most cyclists. The sidewalk-level bike lanes and, worse, the combined bike/pedestrian spaces will only be safer for very slow-moving child-cyclists. Transit-oriented cyclists like myself will not feel comfortable here, both because our increased speed makes intersections dangerous (cars are not looking for quick moving bikes on sidewalks, they only look for cars and bikes that act like cars in roads), and because pedestrians in bike spaces pose hazards to both cyclists and themselves (and their dogs). I much prefer to ride in vehicular traffic with predictable vehicular movements over a shared bike/pedestrian space with unpredictable pedestrian movements. I also would not feel comfortable walking my dog next to a fast-moving, sidewalk-level bike lane. Realistically, if this plan is enacted, I will ride my bike on the road (to the chagrin of motorists who would like to go 30 mph instead of 15-20 mph), or on another road entirely. And I wouldn't walk on the shared spaces, either. So to me, the plan doesn't serve two of its major goals: pedestrian safety and a safe bicycle connection. These goals can be accomplished with much more modest improvements like pedestrian bumpouts at commercial nodes, and bike-permeable planters/barriers at a couple intersections.

My concern is that while Bryant is being made nicer, it is done at a detriment to the other neighboring streets. It is irresponsible to ask questions and for feedback only on the part of the plan that impacts Bryant without being honest about how this will impact other streets, such as Lyndale. Suddenly you are making improvements west of Aldrich and reducing the value and harming the areas east of Aldrich by transferring all the busses and extra motor use to Lyndale. These changes do not exist in a silo. I might like the Bryant plan by itself, but not if it means the busses and increased car plight to Lyndale which is already crowded and slowed as it is due to the reduction of lanes. You can't now add busses to it. So no, I don't like the Bryant plan if it means you are making Lyndale and everything around it more chaotic, louder, etc. There is already a divide in SES across Lyndale and you are now making it more of a divide by improving one side and harming the other.

Please do not move the bus route to Lyndale.

<p>Stakeholders have too much say as to car parking. There are plenty of off street and nearby parking options. Keep cars off bryant and don't force peds and bike commuters onto the same path. Is one street without cars too much to ask?</p>
<p>I am really concerned about directing southbound bikes to ride the wrong way on the new trail. Particularly on Bryant, which is littered with driveways. If you absolutely must do the two-way facility, please ensure that materials do not change at every driveway. And keep bikes and pedestrians separate.</p>
<p>Moving the bus route from Bryant to Lyndale would be a huge mistake. I had to laugh at the statement that "intersections on Lyndale operate at an acceptable level for vehicular traffic flow." Whomever wrote that has apparently never tried to get through the intersection at 50th and Lyndale, or tried to get across Lyndale on foot, as many student will be attempting to do again next year. Adding buses, with frequent stops will make Lyndale more of a nightmare than it already is.</p>
<p>We cannot lose street parking on both sides in Sznzy block. I live on one of the block you propose no parking. We have no garage and neither do our neighbors. Not a proper solution. Eliminate the green on my block if you have to. We need to parking.</p>
<p>The property owners and businesses needs and impacts are not assessed or considered in this plan</p>
<p>I don't understand why you ask this question. You seem to have already decided the answer with your color coded under your draft concept design concepts table.</p>
<p>I think it cuts way too much parking out of the area. You're proposing to cut out more than two thirds of the parking on the 41st to 42nd st. stretch. As well we will lose parking on 42nd st. due to the bump outs.</p>
<p>Reduce vehicle parking and increase green space for runoff mitigation.</p>
<p>Not more bus traffic on Lyndale!</p>
<p>Understandable information about proposed changes to parking availability at and near commercial nodes such as 36th St. and 46th St. Don't do to Bryant Ave. what you did to Hennepin south of Lake St., where you took away all the parking, which will help kill businesses.</p>
<p>NO BUSES ON LYNDALE!!!! That will absolutely impact our quality of life AND home value (as a homeowner on Lyndale Avenue). The people on Bryant CHOSE to buy/live on a bus route. I did not make that choice. Also, I am vehemently, 100% against any more tax dollars going to accommodate bikes. Enough.</p>
<p>Do not move transit to Lyndale Avenue. That might improve pedestrian safety on Bryant Avenue but it makes it worse on Lyndale. By adding transit, you're adding traffic. Lyndale is already quite busy during peak commuting hours and plenty of drivers will be going around stopped buses. Lyndale is already known as a road that isn't safe for pedestrians. This will just make it worse.</p>
<p>Traffic impact on Lyndale</p>
<p>Residential and business parking is necessary and overlooked, especially with the density due to the plentiful apartments being built and multiplex housing conversions expected.</p>

<p>This is very short sighted. Lyndale will be an absolute mess with adding buses. It is already very busy with too much traffic, and keep in mind this will increase when businesses downtown open back up. People drive way too fast on Lyndale as well, and now you are saying add buses? How will this increase pedestrian safety? This will cause more problems both for traffic, safety, etc.</p>
<p>No buses on Lyndale</p>
<p>I'd like to see bus service remain on Bryant Ave</p>
<p>The Buses should not be moved to Lyndale</p>
<p>2-way mixed-use trail will create conflicts between bikers and walkers as well as cross traffic and bikers. There should be a bikeway on each side of the road plus a separate path for walkers.</p>
<p>concept 3 is the choice I hear from neighbors - easier to move bikes to streets (one way would be helpful) other than Bryant.</p>
<p>Shared bike/walk space from 40th-50th is a troubling choice. I mostly bike and I'm afraid of pedestrians' unpredictability - I don't want to run someone over! When I walk, I'm afraid a people biking on walking spaces. Keep it separate, please.</p>
<p>The base case should be no parking spaces, and the property owner should not have to pay an assessment. If a property owner wants to park on the street in front of their property, they should be assessed at the City parking meter rate yearly. That space has value, and the City should be generating income from it.</p>
<p>Keep buses and some parking on every block.</p>

If transit was moved from Bryant Avenue to Lyndale Avenue, would you be able and willing to travel the two blocks between Bryant Avenue and Lyndale Avenue to ride the bus? *If you selected *Yes, if accommodations were made* please list what changes would be needed:

<p>Responses:</p>
<p>Lyndale is SO busy! There is already SO much traffic! While on Bryant the bus moves quickly, but as soon as it hits Lyndale it might be at a dead stop for 30 minutes. Who does it serve to contribute to more traffic on a street that already has too much? If the plan is to make Bryant more pedestrian friendly, why would you take away the bus, which is a pedestrian-friendly form of transportation?</p>
<p>As I described previously in this survey, Lyndale is far too busy to cross for a bus at any intersection that doesn't have a light. I'd have to walk more than half a mile more than I walk now to catch a bus because I would need to go to an intersection on Lyndale that had a stoplight.</p>
<p>Lyndale is busy enough as it is keep transit on Bryant</p>

<p>I support moving buses to Lyndale. I do have safety concerns with locating bus stops at intersections without traffic lights, like at 41st and 45th Street. Even with major improvements like marked crosswalks, improved lighting and flashing pedestrian signals, traffic moves very quickly on Lyndale. It would take a years-long culture shift among drivers. Strongly consider just eliminating those stops at certain unsignalized intersections to keep riders safe, even if they must walk further to the nearest signal. This will speed up bus trips as well. Spacing stops every 3 blocks (46th-43rd-40th, which have signals) would be fine.</p>
<p>Not really accommodation, but Lyndale traffic is scary. That street needs some improvement too!</p>
<p>I will be looking for my next job in downtown. that is why I am concerned. You really did not ask that type of question on this survey. I would like to get the bus on Bryant.</p>
<p>I would move to Lyndale if that is my only option, but I am worried about how moving the route to Lyndale will impact my commute due to already high levels of traffic on Lyndale. Based on experience I've found the routes on the side streets to be more reliable. And as a resident who also drives along Lyndale I am not in favor of moving buses there, with expected negative impacts on the speed of car traffic. I worry there would constantly be problems similar to what happens when trash is picked up along Lyndale on Wednesday mornings, with long backups and cars using oncoming traffic lanes to get around trucks.</p>
<p>Steps need to be taken to provide for safe pedestrian crossings on Lyndale. Stops should not be eliminated as this will only increase the distance required to access transit for residents west of Lyndale.</p>
<p>Lyndale is too hard to cross. The next north/south bus route to the west is Xerxes. This creates too large an area without bus service.</p>
<p>More frequent runs of bus service</p>
<p>Lyndale is to busy buses. When I drive my car I dont drive down Lyndale Ave</p>
<p>I would make the walk, but do not like inconveniencing the denser strip along Bryant.</p>
<p>BUT it's DANGEROUS crossing Lyndale at any intersection without a stoplight. Keep buses on Bryant, where they've always been.</p>
<p>Our kids ride the #4 bus regularly- north and south. The Bryant bus attracted us to the area because our kids have special needs. Lydale is not a transit route + there is appropriate spacing between routes- Bryant to Grand to Nicollet.</p>
<p>I personally would be okay--but, as I driver, I have seen pedestrians unable to cross at intersections with no light. Sometimes I stop for them, but only if the car behind me is far enough back to stop. Stopping for pedestrians is NOT the norm on Lyndale, and I suspect cars speed there more than on Bryant.</p>
<p>I do think attention should be made to 49 Street and Lyndale where all the kids from Washburn and Page cross. It is scary to see kids dodging cars.</p>

<p>Lyndale is very difficult to cross at certain times of the day if you are at a crossroads that doesn't have a stop light (such as 37th and Lyndale). The cars can be back to back with hardly any gaps. This is why I never take the express bus on Grand - because it is too challenging and scary to cross Lyndale. I would ask to add more pedestrian crossings with yield lights to better cross Lyndale to get to the bus stop easily. Also take into consideration mobility access to get to and across Lyndale for Walker Methodist residents.</p>
<p>Because the busses aren't stopping every block I would have to travel 3+ blocks more to get on the same bus.</p>
<p>I live on Lyndale at a non-lighted intersection. Crossing Lyndale can be very difficult, and I worry that people rushing to catch a bus will only be more at risk. Moving buses to Lyndale would seem to serve as de facto traffic calming, but people still speed too much on this street. Additional traffic calming features are needed. Please consider proven devices such as curb bump outs and painted crossing at all intersections that would have bus stops.</p>
<p>I am scared of crossing Lyndale.</p>

The draft design for Bryant Ave S includes a shared use path (i.e., combined space for people walking and biking) from 50th St to 40th St and then transitions to a bikeway trail + sidewalk from 40th St to Lake St. Do you think this is the correct transition point?

<p>Other comments:</p>
<p>Please keep the bikes on the street. Bikes sharing space with pedestrians is a recipe for crashes.</p>
<p>I don't have much of an opinion on this, unless it's impacting parking. People depend on street parking on Bryant.</p>
<p>I think that it is a bad idea to have walker and bikers on the same path at any point in the design. Bike commuters, like myself, bike quickly ~15 mph, and this is too fast to share a path with walkers. If the bike path will have a 10 mph speed limit like the ones around the lake, then a neighboring street, like Aldrich or Dupont/Kings Highway should have sharrows add too it.</p>
<p>I don't have strong feelings about the transition point. I'm just really glad that the project is going in at all. This will be great for the neighborhood!</p>
<p>Parking should not be removed in favor of bike lanes - There are already so many unused bike lanes.</p>
<p>no opinion</p>
<p>I don't understand the notion that the bike path should be all ages/all abilities. Roads should be for transportation, not a playground - please use our parks for play!!!</p>
<p>There is no need for bikeways on Bryant</p>

I do not think that pedestrians and bikers should share the same path. This presents a clear danger to bikers, but especially to pedestrians and parents with children.
No opinion
Sharing walking and biking seems dangerous.
Combined path anywhere sounds like a bad idea, just like combining bike paths and car paths is a bad idea
Shared space creates conflict points. It would be far better to give walkers and bikers their own space. These modes are better for the environment and should be given more priority especially on Bryant. There are other North South routes for cars/drivers to use.
just move the bike lane to another street and keep the buses on Bryant - let the people who live and work at Walker Methodist keep their bus connection
I think having a shared use path is a terrible idea and should not be done, so there should be no need for a transition point.
see final comments, more space
Could it be combined all the way in order to allow for more parking?
I have been attacked, stranger to stranger or follow walking down our city streets 8 times. I want closer bus routes, not farther for me to walk. Seiously, I will move out of the neighborhood and out of Mpls if you keep doing these stupid things to our streets and transportation.
Makes sense given the school. Just make sure there is enough parking given existing density.
It is not comfortable for walkers to share a sidewalk with bikers.
This is what bothers me most about this proposal. I think it is dangerous for both the bicyclists and pedestrians . I would feel unsafe as a pedestrian. I will fight against this.
I don't really know, I can't see the plan.
It is unfortunate that the city is contemplating putting pedestrians at risk in such a manner.
As a bicyclist, I would not use these. I will continue to ride Aldrich. Residential streets are better for biking. Bike lanes on Bryant were always a bad idea
I don't usually go that far south, so I cannot evaluate
Separate biking and sidewalk space the entire length of Bryant Ave would be better, but shared use is better than nothing.
Ahhh any consideration for cars???????

Bryant should have one-way cycletracks on each side of the street for the entire length of the corridor.
In general more separate is better.
There should be no shared path therefore there should be no transition point. This is a "loaded" and dishonest question.
Shared paths walk/bike are a terrible idea
I do not bike enough to determine if that is most user friendly or efficient for a transition. I also am confused as to why it needs to be a walking path when we have sidewalks on either side currently.
Ridiculous plan
Why would you combine bike + sidewalks?? Have you seen the rude bikers on Bryant? They are constantly giving people the finger as they blow through intersections and crosswalks. They NEVER stop for pedestrians. This is a disaster of an idea. Please do not make pedestrians even more vulnerable!
See my comments to Question #1. Mixing bicyclists with ANY other method of transportation (POV, bus, pedestrian, etc.) is, and has been for years a dangerous idea. Until those rude, arrogant lawbreakers are compelled to observe some adherence to rules of the road and rights of way, there will be accidents and injuries caused by the bicyclists, even if they roll away unscathed, leaving their damage behind them!
I don't think parking should be sacrificed for a bike lane. It is a false assumption that if you give people bike lanes people who don't bike much will ride on them. Most casual bikers will not use these nor will they ride them in the winter. Avid bikers do not need a bike lane to ride bike. Most use well known quiet residential streets.
I cannot comment on this.
The bike path needs to be in the street!!!!
Bikes don't belong on Bryant Avenue. Use side streets. Also, this question assumes agreement with the concept.
I'm agnostic about whether this is the exact specific transition. THE MOST important thing is that there is a safe bikeway travelling north/south through the neighborhood. If that means removing parking from one side of Bryant or Aldrich to facilitate, I don't know; but a safe bikeway cannot be lost in whatever changes are made
Not a fan of any shared paths, either as a Walker or a biker.
I don't see how forcing pedestrians to share space with a two-way bike trail is making them the top priority. As a blind person, it is confusing to share a sidewalks with bikes. Get rid of parking on both sides of the street if there is space. Most people have long driveways in this section of Bryant and people can park in that off street location. Storage of cars should be the lowest priority or make the street one way in this section.
As a biker and a pedestrian I do not like the mixed-use path.
no opinion on this point

A path or bike way trail + sidewalk are both bad designs.
Biking and walking should be separate.
is there a reason the path cannot remain the same for the entire route?
I am not a fan of having a bike path. The bikes go too fast on Bryant and do not watch traffic signs or pedestrians
Crazy idea. Even rural roads have pedestrians walking against traffic, not traffic, bike or otherwise, coming up behind them. Keep the damn sidewalks, Think of the kids. They need safe sidewalks.
Room enough for bicycles in the street if buses are gone.
Yes, but south of 40th the bike and ped users will need outreach to learn how to share this space.
Don't know how the bike folks use Bryant. How many complete trips (30-50th) versus the north portion (Lake-40th) versus the south portion (40-50th.) It seems like folks don't use it to access Minnehaha Parkway
I do not think shared use paths are acceptable bike/ped infrastructure in 2020. There should be facilities for both bikes and peds. If it means narrower travel lanes or removing more parking, that is fine.
Do not put bikes on sidewalks. Bikes should be in the street.
There are lots of apartments from 40th to 36th, more parking is needed!
Pedestrians and bikers do not often mix well. Having a wide and clearly marked distinction between bikes and walkers is key to everyone's safety.
Not sure
This should not be a shared use path at all; this is a bad option that relegates bicycles and pedestrians to the bottom of the modal heirarchy, squeezing space together while cars and encroachments enjoy the majority of the right-of-way. This design is an explicit affront to the city's modal heirarchy policy.
40th is fine but, I think an argument could be made for a transition point to be made at 46th St. The population north of 46th is denser, and there are bike/pedestrian network connections to parks and other active transportation routes. Please explore this option.
I am nost sure, 42 is a tough crossing for cars, people and bikes.
Not exactly sure. Given the constant state of flux of construction I would not be able to tell.
I think this shared path is going to lead to many conflicts between bicycles and pedestrians in addition to dangerous driveways and intersections.
Not consistent

I live between 46th & 47th St on Bryant & have no other parking than on street.
A shared use path will not accommodate the full mode shift that are explicit goals of the City. If we expect a full halving of the SOV mode share, then based on the project documents, we should expect roughly 1000 additional peds and/or cyclists even discounting the induced effect of a new high-quality bicycle connection. Again, based on the project documents, that results in $350 + 150 + 1000 = 1500$ non-vehicle users on the low end and $2300 + 550 + 1000 = 3850$ non-vehicle users on the high end, which I don't believe will be adequately accommodated by a shared use path.
no opinion
No comment.
pedestrians and bikers should not share a space. Not safe!
I don't support this design.
Shared bikeway trail and sidewalk is pointless, unsafe, and will just cause cyclists to ride in the road.
I don't know. it seems like there are some important businesses in that area that would still want the busses being on Bryant.
I feel uncomfortable when riding on two-way shared trails that are to the side of roadways, partially because of poor sight lines with crossing automobile traffic. Perhaps the design changes to Bryant will help with that though.
Shared use paths put onus on peds and bike commuters for safety and space. I'll keep biking in the street and take the lane.
Why combine walking and bike? Just get rid of the buses!
If transit is moved, it'd make sense to make the trail as long-lasting as possible and continue bikeway + trail to 50th
Not really, 43rd and 46th are also business hubs.
I don't know
That's a crazy plan. Bikes will run over walkers.
Lyndle is already too busy and people drive way too fast. Adding buses that stop every other block will increase traffic and make Lyndale a nightmare. There is no reason to change. If anything, the city missed an opportunity to add lightrail on 35 with the construction. But moving buses on Lyndale is a bad idea
what is the difference b/t walking and biking and bikeway trail and sidewalk? don't they both accomplish the same thing?
Way too much accommodation for bikes

If no, at which intersection would you make the transition?

Responses:
Mpls City Council lives in a fantasy world. Vote them all out!
None
Please keep bikes off of the pedestrian walkway altogether.
46th Street
The block of 39th & Bryant needs to have more parking. This is a densely populated block, 3 large apartment buildings plus 4-plexes, and very busy park across the street, which brings many people who park on the street. Also, the business on 40th & Lyndale has parking that spills over to this block. Going from 33 to 17 spaces on this block is drastic. Whatever needs to be done to keep as much parking on this block. Many many people here do not have garages or driveways.
Bikers and walkers should not share the same path on Bryant. I know the goal is to have All Ages and Abilities, but a leisurely bike path would remove access for bike commuters.
Aldrich is traveled far less and would provide safer transit for walking and biking as well as motor vehicles
I don't think there should be an all abilities path on/by any stretch.
None
bad idea
36th
No combined path. Leave biking on the street.
if it takes away parking on street. I do not approve
n/a
This shouldn't be built at all. Sidewalks have worked for hundreds of years.
There is no need for more bikeways on Bryant.
None at all
No more biking anywhere

I think sharing a path with bicycles and pedestrians is very dangerous
There doesn't need to be combined biking and walking taking up driving space
46th
46th
Difficult challenge for those employed to design solutions. Transactions are key. My cycling experience is often interrupted by designed paths that end, leaving cyclists confused and often in dangerous traffic areas such as intersections. Either complete the entire path logically, or make it clear where you stop the designed path.
N/A
None
I would I not implement the plan. Waste of money and will make Lyndale even busier and more dangerous.
None. Shared sidewalk and bike trail is not ideal
After 36th Ave. Parking in very scarce as it is around the 3600 block
I don't think there needs to be an additional bike lane! The community knows Bryant is a bike "highway" and we share the road with the bikes while keeping enough parking for residents and customers who are visiting businesses. Stop removing valuable parking spots and adding unnecessary bike lanes!
give all users their own space please remove cars off Bryant all together
I agree that pedestrian volume is likely low enough between 40th and 50th for a shared-use path to be sufficient. With a calmed street, pedestrians also have the option to cross and use the sidewalk on the other side of Bryant, if they are concerned about conflicts with bicycles.
Move project from Lake to Franklin.
I do not think a shared use path is a smart option at all. Do you actually ride or walk? I do. Keep the cycling path on the street or better yet, don't have it on Bryant.
46th.
Lake - 50th
none

Leave as is, there's no need for more walking space, buses on Bryant are more important and used more
No intersection. Leave Bryant Ave alone
Bikes off Bryant.
None
I would remove parking and have it extend for the entirety of the corridor instead.
Separate the whole way
Fucking never. Keep the bicyclists away from pedestrians.
As a biker, I would prefer the bike route to run along a less busy street than Bryant.
Eliminate shared paths entirely. Bicycles and scooters have killed and injured pedestrians. It is difficult to imagine that such a plan is being contemplated anywhere.
I do not think there is a need for a shared path at any point in the corridor.
Pedestrians and bikes together do not work. The entire path should be consistent. Keep the buses on Bryant and make a bike path on another less travelled street
Bike lane should be in Aldrich, not Bryant
I wouldn't change anything
Separate biking and sidewalk spaces the whole length of the project.
Go down kings highway
None.
The project shouldn't happen at all, other than move the bus routes
I wouldn't make a transition, I'd have a cycletrack and sidewalk on each side for the entire corridor.
48th
Dupont should be the bikeway
No Shared Path = No transition point.
No transition - dedicated bike path, and sidewalk

I would do 31st St intersection
Nowhere, until and unless you can compel these two-wheeled scofflaws to obey the laws!
There are side walk to walk in no one walk on the street no one rides there bike on side walks.
I cannot comment knowledgable on this.
36
None
There should be no transition or bike lane
I think the bike lanes work just fine the way they are. They have had a traffic calming effect especially with the bus drivers.
42
No shared use path. Independent bike and sidewalk is needed. Too much bike traffic to share
Not transition
Probably further south
None
N/A - see above
44th
Why is the transtion necessary?
I would leave the street as it it.
I think the combined use will make it unlikely to be used by bicycle commuters.
I wouldn't. The facility should be the same for the entire route.
no bike path
Lyndale is too busy for busses and it's not safe to cross. I will go nowhere near lyndale.
no shared path at all
Spaces should not have to be shared like this. There is more than enough room to prioritize people who are not driving.

No transition. Provide separate walking space throughout corridor
38th Street keep the shared path up to Lyndale Farmstead Park
Bikes & pedestrians should not share any part of the path. This will lead to pedestrians injury and death as happened years ago when pedestrians & bikes shared the path around lake Harriet
Should not be a shared use path at any point on Bryant
No intersection. We will move if this plan is put in place.
None. The whole concept is misguided.
It's not clear why there needs to be a transition.
Nowhere. Stop the war on cars.
I don't think walkers and bikers can share a path. This seems crazy to me. Totally unworkable.
36th Street
50th and Bryant
I would prefer separate biking and walking paths in the whole corridor.
Nowhere, it should have dedicated space that separates bikes and pedestrians along the full corridor.
There should be No transition point since there should be no bike lane on this street, it should be on Aldrich.
Don't take away car parking.
not sure, do you people have anyone who lives in this area>?
Bike path shouldn't be together with sidewalk
No transition
I have no idea
N/A
I wish that transition happened further south (46th or 50th St) as to provide a wide enough dedicated facility for bikes.

It absolutely should be 43rd. The school is here, there is a lot of multifamily, and also a commercial node. 43rd also gives easy direct access to Lake Harriet.
38th
Should be consistent with separated walk and bike way all the way to 50th
I would not make the transition. I like this concept everywhere. 1 side of street for walking, the other side for biking.
n/a.
50th. Having dog walkers and bikers on the same path is a recipe for disaster. I'm unlikely to use a shared path with pedestrians.
I don't understand why we need a transition, can't we make the bikeway and sidewalk all the way down?
I would make the full length have separate bike and walking paths
Not applicable. It should remain separate all the way through.
NA
Not at all
Think maybe it should be the same the entire way from Lake to 50th
I would separate bikers. Put them on King's Hwy.
None. The city has done enough and spent plenty of taxpayer \$ on bicyclists. Any additional funding of this type is necessary and should not be considered.
all the way
To many cars already and the next streets over in both directions would be safer for the bicycle traffic
Dont make the transition. Keep buses on Bryant
50th
The bikeway and sidewalk should be separate for the entire segment.
get bikes off Bryant
There should be no shared use path. They are dangerous! This is a through corridor, and many people who bike bike too fast for a shared-used space.

It should be bikeway trail + sidewalk all the way. Why build in discrimination ?

Anything else you'd like to share with the project team?

Responses:
Turning the street into a one-way for cars and two-way for bikes would allow for more width for bikes, perhaps making it possible to fully separate bikes from pedestrians (instead of the current, shared-use path solution). It would also prevent the street from becoming an arterial, as it sort of is now.
Parking is key. There are many apartments from Bryant & 40th street to Lake Street. Many people park on the street because not all apartment has garages or they are filled up. Winter makes parking even more tedious. Also with the park in winter, families will drive over with skates, sleds and it's nice to have parking on the park. It allows both residents and park goers parking. I feel by moving Metro Transit to Lyndale parking should be saved to the amount it is right now.
Mpls City Council lives in a fantasy world. Vote them all out!
Vote everyone on the Mpls City Council (except Linnea Palmisano) out of office
Please, please, please be mindful about not turning Bryant Ave S into the absolute "should all be a oneway but for some reason isn't" mess that is Uptown north of Lake Street.
Bryant is a major alternative to Lyndale right now for drivers. Lyndale is a nightmare to drive on, day or night. Don't take away the best alternative.
I bike often and dislike biking on Bryant because of the shared bike/car lane. If this moves to a shared bike/pedestrian lane I will bike on Bryant even less. Please provide separate lanes for as much of the street as possible. In my experience downtown where there are shared bike/pedestrian spaces pedestrians rarely understand that they can't take up the whole sidewalk. Street signs, meters, etc. get installed in the bike portion adjacent to the curb effectively narrowing the bike portion to something that's not passable for 2 bikes which feels dangerous.
It is not realistic to cause the level of upheaval, on a daily basis, to the lives of so many people who actually live on Bryant, by removing parking, for the sake of a dedicated bike lane. Many bicyclists ride on Aldrich. Why does the city insist on putting bike lanes on the busiest streets? Why are they not put on the less busy side streets? It doesn't make sense. The bike lanes, for example, on 28th & 26th are on busy streets. It doesn't make sense.
There are all already quite a few one ways in the neighborhood with Emerson and Dupont. I think Bryant being a one way as well would just be more confusion than needed. I am concerned about this design is what it will mean for bike commuting. The primary bikers on Bryant currently are commuters going 15+ mph. I know that the goal of this design is expand the use to more than just bike commuters (currently mostly white men), but I think that the bike commuter needs to be more remembered in the design. I, a white female, became a bike commuter when moving to Minneapolis, and I quickly became a comfortable going 15+ mph. I do not use the paths on the Chain of Lakes for commuting because

<p>the speed limit is too slow. I don't feel strongly that commuting speeds need to stay on Bryant, but I think that there should then be sharrows or protected bike lanes (big fan of 28th/26 and Park/Portland) added to one of the neighboring streets.</p>
<p>DO NOT put additional bike on Bryant and lose parking for seniors at LTC and Senior Housing</p>
<p>You're creating problems to solve. Developments made and variances granted per transit on Bryant, leave transit on Bryant. Construction ten years ago on Lyndale, do not want more.</p>
<p>This project sucks. If it's not broke don't fix it. Enough with the bike routes in uptown. No one uses them...</p>
<p>Would only support a one way if one street parking is included especially for the neighbors that really need this option. This design needs to be approved with 100% renter/owner buy in.</p>
<p>I live on Lyndale at 38th and I'm very excited about both the changes on Bryant and getting transit here on Lyndale. Having safe bike facilities on Bryant will make it easy for us to bike kids to/from school at Barton.</p>
<p>If Bryant is one way, doesn't another parallel street need to be one way the other direction to even out traffic flow?</p>
<p>Residents need to be able to park in front of their homes.</p>
<p>Will the city be providing any low interest loans and allow easier variances to residents who will now have to build parking space/ erect garage expansion off their alley or driveway due to lost parking.</p>
<p>Please don't eliminate street parking on Bryant, the current plan eliminates way too much</p>
<p>It just feels like you are trying to solve all the Bryant Ave problems without considering the impact to other streets. It feels like the solutions for Bryant compound the problems on other streets, Lyndale in particular.</p>
<p>People share your priorities the way everyone agrees that taxes suck. In reality, the majority want to be able to move about the city quickly and be able to park. Virtually Everything our city planners have done for the last twenty has made that more difficult. It is time to start truly listening to your constituents instead of serving them platitudes like "do you want safe streets" then using the yes answer to justify changes almost no one wants. The proof? Major petitions and outrage over the changes at the creek and now on Bryant. The backlash will only continue to increase until you actually listen to us.</p>
<p>You only listen to the fraction of 1% who like bikes and hate cars. Having biked to work down Bryant on and off for years - you need better road surfaces and fewer stop signs. A parkway like lyndale would be nice but words like Green space, pedestrian friendly, safety... are code for banning or restricting the use of the use of cars. We will vote you impractical incompetent activists bast*rds out.</p>
<p>Very few people use the existing bike lanes.Having more does not improve anything. In case no one has noticed, we have sub zero temperatures.</p>

<p>There are so many things that are wrong about these plans. A city is built of NEIGHBORHOODS with NEIGHBORS who live on our blocks. To disrupt a neighborhood that actually functions well for those who live in the neighborhood is a real disservice. Where is it written that there should be wider boulevards and greenspace on a busy street like Bryant? Where is it written that streets should be curvy, when this will interfere with snowplows that already have difficulty navigating our narrow streets? These plans are aesthetically pleasing but not practical or functional for those who live and shop at the local businesses. And as stated before, would create a real hardship and impossible living conditions for elderly residents or residents with handicaps. So -- bicyclists would get a nice bikeway, but the many of the people living in the neighborhood would be greatly inconvenienced or would find their home unlivable because of their inability to gain access to their only mode of transportation, their car. Bryant Avenue South is not a perfect street, but it is a street that nonetheless functions well. There is not excessive speeding on Bryant that I have noticed. A one-way street would encourage speeding, in my opinion. In other words, my husband and I are against eliminating parking on Bryant Avenue South because of its violation of the ADA, and also find other "improvements" to actually not be an improvement in the FUNCTIONING of this street which actually functions pretty well as it is.</p>
<p>I think that the current plan does not take the needs of businesses and residents into account</p>
<p>We don't need more one-way streets. We need more access to go to businesses and houses</p>
<p>People on Bryant know they are on a transit route and expect high traffic. If you make it one way and divert traffic to adjacent streets that were not busy and had no reason to believe they would be, it is unfair. Bryant is a thorough fare and should stay that way. Slowing down traffic would be great. But putting biking on an adjacent street where it would not increase car traffic and noise and keeping the parking on Bryant is important. I know of several businesses that would lose customers if parking disappeared. I, for one, would chose a new dentist and a new vet. I cannot bike or bus my dog to the vet.</p>
<p>How many years will it be until busses are moved back on Bryant?</p>
<p>Available street parking in front of a resident's home is essential, regardless of which side of the street the home is located. Do not try to limit speed by creating a meandering lane and restricting street width - try speed bumps instead and maintain width and available parking.</p>
<p>You have a many senior living complexes along Bryant Ave which depend on the bus service to get to grocery stores, doctor's etc. Seniors don't just jump on a bike and go like you thing everyone should. Someday, you will be old, too, and find out what it is like. Shame on all of you.</p>
<p>Many of us who live in this area have other priorities. Crime prevention would be number one. Number two would be affordable housing. This plan is unnecessary and a waste of money.</p>
<p>Please consider not using a chicane between 47th and 46th street. We are so excited about having a full boulevard in front of our house & this chicane moves it to the other side of the street.</p>
<p>If you move this to a one way street, please make sure that there is a bidirectional, protected bike lane. A one way street allows for more parking, which placates a lot of people unwilling to consider other options, but it also likely increases speed on the street. Having protection for pedestrians and bikers will be very important. I would also like to advocate for near-side traffic signals and banning right turns on red in the corridor to further protect pedestrians and bikers.</p>

<p>However it needs to happen/whatever design standard needs to change, the City needs to implement more near-side traffic signals if it is serious about pedestrian and bike safety.</p>
<p>Seems like a waste of money. Why don't you spend it where it's needed like helping businesses on Lake Street. Public safety. It's cold here, I'm older and I drive to conduct my business.</p>
<p>I live a few blocks away from the southernmost end of this project and am very excited to see improvements that move away from car-based transit in the area. I feel uncertain about moving mass transit to Lyndale since it is very busy and unpleasant on foot but have no useful feedback on that.</p>
<p>I thought Concept 3 (Transit on Bryant) was a better concept. The two areas it "Did not meet project goal" are due to the assumption that a bikeway on an adjacent street would eliminate parking on one side of that street. I don't think that assumption is true if the bikeway is located on Kings Highway. Ideally, I would like to see transit on Lyndale (supporting future ABRT) and bikeway on Kings Hwy, and traffic calming, pedestrian facilities, and parking on Bryant to keep all modes separate.</p>
<p>although, there are many narrow streets in the neighborhood that SHOULD be one way, Bryant should be 2-way</p>
<p>Bryant and the east Harriet neighborhood should be the last place that needs bike lanes and more green infrastructure. The chain of lakes are blocks away, Bryant is already a bike highway, you can easily access the greenway or Blaisedale bike lane, there are several parks along Bryant. I think your assessment is seriously flawed and as a long time Minneapolis resident I am disappointed.</p>
<p>I'm underwhelmed by the design proposal. I'm especially disappointed in giving free car storage for cars near Bryant Square Park. Breaking up the separate bike path route to accommodate car storage in a climate emergency given the city's climate goals should be reconsidered. I think the plan improves things vastly for pedestrians you just need to work on the biking infrastructure. Bryant should be low stress, its one of the streets I feel safe riding on. It's uncomfortable how close cars can get. I worry about having a separate path for bikes and the conflict with cars. Riding in the street makes you visible. The proposal isn't bold enough for the Bryant that residents actually deserve. Remove cars off Bryant.</p>
<p>why don't you spend the money on crime prevention, not another bike centric pile of clap trap</p>
<p>I support turning some blocks of Bryant into one-ways to create more room for boulevards/trees (and snow storage in winter). It would be a missed opportunity if Bryant remains a 2-way through-street for vehicles for the entire project length of Lake to 50th, as that does nothing to discourage cars from using Bryant as an alternative to Lyndale. There must be some kind of traffic interruption to sever the corridor as a through street. I wouldn't necessarily want to make the entire corridor a one-way, as that would harm businesses with confusing access. Please consider entirely closing or making one-way the block adjacent to Bryant Square Park (31st to 32nd). The intersection of Bryant and 31st is signalized and could accommodate traffic detouring from Bryant onto 31st (connecting cars to Lyndale or Hennepin). This seems like a major opportunity to do something special for the park, while still providing the neighborhood with street parking. The 3100 block could be a really unique and useful slow-speed one-way "woonerf". Maybe even with diagonal parking instead of parallel (e.g. diagonal parking on a section of the block instead of parallel for the entire block), freeing up space for trees, benches, stormwater features, etc.</p>

You could turn Bryant into a 1 way street but keep a bus lane in the opposite direction. If you turn Bryant into a 1 way street will you then turn Grant into a 1 way street in the opposite direction? Please be more creative in solutions and please don't make drastic changes to people who chose their homes long ago for walkability and access to buses. We are pushing bike lanes too hard in this city when winter parking is a major issue in south Minneapolis. Minneapolis is unlike so many other cities - our sidewalks are much more dangerous in winter than sidewalks in other cities - don't assume every middle aged or older person wants to move as they get older and abandon their south minneapolis home because they can't park close to home or their friend coming over for dinner can't park close to their home, etc. Think about the older people who live in these neighborhoods and be realistic about the impact of winter weather.

Also include Lake to Franklin as one-way. This is what needs greater attention because of congestion, narrow streets, bike paths and speeding.

The only way for the city to care about safety and the climate crisis is to install a *protected* bikeway/lanes on this street. I also take transit and moving that to Lyndale would be totally fine. Bryant is supposed to be a bike route, but right now it is too wide and people drive their cars far too aggressively on it.

I think you should ask the business owners what they would prefer - parking immediately out front or access on a two-way street? Where possible, we should do what we can to create a good environment for businesses in the area (since we are already making great accommodations for bikers!) so I would defer to what would help businesses the most.

It's amazing that I've lived in this neighbourhood for about 12 years, and Minneapolis for 20. I've lived with a car, without and biked, bused, walked. Some of these so called improvements in design are baffling. If you lived near Bryant you would understand that putting a green bike lane on a narrow, heavily trafficked, bus route (like the city did a few years back) was one of the most irritating ideas for everyone who uses Bryant. I have biked in this city for 20 years and this particular plan seems about as practical. I know this is aspirational and there must be some big funds behind this but just because you can do something doesn't mean you should or it's needed. I just really don't see this improves our mobility and lives in our neighbourhood of Bryant Ave. in South Minneapolis. I have never found the intersections to be difficult crossing or walking to be a problem at all.

This proposal is as bad as the Minnehaha Creek proposal that tried to stop through traffic on Minnehaha Parkway. While the street itself definitely needs repaving, all of the extra bells and whistles are yet another example of idealistic city planners trying to inflict some utopian ideals onto our neighborhood without thinking how they will function on a day-to-day basis. Here are some of the worst ideas in the plan. (1) As a cyclist and a walker, I think bikes belong on the street not the sidewalk. It is far too difficult to see bikes on the sidewalk. I almost hit a biker once in front of Hennepin Avenue church because it was going down the hill quite quickly and was not there when I looked before making my turn. Putting bikes with pedestrians is a bad idea, especially with the growth of e-bikes. (2) Bump outs in our climate are a terrible idea. It is difficult enough now to get the straight street in front of our house plowed now or drive around a corner or get to a bus stop during the winter. (3) One of the reasons I love Lynnhurst is because of the many small businesses on or near Bryant. Reducing the parking by 70% during or right after a pandemic is tantamount to the city telling businesses to move to Edina or some other suburb. (4) In the almost 20 years I have lived here, there are fewer and fewer buses and they come less frequently. Yet all recent city plans (like the 2040 plan) seem to assume that buses are a full substitute for cars and that eliminating parking is a benefit to neighborhoods. That is simply not the case! While I am happy to commute by bus downtown if it takes a reasonable amount of time and does not involve changing buses, there is nowhere else I need to go that I can get by bus. In conclusion, given all the challenges our city has now, I see many of the

changes proposed in this plan as counterproductive and frankly as diverting funds that could better be spent elsewhere. Thank you for considering my comments.

Shared bikes/walk will always be a conflict (commuters go 15mph regardless of regulations). Best used in areas with little traffic. Biking from 50th to 46 is steep = fewer cyclists. 40-46th is flat, likely more traffic, better to separate. I'm concerned with loss of parking for businesses and apartments. Could back off the green a bit. But you can't make everyone happy. nice work

I do not want more traffic on Lyndale Ave my home neighborhood. It is not a highway. Why beautify one street and destroy another neighborhood.

The one-way option could be the solution. It would make winter driving much easier and solve most of the other issues.

Yes, come talk to someone who has lived in neighborhood for all these years, before that Ecco and the Wedge. I know the area. I went to Douglas, Whittier, Jefferson and West. I've walked around the lakes thousands of times and shopped Uptown hundreds of times, probably thousands of times. All, I repeat all the improvements make me think many of you are on the take or have people pick you up and drop you off and you don't actually use the streets. Seriously, do any of you live in the City? I used to be proud to live in Mpls and thought it was beautiful. There is a reason no one shops in uptown, no place to park, you can't run into any store to buy something. The 2040 plan is off the charts crazy!

I appreciate the chance to participate in this survey and hope we can find ways to make the project work for everyone. Greatly reducing the number of parking spaces does not make sense to me - it is considering the needs of some but not all. My in-laws are elderly. I look forward to them visiting post-pandemic and I don't want to see this hampered by lack of parking on my block.

I support the design. Even though Bryant is currently a bike boulevard, I tend to avoid it - don't feel safe with cars whooshing by at 35-40 miles per hour. The new design would make it truly bikable!

There's nothing wrong with the way it is now, no need to fix what's not broken

Bryant connects well to the greenway so it feels weird to split the bike paths to two different one-ways.

You all will not stop until mpls is one giant bike path. I have lived at 3654 Bryant Ave S for 14 years. I work(ed) in the service industry and am very concerned about finding space to park, at my home, after I return from work late at night. I would take the bus, but you try figuring out how to get home from the North Loop. Yeah, downtown mpls to uptown

<p>mpls....you'd think there would be bus options, but there's not. Also, who wants to wait for the southbound 4 on Hennepin (or Nicolette) at night? Before pandemic, I def did my best to avoid the area at certain times.</p>
<p>Just don't narrow the street. We have the Kings Highway as a parkway and it isn't safe for bicycles in the narrow street with bump outs.</p>
<p>I like the project overall and I'm excited for the changes! As a condo owner at 4325 Bryant its been hard to sell my unit in the middle of a pandemic, while my HOA is going through a lawsuit and 'parking' is the number one stated hangup potential renters and buyers have had. I just signed a 2 year lease with someone. But I want to make sure you're being extra careful with the 43rd and Bryant intersection and making sure there is sufficient parking given the existing density and school. I moved to this area because of its vibrancy and mix of residential, and commercial space. These older condo buildings already provide great 'missing middle density'. It's got a good thing going with proximity to the school and lake and transit. But it has the potential to be GREAT if you guys do your jobs well :) I trust you. (Trying not to be a 'parking NIMBY' and yet here I am. HA)</p>
<p>I used to live on 34th & Bryant. I now live on 35th & Fremont. I hate our one way street. People drive very fast on a one way street. It also creates a lot more traffic because people get confused on how to get around.</p>
<p>Remove on-street parking to increase multimodal facilities even more. Vehicle access and parking should be at the bottom of the list.</p>
<p>The last suggestion, One Way Bryant, makes the most sense and in addition is much KINDER to residents on Bryant Ave.</p>
<p>I understand where stakeholders are coming from in wanting to turn Bryant into a one-way for this project but I worry about the implications for increased traffic speeds. Overall, I am very happy to see green infrastructure and pedestrian/biker safety prioritized as a part of this project. Thank you for the work that you do!</p>
<p>I'm so glad to have buses of this quite residential street. They are so loud and fly down the road</p>
<p>Please reconsider the plan with a more holistic view of the neighborhoods. As a resident on Aldrich between 34th and 35th, I often wonder if my street should be one-way since cars wait to pass each other because of parking on both sides, and it's not just during the Winter. The street is too thin for 4 cars across. Maybe the thinner streets adjacent to Bryant should play a more substantial role in this solution for bikes and parking. I appreciate the project goals and opportunities for public input</p>
<p>I think that it will look nice but it will drive me out of my home with the cost. it will make it harder for me to get out of my driveway, be hard for me to clear the snow, and give me so space for me to park in the summer. I want to get a job downtown and ride the bus. It is easy for me to catch a bus on Bryant as it is now. This plan really does not help me.</p>
<p>I see benefit in moving the bike lanes to an adjacent street and allow parking to remain on both sides of Bryant. Bryant is more heavily multi unit residences requiring more parking than the other streets.</p>

My preference would be for 2-way traffic on most blocks, but I'd fully support 1-way traffic on a few blocks where space is the most restricted. These 1-ways could also be opposite direction, to effectively create a diverter so that people don't use Bryant to drive all the way from Lake to 50th. Also, I'd encourage the team to consider even less parking on many blocks, to provide even more green space. Walking around the corner to get to a parking spot is not a major sacrifice, and getting to an even greener street design would be great.

Eliminating parking on Bryant seems to be a very poor fit with the 2040 plan. Increased density will equal more cars on the street not less. It seems as if no one has any idea what life will be like following the pandemic. Will buses ever carry more than one or two people? Will a transit system focused on serving downtown be even less viable in the future as more people continue to work from home? It seems now is a poor time for making such plans given the great uncertainty that exists.

I appreciate the thought that has gone into this project, but I wish there was less space for car traffic. In the scenario the team has presented, it is disappointing that 28' out of 55' would be reserved for car traffic or for free car storage. Given that Bryant is surrounded by north-south streets that are open to cars, and that most homes along the corridor have alley and garage access, I believe that it is not too much to ask to have Bryant closed to vehicle traffic (perhaps with the exception of loading zones at commercial nodes). As long as the project team takes it as a given that accommodating cars and their storage is necessary, high quality bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure will be out of reach. At a bare minimum, please do not cave to the inevitable demands for more parking or wider travel lanes. The city has more than enough of both already. Thank you for your consideration.

I think making Bryant one-way is the best idea of this whole project. What would be the other coordinating one-way?
 One-way streets make for greater pedestrian and bike safety

It is unfair that you have pressed forward with this project during the pandemic. Everyone is stressed out and dealing with hardship, upheavals, illness and more. Few people on this street even knew about this until recent weeks. We haven't had time to absorb it, yet you've already made up your minds. This project should be delayed so the public can give more feedback. We are the ones who live here; it is going to affect our day to day lives in huge ways

I would love to finally see a safe north-south bike route through Uptown. There are currently too many cars going too fast down Bryant Ave. I've lived here for over 25 years, I don't drive and spend most of my money in Uptown. I'd like transportation infrastructure improvements like this that I can actually use, rather than spending my property taxes subsidizing car storage.

There are times when there isn't enough parking on Bryant now. I think Bryant and Lyndale should be left alone! You take away parking I am sure people will be moving and it will be hard to fill rental apartments!

As a bicyclist, I don't always feel safe sharing Bryant with cars. I often see (younger) bikers use the sidewalk where I live (between Lake and 31st), which isn't safe for pedestrians. There isn't enough room for bikes, cars, and parking in the winter because of the snow, and people DO bike along Bryant in the winter. As a motorist, I am concerned that bicyclists with whom I share the road may not feel or be safe. Dedicated bike and pedestrian paths are crucial, even if it means reducing on-street parking, or turning Bryant into a one-way street for cars. PS, as both a driver and a bicyclist, I find it terrifying to use Bryant between the Greenway and 28th. It is too narrow with parking on both sides and two-way vehicle traffic.

<p>I would fully support making it one way for more tree planting space and better biking and walking space. I do not think that parking is a valuable use of the extra space created by making portions one way.</p>
<p>They are putting up more rental units in this area creating less on street parking availability. Many homes in this area have no garages or off street parking availability. This project is not a good idea for those homeowners.</p>
<p>Where are people going to park? How is one way traffic going to improve the lives of people who use Bryant daily for driving? I have a camera on the street on an average count more cars parked on the block than bikes that ride past on the street. I know going green is nice and great, but this sounds like a huge headache for everyone living in an apartment or multi family building</p>
<p>I bike, park, work, and live on Bryant and strongly oppose this plan. It would be detrimental for homeowners and renters and would even further decrease accessibility, especially on weekends.</p>
<p>There are so few one way streets in this area, I worry it would be confusing and dangerous for Bryant to turn into a one-way street. As a resident of the neighborhood (32nd and Colfax) I strongly support prioritizing pedestrians and bikers on Bryant. I also strongly support removing on-street parking spaces to make space for these improvements.</p>
<p>I like the proposed changes to 31st-32nd street! I am mildly concerned about parking, but would isolate my concern to summer evenings and weekends. Otherwise, from my observations over the last 5 years, the street can handle the decreased parking spaces fall through spring. Would like to see an enhanced parking lot for Bryant Park patrons, or increased public parking options near Bryant and Lake. There is a lot of spillover in the summers from people parking on Bryant and walking north to Lake street, which leaves residents more easily frustrated and fixated on parking. Especially excited about a boulevard to accommodate snow piles from street plowing and the storm water management proposal.</p>
<p>Stop the insanity</p>
<p>I am a resident of Bryant (3611 Bryant Ave S) and support creating infrastructure that supports the project goals - especially pedestrian accessibility and environmentally conscious design. Although I own a car, I recognize the positive impact of the plan outweighs my possible inability to find a parking spot.</p>
<p>The one-way concept is interesting. It would provide for more parking but could get messy around adjacent streets. Has some initial investigation gone into this option that can be shared?</p>
<p>The future of transportation in cities like ours is dogs. Seriously. Put more space in for non motorized vehicles and make sure there are garbage cans and ways for dogs not to burn their feet in summer.</p>
<p>Creating a one-way on Bryant will shift pedestrian/car problems to nearby streets, which you'll have to address in the next 20 year plan. Also, Lyndale residents do not want all of the transit to be moved to Lyndale. This will only increase the hectic traffic on Lyndale.</p>
<p>Pull your heads out of the sand. Stop drinking the kool-aid. Study the history of transportation and the rise of the middle class to understand the major role that personal vehicles played in creating a strong, stable economy. Wake up to the reality of unintended consequences. And, finally, hire some talented people, even the PowerPoint slide show looks like it was made by amateurs.</p>

<p>You are trying to squeeze too much into the space. You cant ignore the needs of Bryant ave residents and businesses.</p>
<p>Please check the weather. We live in a climate where for nearly 50% of the year bike lanes are useless. Your plans are driving seniors from their homes.</p>
<p>Please stop making Minneapolis unfriendly to drivers. Those of us who are older can't bike to the grocery store, doctors, etc. Please, I beg you, stop catering only to the young and fit.</p>
<p>Once again, I reiterate my opposition to any further planning until and unless the Pandemic crisis is behind us. Perhaps the next mutation will be a virus as deadly as rabies, more easily transmissible than pneumonic plague (not bubonic plague) or measles. If that happens, then the population may drop down to five or ten thousand people, and there will be no "mass" to transit or worry about. If that awful event occurs, then the streets and bike-ways may better serve as mass graves. Re question Number 5. again, with your utopian views of trees and plants. So, are you going to plant elm trees again, or are you and your all-seeing, all-knowing sages going to plant more ash trees How did that work out for you? And us? And how much did that ash tree folly cost the taxpayer? A one-way street which increases parking could have some merit. but would need to see detailed plans and surveys (and surveys carried out by some firm NOT associated in any way, shape or form with the elitist utopians who have mismanaged this city for fifty years! Once again, I reiterate my opposition to any further planning until and unless the Pandemic crisis is behind us. Perhaps the next mutation will be a virus as deadly as rabies, more easily transmissible than pneumonic plague (not bubonic plague) or measles. If that happens, then the population may drop down to five or ten thousand people, and there will be no "mass" to transit or worry about. If that awful event occurs, then the streets and bike-ways may serve as mass graves. Re question Number 5. again, with your utopian views of trees and plants. So, are you going to plant elm trees again, or are you and your all-seeing, all-knowing sages going to plant more ash trees How did that work out for you? And us? And how much did that ash tree folly cost the taxpayer? A one-way street which increases parking could have some merit. but would need to see detailed plans and surveys (and surveys carried out by some firm NOT associated in any way, shape or form with the elitist utopians who have mismanaged this city for fifty years! One other thought. I understood that at one point, the street car rails were still under much of Bryant Avenue. Perhaps the next time you plan to expand your "light rail", you might want to think about re-using those rails, if they are still there.</p>
<p>I am excited for this project and hope the public sentiment is met with facts to increase desire to make the changes sustainable!</p>
<p>One way is out</p>
<p>Please do not follow through with the current plan to decrease on-street parking, especially in business areas. If my clients (and I) have nowhere to park I will be forced to relocate my business.</p>
<p>I think it might be worth considering turning it into a pedestrian and bicycle only street, similar to the kind one might see in Europe. I would expect people who live locally would still be able to drive on it to their homes but commuting or driving through Bryant to get to some other place would be highly discouraged. To be truly safer (until autonomous vehicles are the norm), cars need to be kept way away from pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

<p>I am adamantly opposed to the multi-use path on Bryant. It is dangerous to have bikes riding very fast so close to my front lawn/property. The multi-use path is ugly, will not hold up over time, will not add to the value of my property and bikes need to ride in the street!!!!</p>
<p>Minneapolis needs free-flowing main thoroughfares with parking. We are a cold and dispersed city and need our cars. If a real survey of residents was done the result would be in agreement with this.</p>
<p>I live on Hennepin Ave and the reconstruction there has eliminated way to much parking both for residents and commercially as well. There are already ample bike lanes, including the lakes, in this area and use is sparse at best on Hennepin. Stop making this mistake...Lisa Bender isn't running again.</p>
<p>I think you are wrong about people only using Bryant for a couple of blocks and then turning off to travel to another street. I travel the length of this project from my home at 36th and Bryant going north and south.</p>
<p>Two way traffic works better to retain the grid. One way traffic tends to increase vehicle speeds. Also, drivers wanting to go the opposite way will travel on adjacent streets, such as Colfax and Aldrich.</p>
<p>Please do not lose a protected bikeway. Realize that autonomous driving vehicles are coming sooner than we appreciate and saving large parts of our city for temporary car storage is going to soon be a huge waste</p>
<p>Overall great plan to maximize wide Bryant Ave to facilitate bike traffic, increase green space and decrease car activity</p>
<p>The way the project currently looks gets rid of way too much on the street parking, when we already dint have enough on 43rd and Bryant.</p>
<p>Glad to see buses move to Lyndale because they are too slow on Bryant. Also, the traffic signal at 35th & Bryant seems to encourage motorists to drive very fast on 35th.</p>
<p>All of this discussion of Bryant, independent of the effects on other major thoroughfares in the area borders on insanity. A one way street where either more traffic diverted to Lyndale or other residential streets seems myopic at best. Moving bus traffic solely on to Lyndale, where it is already very difficult to cross at most times of the day seems to be a particularly lousy idea. Lyndale was recently reconstructed to handle vehicle traffic in a more safe and efficient manner, to throw busses onto that street without the proper infrastructure and traffic calming devices is really a bad idea</p>
<p>Horrible plan. When they were counting cars for parking they also should have counted the bicycle traffic especially in our 8 months of winter.</p>
<p>I think this project is a mistake</p>
<p>Need some buffer, even if not full boulevard on the East side of the street between homes and shared path.</p>
<p>Aldrich is already an "all ages" bike route.</p>
<p>I think one way traffic would adversely affect the small businesses along Bryant.</p>

Why go out of the way to make Bryant one way while preserving parking. Side streets have plenty of available parking for businesses, residents, and their guests. A 55' right of way would allow a half profile that includes: 5' sidewalk, 1' buffer, 5' one way cycle track, 5.5' boulevard, and 11' centerline to back of curb for driving lane (repeat that on other side of street). A 55' right of way will naturally force trade offs. But this design follows best practices of bikes traveling 1) up on the curb, and 2) in the direction of vehicle flow to prevent conflict points at intersections. Many countries have cycle tracks as narrow as 5-6' wide, next to similar width sidewalks. This design also allows for strategically places pull-outs for hired transportation, critical business delivery, needs or accessibility, by chicaning the lanes to one side (narrowing/eliminating the boulevard on one side, and providing space for a pull-out by eliminating the boulevard on the other side). It also allows transit to remain in the corridor if desired, using the 5.5' boulevard space for narrow transit shelters if so desired. I'm ambivalent about whether transit should stay on Bryant or move to Lyndale, but we do have more businesses, parks, and apartments along Bryant than Lyndale south of 34th. If Bryant continues to be a slower street with less places to park for cars, transit may make sense to keep there. Bike conflicts (skip-hopping) would be removed.

seems that the current design including moving transit to Lyndale creates enough space. one-way may be too detrimental to business nodes and adjacent streets

Bryant Ave. S from Franklin Ave. to 50th should be one-way the entire length. There are numerous other one-way streets in the vicinity and this is one that definitely should be as well. This would make a huge difference in safety, ease of driving and citizen peace-of-mind.

People drive pretty fast on the one ways in Whittier and Philips. I don't think that making Bryant a one way would make it safer.

4300 block is eliminating 20 parking spaces. I own in East Harriet Flats. Bryant and 43rd are very busy already for parking. Your analysis states 4300 Bryant is currently as it should be and 43rd is already crowded. How can we lose 20 spaces? I already park on 43rd all the time and some days depending on when I'm coming home, I have to park on Aldrich. This is going to make a lot of us have to park even further away. We aren't the ones going to the businesses. We live here and have to carry in groceries, etc. Not fun from a block away.

I'd really like to see wider bicycle facilities. Bicycling with another person is really only enjoyable when you can ride side-by-side, and carry on a conversation. It's not enjoyable when one person has to look backwards to talk to the other person, and when one person has to shout up to the other person. Much in the same way that walking with another person is maximally enjoyable when walking side-by-side. People riding around in private cars are able to chat while sitting side-by-side. I'm not sure that private car drivers should be given that opportunity while people riding or rolling are denied the same opportunity.

Bus line on Lyndale would be disastrously slow given the gridlock during rush hour that was typical pre-pandemic. It is absolutely ludicrous to be conducting and referring to traffic studies in a time when school is not in session, huge numbers of people are still working from home, etc. I urge you to hit the brakes and re-examine when you can get a real picture of traffic patterns.

<p>I would like for the team to state the impact to transit travel times if buses move to Lyndale. The level of auto traffic on Lyndale makes me concerned that transit vehicles will ultimately be slowed in the long run. Combined with the fact that the majority of commercial activity and residential density is along/near Bryant, this seems like a move that does not serve riders well. The buses follow the old streetcar route for good reasons, I think this change is being taken too lightly. I assume that this plan includes the potential to move bus service from Grand Ave over to Lyndale as well - and should be stated as such in materials if that is the case - with stakeholder outreach to residents near those routes as well. Additionally, there should be a more serious look at placing a bicycle facility on a parallel street rather than on Bryant if there are space constraints. If the bicycle facility, or transit service is sub-par because of space constraints, share a plan for what it would look like to have bicycles on Aldrich or Colfax.</p>
<p>Please relook at on-street parking. Our household, and several of our neighbors do not have other parking options. We live here and park here 24/7. Homeowners who are helping to pay for this project should have the priority.</p>
<p>Add more space for trees and eliminate on-street parking!</p>
<p>Bryant should be for busses and bikes only. No cars maybe, but definitely not Lyndale.</p>
<p>Just make it a people only corridor for people on bikes and on foot. Do something visionary instead of marginal.</p>
<p>If we implement a one-way street, it should be used to provide expanded green space for innovative storm water solutions and more space for separation between bike path and sidewalk, not for parking</p>
<p>I think that transit should remain on Bryant Avenue. It is currently a familiar route for many and the redesign of Lyndale a few years ago was not designed for transit traffic. It would only slow down traffic in the area and create further headaches. I think Bryant and Lyndale from 50th street to Lake Street work together where Bryant is for bikers, pedestrians, and transit whereas Lyndale is for cars and trucks. I think this division of purpose is good as is and shouldn't be changed.</p>
<p>Mpls budget shouldn't be wasted on pie in the sky dreamscape exercises. Fix the street within its boundaries and existing use cases.</p>
<p>not yet</p>
<p>Why is the city spending all of this money on a project that is not essential? The city has more urgent priorities. Because of overspending on the stadium, Minneapolis now owes millions on it. Due to murders by the police, Minneapolis owes millions to the victims families. In addition people are still living in tents in the freezing cold. Minneapolis should pay what we owe and use other money to help those without housing instead of putting money into more never ending construction projects. MNDOT HAS already turned Lyndale into a freeway with their continued construction of 35 W. Adding buses to Lyndale is going to make this section of Lyndale more unpleasant.</p>
<p>very concerned about the lack of concern for business parking at 50th and Gryant</p>
<p>One way might help but that would need to be combined with not having a combined use path and providing a safe separation between paths and residential yard areas</p>

<p>I live one block of Lyndale Andrew I cannot believe the consideration of adding busses. Have you driven Lyndale in the last few years?? Where will the busses go? It is already so congested, and with the restricted lanes (???), what a nightmare. Your group will truly show your incompetence and lack of care for the community and people if you attempt to put busses on Lyndale. Insanity. Just another reason to leave the area....</p>
<p>Your parking numbers don't match what I see everyday on Bryant Ave between 47 & 48. During snow emergencies, 47 is full and the apartments from Bryant/ 46 park there. I've helped shoveled many of them out</p>
<p>The chicanes are cool but may be unnecessary. Traffic calming will be achieved by the narrow driving lanes currently proposed. Both side of the streets should get good sized boulevards. Also, I'm am really thrilled with the stormwater runoff treatment possibilities!</p>
<p>One-way would be great. But if we have that extra space, don't give it all to parking -- use it for more green space and bike/ped facilities. Perhaps put more buffer between the sidewalk and bike trail so that there's not conflict between those two overlapping modes.</p>
<p>I think moving the buses to Lyndale is a great idea (I am a Lyndale resident that uses bus transport very infrequently, 3-4 times a year, but Bryant is so narrow it would help that street greatly. Lyndale is busy but the increased bus traffic would not materially effect noise or congestion. Further since the redesign of Lyndale there is ample opportunity for stop amenities along the route. The biggest problem will be at the 50th & Lyndale intersection where now it is hellacious to turn west onto 50th from Lyndale so that will require major rework</p>
<p>I find it so interesting that you identify "stakeholders" mostly as people who do not live on Bryant Ave S. We do not want bikes or buses on Bryant Ave. We would approve a one-way street if we could still park on the east side, otherwise, we will move. In a year of COVID and so many other disruptions, this is so upsetting. Thinking about leaving the home we've known for decades, the home we had hoped to leave to our children is troubling. We'd love trees & a boulevard but if we cannot park on the 4700 block of Bryant, we will have to move. Did you take into account the needs of older adults?</p>
<p>one ways generally move too fast. Also, a one way on bryant would mean you'll need to find another route for the return trip - here there is no naturally "paired" one way.</p>
<p>I think this project is about 75% of the way there. It is massively better than the current roadway. But we need to have a truly transformative design to fight climate change in the decades to come. Please consider taking more space from cars to live up to the city's complete streets policy and carbon reduction goals.</p>
<p>The Bryant make-over concept is an unnecessary waste of money. We moved to Colfax Avenue because our special needs children require transit. They bicycle to work, play and school when weather permits. They take the bus frequently. Lyndale is NOT a bus route, especially with only one thru lane. Keep the buses on Bryant. Plant more trees. Bicyclists do not pay the freight for these hack-neyed ideas. The engineers should spend our money and energy on projects that benefit the entire community- not just cyclists. Please be sure these comments to make it into the record.</p>
<p>Increasing traffic and parking on adjacent streets in order to plant trees on Bryant, current residents/stakeholders/taxpayers should be the priorities</p>

It appears that this project has been developed in a vacuum, taking into account the opinions, needs and priorities of some stakeholders but ignoring those of others. What is being proposed is along what the Minneapolis 2040 plan describes as a Corridor. Bryant Ave. has many multi-family homes where a high number of residents forgo owning a car in order to make use of public transportation. Shifting transit several blocks away will negatively affect accessibility for those on Bryant Ave. Additionally, by shifting transit to Lyndale, an already extremely busy street (and designated in the Minneapolis 2040 plan as an Interior street, meaning more single-family homes), this project creates problems rather than solutions. Crossing Lyndale is already far more difficult than crossing Bryant - this plan will make it nearly impossible and further exacerbate the ability for Bryant residents to access public transportation. Please reconsider this approach and identify other ways to manage traffic on Bryant.

Are you out of your minds? Both Hennepin and Lyndale are getting the “war on cars” treatment, and now Bryant? How exactly is normal north south volume supposed to get around in this city? This is utter lunacy. We have homeless people and affordable housing crises yet you want to rebuild existing roads to make it harder for people to get around? Stop it. Put \$\$\$ where it matters. This is not a priority.

I just think this is all a huge waste of money.

I support the effort to reduce on-street parking along the corridor in order to accommodate other project goals. However, I think that all blocks should have at least some on-street parking, in particular those residential blocks with no driveways. I live on the East side of the 4700 block, and we are one of the few areas along the corridor that does not have driveways. The current draft also has 0 on-street parking spots for this block. With no on-street parking and no driveway on Bryant, it makes it extremely challenging to have any visitors, any delivery drivers, etc.

Remove the semaphore and replace it with a stop sign at Bryant Ave S & W 35th St, since there will no longer be buses on Bryant. 1. There are many t-bone collisions at the intersection caused by drivers ignoring the red light. 2. Cars speed between Bryant & Lyndale on W 35th, trying to beat the lights. 3. At rush hour, cars line up for blocks waiting for the light to change. Synchronizing the signals citywide would help too.

I like the idea of transit moving to Lyndale - there is simply too much happening on Bryant between bikes, cars and transit. Thanks!

Look to Vancouver BC for examples of great bike infrastructure

Making Bryant a one way might push more traffic into Lyndale. Lyndale is already too busy, adding a bus lane and making Bryant a one way would certainly increase traffic on Lyndale. The proposed plan says traffic on Lyndale was assessed to be at an appropriate level. I would like to see more data on that. Lyndale traffic without a bus lane is already at a level I feel is unacceptable. All of this is surely going to make it worse. Are we prioritizing bikes? I think we need to prioritize bus transit options. Why are bikes always the priority? How about keep the bus on Bryant and moving bike lanes to Aldrich?

The goal for all-ages cycle routes is generally good, but 1) we have long winters when cycling is dangerous, 2) many cyclists (and car drivers) go too fast, endangering pedestrians, 3) many older or infirm people will not take up cycling, no matter what.

If transit goes to Lyndale, there needs to be a light at 41st or 42nd to allow people to cross. Kids cross to go to Judson preschool at 41st and Harriet, and crossing for Bethelhem Church is dangerous. I don't think turning Bryant into a one way is a good idea to create parking. If one way creates a bigger boulevard to plant more or taller trees (flowers and shrubs can fuck all the way off), then I'm in favor it.

This is the perfect opportunity to have a pedestrian friendly north/south connection from lake street to minnehaha creek. We desperately need to remove as much vehicle accommodations from this street as possible.

Again, I recommend doing a current traffic study. Even with COVID-19, Lyndale is jam packed with traffic at all hours of the day. Please consider your neighbors when deciding on this change.

I live on Bryant between Lake st and 31st. I have no back parking and it is often hard to find a spot to park (during non-Covid times) because of restaurants at Lake & Bryant. I don't want to lose half the parking on my block. Can it go from 31st to 50th?

I see that not all stakeholders were invited to participate. The Tangletown and the Kingfield neighborhoods border Lyndale Avenue, but do not seem to have been included. Many of the Bryant Ave transit riders come from these neighborhoods. Many residents of these neighborhoods would be impacted by increased traffic on an already overburdened Lyndale Ave. People who have recently purchased homes on Lyndale will see their property values drop with changes to the traffic level. The street is already dangerous to cross, please do not make it worse.

turning Bryant into a one-way will only attract more vehicle traffic. A one-way says "expressway" to vehicles.

The one-way option should not be considered if it does not include a fully dedicated two-way facility for cyclists. I will not be using the shared trail when this project is implemented and will stay in the street. Drivers park across sidewalks/trails on their driveways constantly, and you constantly have to slow down for side-by-side walkers and dog leashes stretching across the trail. For those of us who bike for transportation instead of recreation, this design is a significant downgrade, because now drivers will get angry at us for being in the street. If it's converted to a one-way without a dedicated two-way bike facility, I'll have to divert to other streets with fewer safety features to get places by bike in a timely manner. Additionally, one-ways tend to push people to drive fast. Please try to use the full right-of-way first before considering this option. It also tends to blind drivers from bikes coming in the opposite direction if there is a contraflow facility.

As long as you give Great Value to a tiny percent of the users you will not be able to see how poorly visioned this plan is. Gaslighting yourselves prevents you from seeing the whole picture.

I am concerned about lost parking spaces on Bryant and that they will overflow to my corner. I live at 44th & Aldrich.

Nice work on this! The concepts represent a very balanced approach to addressing mobility needs in this area. Bryant is my primary bicycle route to/from my home and improvements to safety and roadway condition are sorely needed. I am looking forward to not having to avoid sinkholes and buses on my bike. For a regional service like ABRT, Lyndale makes a lot more sense for that type of transit given its role as an arterial and ability to move people efficiently. Bryant makes more sense for local origin and destination trips and its level of transit service should correspond to that. I support moving the 4 (or F,G,H line) to Lyndale, but ask that Metro Transit explore keeping the 23 on Bryant for its jog on Bryant between 36th and 38th. I don't think there would be a major travel time penalty and I notice many older adults and people with disabilities that board here from Walker Place, as well as Walker Place employees that use the 23. I would be concerned that moving the stop would shift some of these customers to Metro Mobility due to conditional eligibility. Also, as we develop transit service on Lyndale we should pay attention to developing a high quality pedestrian environment on streets that would connect to rapid bus service, particularly from multi family housing or community amenities (36th and 40th come to mind as primary examples). The proposed treatments at intersections will calm traffic and ease pedestrian crossings and I am strongly in favor of them. I also drive in this area and in my experience there is not a major shortage of parking, except during a snow emergency, and the City has many tools (residential permitting, accessible space permitting, etc.) to mitigate the effects of reduced parking.

Keep car parking.

Lyndale is an extremely inappropriate bus route for several reasons, including width, residential nature, and proximity to Grand bus route.

Really happy with the proposed design! I'm glad the city is prioritizing walking, biking, and greenspace over parking. I have been living on Bryant for almost a decade and bike into downtown most days and happy to see these improvements.

The signs on Lyndale (where I live) let me know about this effort. Thanks!

Please don't make Lyndale even more congested than it already is. Bike lanes are important but are not busy enough on Bryant to completely impact Lyndale 13 months a year. There is also King's that can provide space for bikers as well.

Bryant has been a bikeway for at least fifteen years that I can remember. It has become the default bicycle throughway for from the Greenway southward. Moving the busses a short block over seems like a good idea also.

I have been commuting the length of Bryant from 55th to Franklin for years and I have often wondered why aldrich and bryant weren't changed to one way streets. Biking on Bryant north of Lake Street is absolutely terrible conditions in the winter due to the narrow lane and inability of plows to effectively remove snow. In addition, the entire length of Bryant has many poor sight-lines and this would likely be alleviating considerably if they were to change to one-ways.

The signal timings at Lake/31st and 35th/36th are set up for cars. On a bike, you end up having to stop twice at each pair - there is not enough time to get through both lights in the pair at bike speed. This really needs to be addressed. I bike Bryant almost every day. The city proposal looks like a big improvement. Thanks for the great work!

Residents of busy streets in south Minneapolis have been suffering extreme traffic changes / increases since the 35W construction began two years ago. Now it's finally almost back to normal and you're going to rip up our streets for more

<p>construction? Please give us a break already. It feels like the world and our neighborhood are in chaos and I can't handle more change right now.</p>
<p>As noted, the changes proposed to Bryant will affect the network of roads around it. For this reason, the scope of the project should be broadened in nature, at a minimum to incorporate Lyndale (as a major thoroughfare). To follow the current path of this work, will be shortsighted and very likely lead to a scenario where Bryant Ave residents win/gain and Lyndale Ave residents lose. In general terms, the work / efforts here are good to see. Improvements can be made to improve the flow of people and modes of travel daily. But let's not only address one piece of the broader network through SW Mpls.</p>
<p>Please don't speak too quickly when presenting. Allow time for listeners to understand.</p>
<p>You can absolutely not go through with a plan that takes that much street parking away!</p>
<p>Thanks for the opportunity to provide input.</p>
<p>I love the idea of a one way. Water quality is an issue that is so important, with more green space that would be a great improvement. I also like the idea of having green boulevards on both sides of the street.</p>
<p>I think turning Bryant into a one-way going NORTH would be a great idea. Don't do it to expand parking though... do it to expand the boulevard between bike path and sidewalk or just the bike path itself. It would be a dream to make the bike path double the width as it is proposed today to accommodate groups of bikers. I often see people biking side by side on Bryant today (which is much nicer than single file). I often drive south on Blaisedale which amazingly quick (much better than Lyndale). So Bryant going north is perfect. Lyndale or side streets should be able to accommodate people needing to redirect themselves.</p>
<p>I think making Bryant a one way street would just add to an already ivercongested Lyndale.</p>
<p>Not willing to give up on street parking</p>
<p>This would be a really great idea if transit remained on Bryant, and if either Aldrich or Colfax were then one-way going the other direction and also had corresponding transit.</p>
<p>I LOVE that idea a LOT</p>
<p>We'd have to move if transit (specifically route 4) was moved off of Bryant Ave and we've been here for decades and planned to live the rest of our lives here (or as much as we could).</p>
<p>This, combined with the increase in crime, has made me think about moving out of the city I love, after 43 years. It is, to be blunt, a crazy idea.</p>
<p>People drive too fast on one-way streets.</p>
<p>Very pleased to see transit moving to Lyndale. Please don't skimp on investments to transit infrastructure there.</p>

<p>Putting two-way bike traffic on a one-way street is dangerous. Cars at intersections will not be looking for contra-flow cyclists.</p>
<p>I am strongly against this idea. We need to live in this area and have easy non-congested flow of traffic, walking, biking. The non-Bryant streets want to remain as they are calm-side streets. I don't want to overburden an already busy Lyndale. Making Bryant one-way inevitably means that other streets become busier and more chaotic with cars needing to have flexibility of flow. Making improvements to function of Bryant is good but NOT at the expense of all other streets. changes should improve the access and flow of movement, not restrict it. It doesn't matter how much green space is around a street if the street is backed up and busy. Don't restrict the flow.</p>
<p>Very opposed to moving all transit to Lyndale. I live on Lyndale - it's bad enough we have to deal with the 2040 plan, but now you want to add all the buses too?</p>
<p>I've lived on Bryant Ave S for 3 years now! One year near 26th, and 2 near 40th. Before the pandemic, I biked to downtown Bryant to work downtown. Love all of the changes. Bryant just doesn't seem appropriate for the massive double length busses we get. Lyndale has much larger setbacks, and is really the obvious choice for bus traffic. I'm also open to the idea of making portions of Bryant one-way. My only concern is that the "right-sizing" of parking might have gone a bit too far, especially with increased density from the 2040 plan. Also, what if there is a snow emergency? I generally like the parking reductions, but I think a couple more spots per block could be wise.</p>
<p>Given its cost the fact that it meets the most project goals, Option 2 is clearly the best plan for both the city and stakeholders. I have never had an issue with buses or traffic on Lyndale, and rerouting buses to that avenue prioritizes pedestrian safety.</p>
<p>It's tough to get a feel for how this would change things. Wouldn't you need a corollary one-way street then to go the other way? Aldrich?</p>
<p>I am hopeful that moving transit to Lyndale will result in great transit efficiency, which will result in greater transit usage. On the concept of making some or all of Bryant a one-way, I think there should be fewer one-way streets, not more. Lyndale traffic is still too fast. The county needs to be on board to help address that.</p>
<p>I know it's technically outside the scope of this project, but the lack of a bikeway to actually connect lake street to the midtown greenway is a huge gap: it's one more block to add infra to but bikers will have to literally ride in the street for one single block due to this gap.</p>
<p>Please keep the bus route on Bryant</p>
<p>Make it a one way with separation for a bike path and walking path. Don't hire out bike infrastructure projects to engineering consultant firms who have made terrible bike connections in the past. E.g. 36th and kings highway connections.</p>
<p>Please do not do only the suburban shared-use side path! This is not good enough.</p>

Businesses on Bryant would suffer with less traffic if transit was moved to Lyndale, and/or if Bryant were to become a one way. Why does it seem like most transit projects are being done to make changes for the sake of making changes, not to actually make improvements? Are you aware Lyndale recently went through a very expensive redesign that added traffic calming elements like weaving lanes, parking cut ins and lane reductions, now you want to add buses to this recently reduced roadway. Ridiculous. Next you'll want to waste millions expanding Lyndale back to its former layout to accommodate public transportation. When will someone realize we live in MN and people don't ride their bikes as much as Europe? It's not because we don't have enough bike lanes, it's because we have winter. This phase of bike path crazy city council and planners is going to be over soon, which is the change most people want to see.

No loss of parking.

Regarding #5: I think if exploring making Bryant a one-way in parts or whole, we should explore splitting it into two directions at some point, with a diverter -- which leads to my second point. 2. A big portion of this project's goals related to pedestrians and cyclists should be to keep Bryant as neighborhood-only traffic. Any continuation from Lake to 50th Street should be considered a negative -- especially if the city is going through the trouble of relocating transit. We should explore traffic diverters along Bryant, even if the path for cyclist is off-street. We should consider grand, beautiful traffic diverters that might actually be chunks of green space adopted by the neighborhoods with trees and grass, which could be implemented wherever there isn't driveway access to Bryant. Please consider this! Thank you.

Must consider existing housing types and activity on Bryant and Lyndale. Lyndale already very busy and difficult to cross for pedestrians. This plan would further exacerbate this difficulty

One way streets usually increase traffic speed. Not a fan of chicanes (RE: impediments) this kind of crap just increases road rage & moves traffic to residential side streets & worsens already poor plowing. Lyndale should have been the transit street, but now it's F'd up with a curvey slolem & only one lane each way. If you want to decrease speeds get traffic control out there & make \$ at same time, instead of designing streets to function poorly by installing obstacles and eliminating lanes. Cars will never go away in MN until GOOD transit is ALREADY in place and it's actually [crime] safe to be on it and the streets at all hours. And bike commuters aren't going to use side streets b/c you have a stop sign every other block; it's too putzy. If it's a designated bike route, it needs to be freed from most of the stop signs along the route.

I like the idea of moving transit to Lyndale. I think the loss of parking due to losing one side of the street and all the bump outs will significantly effect the people who live on Bryant Ave. It will also effect the people on adjoining streets as residents fight to parking where they can.

Would rather remove parking than implement one-way street.

I do not want buses rerouted on to Lyndale. It is already such a busy street with traffic and buses will clog the flow even more. It will be very difficult to travel down safely especially with one lane people will want to pass the buses and it will be dangerous and cause frustrations for drivers and those that live on Lyndale Ave. This is not safe for the community and I highly recommend not rerouting the traffic on to Lyndale Ave S.

Moving buses to Lyndale is a bad, bad idea. Traffic there already clogs up and makes access or crossing difficult. Clogged traffic -- as now happens often on 46th. St. since its dumb redesign, for example -- adds a lot of air pollution to Minneapolis. Adding buses to a street that has only two lanes means every time a bus stops, traffic will pile up even more behind it. Or some lamebrained chuckleheads will try to zoom around the bus in the opposing lane. All those

<p>things will be even worse in the winter whenever there's snow and slush. Leave the buses on Bryant and move the bikes to Dupont/King's Hwy.</p>
<p>Absolutely not. What are you guys thinking? There's literally no basis for a harebrained scheme like that. Maintain 2-way traffic. And keep busses on Bryant.</p>
<p>Turning Bryant into a one-way will just increase traffic on neighboring roads.</p>
<p>Moving bus traffic to Lyndale is not acceptable. When the Lyndale design was done, it was clearly defined as not suitable to buses. The lanes do not accommodate for stopped busses and stop all traffic behind them. This increases potential for cars trying to get around them and causing accidents.</p>
<p>removing transit will make me more likely to bike on Bryant and increasing the safety at intersection will also really help</p>
<p>One way streets tend to speed up the traffic and with two parks seams to be a reckless idea to the children</p>
<p>We have enough bike lanes. We dont need to move buses to Lyndale for creating more bike lanes. This will make Lyndale way too congested. Just because apt buildings are being built on Lyndale, does not mean there needs to be a bus.</p>
<p>I don't believe adding bus lines to Lyndale, which is already congested, is the right goal for this project. You can still maintain bus lines on Bryant Ave if you move the trail to 50th and accommodate accordingly.</p>
<p>I do not agree with moving the buses to Lyndale. Lyndale was recently redesigned with features such as bump outs to not accommodate buses. I also disagree with the assessment that Bryant is at capacity and Lyndale has room for more transit. If you go to either street any day you will see that there is minimal traffic on Bryant compared to Lyndale. Also between 36th and 50th, Lyndale is almost entirely residential where Bryant Ave has a school and a number of businesses that would benefit from the bus route. The buses should stay on Bryant and not move to Lyndale.</p>
<p>rather than move Metro Transit buses to Lyndale, they would be better off to move buses to Dupont to 36th then maybe to Colfax. The buses on Lyndale make driving either direction on Lyndale very tough. However, the rerouting is temporary and I think traffic would be okay knowing the project is a temporary disruption. The 4 bus on Bryant is an excellent bus ride to and from downtown.</p>
<p>One-way bikeways going with the flow of traffic is better than a two-way bikeway in which one direction is going against the flow of traffic. Motorists turning onto or coming from driveways and side streets may not look both ways and cause dangerous conflicts with bike traffic.</p>
<p>get bikes off Bryant</p>
<p>Eliminating the bus route and moving it to Lyndale is concerning. Lyndale is an extremely busy road and I have safety concerns over a bus route being moved there and pedestrians crossing the street in dangerous traffic. That impact on the bus rider stakeholder should be explored more.</p>

<p>Leave buses on Bryant but reduce the number of cars travelling on Bryant.</p>
<p>I strongly support the addition of boulevards, chicanes and the bike path. The intersection treatments also look very good for pedestrians and bikes. I've been pleasantly surprised with how nice the new path on 18th ave NE feels when biking on. It seems like a good idea to apply this design style to other street reconstructions as it allows the streets itself to be made narrower. Aggressive driving has been especially bad this year in the city and any design treatments to force drivers to slow down are welcome.</p>
<p>a one-way street is a bad idea - people will drive faster</p>
<p>This looks to become another unfortunate design mistake, just like the Lake to 36th work that was done on Hennepin Ave S.</p>
<p>I live on 32XX Lyndale Ave S and like many of my neighbors, have been here since before it was converted. The Lyndale Ave project had many of the same goals as the new Bryant Ave project. For me, the main benefits have been decreased noise and traffic calming. The only drawback has been an increase in traffic backups, so I have a difficult time understanding how transit would work given that it gets backed up every day during rush hour and is much busier in general with the increased density of the neighborhood. Not being able to get around a stopped bus will greatly impact traffic flow and frustrate drivers. Emergency vehicles already have a difficult time getting through during busy periods and adding transit would only make that worse. Every winter, the snow decreases the lane width considerably which poses risks to parked cars being damaged by passing buses. Additionally, it will further increase noise and pollution which will lower property values and quality of life. Lyndale was not redesigned for transit. One of the design ideas for Bryant Ave was "squeeze it in" and that is what it feels like you are doing if you move transit to Lyndale Ave.</p>
<p>We have 6 most of winter. People are going to drive cars, electric in the future. You need to plan for reality, not wishful thinking and strictly young childless athletic persons.</p>

INTERACTIVE FEEDBACK MAP COMMENTS

Pin Category	Initial Comment	Follow-up Comment(s)
Pedestrian safety and access	Barton relies on bikes, foot traffic, city bus and cars in a unique way on Bryant but unarguably needs to protect the 100s of children. What works here doesn't have to be a model for any other intersection.	
Transit service or amenity	46th is a commercial node on bryant, not Lyndale, busses should contrive on this stretch of bryant.	There's also a commercial node at 46th and Grand... which would be much better accessed if the stop is placed in between these two nodes (e.g. on Lyndale).

Transit service or amenity	46th is a commercial node on bryant, not Lyndale, busses should contrive on this stretch of bryant.	I agree that having buses stay on Lyndale would be great for equally servicing both Bryant/46th and Grand/46th commercial nodes. Moving buses off of Lyndale back to Bryant for just a few blocks would greatly slow down the transit time to/from downtown for those bus routes.
Transit service or amenity	38th and Bryant is a superior location for busses over 38th and Lyndale given the park and Walker traffic for recreation and work.	
Transit service or amenity	36th and Bryant is a walking node with many apartments vs Lyndale and 36th with all four corners dedicated to drivers.	
Transit service or amenity	50th and Bryant is a commercial node (vs. 50th and Lyndale) and busses should remain on bryant from 46th to 50th.	I'm pretty sure the proposed re-routing of the 4 bus takes 50th street (after turning from Lyndale). This node would still be served.
Transit service or amenity	50th and Bryant is a commercial node (vs. 50th and Lyndale) and busses should remain on bryant from 46th to 50th.	I think it would be a huge mistake to have buses remain on Bryant between 46th and 50th. That stretch is all residential, and forcing buses off of Lyndale for just a few short blocks would greatly slow down transit time to/from downtown. As the other commenter said, the 50th and Bryant commercial node would still be served by buses either way.
Transit service or amenity	50th and Bryant is a commercial node (vs. 50th and Lyndale) and busses should remain on bryant from 46th to 50th.	Totally opposed to adding more bus routes to Lyndale Ave. it is already overcrowded and with the higher speed limit it will only attract more traffic than what your are proposing. Also, you are considering redoing the 50th and Lyndale interchange. This was discussed during Lyndale reconstruction and rejected due to having to remove houses on the corner. Whereas on 50th and Bryant there is an empty automotive business where space can be taken to redo that intersection. Currently, if a car is turning right on Lyndale other cars behind swerve into the left turn lane to pass at the intersection. Whatâ€™s

		to keep that from happening every time a bus comes to a stop? Lastly, even with the stoplight to cross Lyndale it is still dangerous with speeding cars and now cars will swerve around buses because they can't see the stoplight. Are the accidents between vehicles and pedestrians/bikes due to buses or other vehicles? If not, moving buses to Lyndale will NOT solve this issue.
Bicycle facility and access	Bike lanes would enjoy the safer conditions on Kings hwy from 36th to 50th (vs. Bryant). Except for the big hill at 39th	This might be true but I believe the Park Board already decided not to add a bike facility to Kings Highway.
Business access, parking, or	We do not have off street parking. We would like to have a curb cut put in for a planned garage build during this construction. House 4045	
Pedestrian safety and access	Right now this intersection is a nightmare -- drivers heading north to Lake Street roll through the stop sign at 5-10 mph many times, narrowly missing pedestrians -- and the same thing happens for drivers coming off Lake Harriet and headed to Lyndale. This design concept will definitely help, but I really think coming up with some sort of brand new idea to discourage poor driver behavior will be key with kids returning to school. It could be that this is where a diverter is placed.	I agree that a more aggressive traffic calming element would make sense here. Mini-roundabout? Not wild about diverters given that it would funnel n. bound traffic to Aldrich which would then be a left turn across a pedestrian crossing with no signal/stop sign.
Bicycle facility and access	43rd street is being considered as a low stress bikeway, so making sure that is considered in this linkage will be important.	
Green infrastructure/sustain	With no private driveway access for a significant chunk of this block, this could be a great spot to consider culdesac'ing	

	Bryant for 20-50' and adding some trees and plantings, as a continuation and linkage to Lyndale Farmstead Park.	
Bicycle facility and access	Are we at a point yet where we can re-negotiate with businesses (or skip them entirely) to get the 36th Street off-street bikeway connected this this new Bryant route? That could be key for people getting safely from Uptown to this node, and to Bde Maka Ska. It looks like this in this rendering, but please push for this!	Please do not remove parking on this corridor. There are already plenty of ways to get to the lake without removing much needed business and residential parking for this business node. It is very easy to travel an extra block to get to the lake or take a residential side street,
Bicycle facility and access	Are we at a point yet where we can re-negotiate with businesses (or skip them entirely) to get the 36th Street off-street bikeway connected this this new Bryant route? That could be key for people getting safely from Uptown to this node, and to Bde Maka Ska. It looks like this in this rendering, but please push for this!	I like the idea of having less parking and being able to bike more. I want to be able to bike on this road without people flying by unsafely. I'm also for less parking to make this happen.
Bicycle facility and access	Are we at a point yet where we can re-negotiate with businesses (or skip them entirely) to get the 36th Street off-street bikeway connected this this new Bryant route? That could be key for people getting safely from Uptown to this node, and to Bde Maka Ska. It looks like this in this rendering, but please push for this!	I agree with connecting the 36th Street off-street bikeway. As a cyclist I'm not a huge fan of the design, but it would be better if it connected all the way to Bryant – the switch at Dupont is painful.
Bicycle facility and access	Traffic light timing -- can we time these lights so that someone traveling at 12-14 mph has a shot at making all of the lights, but someone drive 30+ mph gets stopped more? That would encourage safer driving speeds and also encourage more people to choose to bike vs. drive.	great idea!

Bicycle facility and access	Traffic light timing -- can we time these lights so that someone traveling at 12-14 mph has a shot at making all of the lights, but someone drive 30+ mph gets stopped more? That would encourage safer driving speeds and also encourage more people to choose to bike vs. drive.	I like this idea!!
Bicycle facility and access	Traffic light timing -- can we time these lights so that someone traveling at 12-14 mph has a shot at making all of the lights, but someone drive 30+ mph gets stopped more? That would encourage safer driving speeds and also encourage more people to choose to bike vs. drive.	Yes, please. Especially at Lake and 31st -- I've only seen one cyclist make both lights in the years I've lived in this neighborhood.
Pedestrian safety and access	All of these bumpouts look amazing -- thank you! Can we also consider raised crosswalks at all key intersections?	second this. With connecting street stop signs prior to raised sidewalks.
Other feedback	Another good zone to consider culdesac'ing Bryant and expanding the park/greenspace to connect to the west side of Bryant. Something 20-50' could be enough to establish as a safe green space.	Yes, I think staff should consider closing blocks to traffic wherever possible to make this the best facility possible for bikes/peds.
Other feedback	Another good zone to consider culdesac'ing Bryant and expanding the park/greenspace to connect to the west side of Bryant. Something 20-50' could be enough to establish as a safe green space.	Cul de sacing is an unnecessary expense. This project should not be including every bell and whistle.
Other feedback	If Bryant had traffic diverters at this intersection, many of the dangers cyclists face north of this point would be avoided as motorists rush toward Lake Street to avoid Hennepin.	Yes, the worst part about biking north of here is the amount of cars that use it for through traffic. A simple diverter would do wonders here.

<p>Bicycle facility and access</p>	<p>Connections on the following cross streets are dangerous for cyclists on the bike paths at the following intersections (coming/going from the EAST). 32nd, 35th, 37th, 42nd, and also problematic at 39th, 40th, 41st, and 46th. The problem is that you have vehicles parked on the East side of the street buffering bicyclists from visibility by cars leaving and entering those streets. Drivers leaving Bryant are at significant risk of hooking bicyclists due to not seeing them hidden behind parked cars and SUVs and far outside their field of vision and awareness. In addition, for cars coming into Bryant from cross streets, drivers will be forced to inch forward directly into the way of bicycle paths in order to see if they are clear of cars before turn/cross onto Bryant from traffic. In the proposed configuration, it seems the only way to prevent cross-modal accidents is to have stop signs for bicyclists on every block forcing them to look both in front of them and behind them for cars as they leave the safe cocoon of the bike path into the 'car space'. Seems to not pass the 8-80 age test. The problem is particularly bad at intersections which are not four way stops as listed above. You can address this problem by moving the parking to the other (West) side of the street where no bicycle path exists. Also, it would be good to indicate where stop signs will be located in your design and to raise sidewalks to make drivers very clear of the bike path they may be inadvertently obstructing.</p>	<p>This commenter raises some very valid safety concerns with the separate bike path configuration and makes a compelling argument for keeping the bike lanes in the roadway. I think residents that will have to walk across the bike path to get to and from their homes and apts. will be unsafe as well. I foresee pedestrian / bike collisions.</p>
------------------------------------	---	--

<p>Bicycle facility and access</p>	<p>Connections on the following cross streets are dangerous for cyclists on the bike paths at the following intersections (coming/going from the EAST). 32nd, 35th, 37th, 42nd, and also problematic at 39th, 40th, 41st, and 46th. The problem is that you have vehicles parked on the East side of the street buffering bicyclists from visibility by cars leaving and entering those streets. Drivers leaving Bryant are at significant risk of hooking bicyclists due to not seeing them hidden behind parked cars and SUVs and far outside their field of vision and awareness. In addition, for cars coming into Bryant from cross streets, drivers will be forced to inch forward directly into the way of bicycle paths in order to see if they are clear of cars before turn/cross onto Bryant from traffic. In the proposed configuration, it seems the only way to prevent cross-modal accidents is to have stop signs for bicyclists on every block forcing them to look both in front of them and behind them for cars as they leave the safe cocoon of the bike path into the 'car space'. Seems to not pass the 8-80 age test. The problem is particularly bad at intersections which are not four way stops as listed above. You can address this problem by moving the parking to the other (West) side of the street where no bicycle path exists. Also, it would be good to indicate where stop signs will be located in your design and to raise sidewalks to make drivers very clear of the bike path they may be inadvertently obstructing.</p>	<p>This commenter raises some very valid safety concerns with the separate bike path configuration and makes a compelling argument for keeping the bike lanes in the roadway. I think residents that will have to walk across the bike path to get to and from their homes and apts. will be unsafe as well. I foresee pedestrian / bike collisions.</p>
------------------------------------	---	--

<p>Bicycle facility and access</p>	<p>Connections on the following cross streets are dangerous for cyclists on the bike paths at the following intersections (coming/going from the EAST). 32nd, 35th, 37th, 42nd, and also problematic at 39th, 40th, 41st, and 46th. The problem is that you have vehicles parked on the East side of the street buffering bicyclists from visibility by cars leaving and entering those streets. Drivers leaving Bryant are at significant risk of hooking bicyclists due to not seeing them hidden behind parked cars and SUVs and far outside their field of vision and awareness. In addition, for cars coming into Bryant from cross streets, drivers will be forced to inch forward directly into the way of bicycle paths in order to see if they are clear of cars before turn/cross onto Bryant from traffic. In the proposed configuration, it seems the only way to prevent cross-modal accidents is to have stop signs for bicyclists on every block forcing them to look both in front of them and behind them for cars as they leave the safe cocoon of the bike path into the 'car space'. Seems to not pass the 8-80 age test. The problem is particularly bad at intersections which are not four way stops as listed above. You can address this problem by moving the parking to the other (West) side of the street where no bicycle path exists. Also, it would be good to indicate where stop signs will be located in your design and to raise sidewalks to make drivers very clear of the bike path they may be inadvertently obstructing.</p>	<p>This commenter raises some very valid safety concerns with the separate bike path configuration and makes a compelling argument for keeping the bike lanes in the roadway. I think residents that will have to walk across the bike path to get to and from their homes and apts. will be unsafe as well. I foresee pedestrian / bike collisions.</p>
------------------------------------	---	--

<p>Bicycle facility and access</p>	<p>Connections on the following cross streets are dangerous for cyclists on the bike paths at the following intersections (coming/going from the EAST). 32nd, 35th, 37th, 42nd, and also problematic at 39th, 40th, 41st, and 46th. The problem is that you have vehicles parked on the East side of the street buffering bicyclists from visibility by cars leaving and entering those streets. Drivers leaving Bryant are at significant risk of hooking bicyclists due to not seeing them hidden behind parked cars and SUVs and far outside their field of vision and awareness. In addition, for cars coming into Bryant from cross streets, drivers will be forced to inch forward directly into the way of bicycle paths in order to see if they are clear of cars before turn/cross onto Bryant from traffic. In the proposed configuration, it seems the only way to prevent cross-modal accidents is to have stop signs for bicyclists on every block forcing them to look both in front of them and behind them for cars as they leave the safe cocoon of the bike path into the 'car space'. Seems to not pass the 8-80 age test. The problem is particularly bad at intersections which are not four way stops as listed above. You can address this problem by moving the parking to the other (West) side of the street where no bicycle path exists. Also, it would be good to indicate where stop signs will be located in your design and to raise sidewalks to make drivers very clear of the bike path they may be inadvertently obstructing.</p>	<p>This commenter raises some very valid safety concerns with the separate bike path configuration and makes a compelling argument for keeping the bike lanes in the roadway. I think residents that will have to walk across the bike path to get to and from their homes and apts. will be unsafe as well. I foresee pedestrian / bike collisions.</p>
<p>Business access, parking, or</p>	<p>Why are bikers being prioritized over home-owners who need on-street parking? Especially, when the home-</p>	<p>I disagree. Bikers can be home-owners too and even if they are renters, they still are residents who live in the area and deserve to be included.</p>

	owners are being assessed. It's not the right prioritization.	
Bicycle facility and access	While the road may not warrant full reconstruction, the lack of continued dedicated bike lanes on this one block to connect to the Greenway is a huge gap and should be included in the project.	I agree. It's - ONE - block. Add something to connect all the hard work of a dedicated bike lane to the Greenway.
Green infrastructure/sustain	Would like to see a boulevard buffer between the sidewalk and driving lanes for both sides of the road. A wide enough boulevard for large trees is preferred, as trees add shade and will stop errant vehicles from entering the sidewalk.	
Other feedback	I'm in favor of converting Bryant Ave to a single-lane one-way road if it adds more space for: boulevards, biking, sidewalks, and parking.	Me too!!
Bicycle facility and access	I suspect that the bike trails will be stop-controlled at each intersection, but would prefer less stops as a bicyclist, as it takes a lot of energy to start up. Some bicyclists are more likely to yield or ignore the stop signs	This commenter raises some very valid concerns with the separate bike path configuration and making it necessary to have a stop sign at each intersection. This is a compelling argument for keeping the bike lanes in the roadway. I think residents that will have to walk across the bike path to get to and from their homes and apts. will be unsafe as well. I foresee pedestrian / bike collisions.
Transit service or amenity	I prefer to move transit to Lyndale Avenue to separate bike traffic from bus traffic/users. The 4 would also be faster going downtown without having to re-route to/from Bryant.	Strongly agree!
Transit service or amenity	I prefer to move transit to Lyndale Avenue to separate bike traffic from bus traffic/users. The 4 would also be faster going downtown without having to re-route to/from Bryant.	Agreed with this! I am super excited about the buses moving to Lyndale even with the extra block I'd walk to the stop.

Bicycle facility and access	Would love to see this block of Bryant blocked off to through traffic (except bikes and pedestrians).	
Business access, parking, or	Unlike most of this corridor, the East side of the 4700 block has no driveway access to Bryant. I think this block needs to maintain at least some on-street parking (though I support the effort to reduce the total amount of on-street parking in order to accommodate green space, etc.). With no driveways AND no on-street parking, it would make it extremely difficult to have any visitors, delivery drivers, etc.	I do not understand this comment. The east side of the street on this block has an alley with garages/parking spots behind houses. The west side of the street has all driveways with all but one (as I recall) having a garage. I get that it is convenient to park on the street, but an assessment is not a charge for a parking place or convenient loading area. All houses with alleys and garages should also have dedicated street loading spots on every block? I appreciate that this is a change and potentially aggravating, but for those with alleys, parking spots, and garages, asking the city to provide another private spot. . . . well, I think I value the bike lane more.
Business access, parking, or	Unlike most of this corridor, the East side of the 4700 block has no driveway access to Bryant. I think this block needs to maintain at least some on-street parking (though I support the effort to reduce the total amount of on-street parking in order to accommodate green space, etc.). With no driveways AND no on-street parking, it would make it extremely difficult to have any visitors, delivery drivers, etc.	Sorry for the confusion, I definitely wasn't advocating for private spots or "dedicated" spots. I just think it would make sense to keep a small handful of on-street parking spots available rather than totally reduce to 0, similar to the proposed design for many other blocks on the corridor (e.g. 4900, 4600, 4500, 4300, 4200, etc.). Unlike driveways, alleys are a shared space. For someone with a driveway it is relatively easier to have visitors park in your driveway when they come. You can't do the same with alleys or they will block alley access for others. Not all houses on this block have extra paved parking areas in back in addition to their garages. And presumably garage space is already being used for homeowners' cars.
Green infrastructure/sustain	This block (4001 to 4052) drains terribly. Every driveway has large pools of water at its end in the late winter and spring. Some water mitigation will be necessary if there is to be a bike path on the eastern side of the road.	

<p>Bicycle facility and access</p>	<p>Bicycles coming down the hill from 48th are going extremely fast. Consider how to slow them down and provide pedestrian safety in the shared lane</p>	
<p>Business access, parking, or</p>	<p>Hello I am commenting on the need for residents to park their moving trucks.</p> <p>There are many renters on this particular block. The buildings are constructed with the larger entry doors and larger doors into the apartments are located facing Bryant Ave. Where will the moving trucks legally be allowed to park? The average rental length in this area is about 2 to 3 years so considering the large amount of rental this is a very important concern.</p> <p>I have asked this question months ago and was told not to be concerned until the draft was done. I went to the recent open house. I asked this question twice and two other questions. They refused to answer my questions, so why there was a discussion it did not include all that wanted to be involved in the conversation. This lack of transparency seems directed mainly at the renters as most of the single family homeowners have adequate space to park their vehicles , including moving trucks.</p>	
<p>Business access, parking, or</p>	<p>This block needs as many parking spaces as possible due to the large amount of rentals on the block. While there is some included there is a large amount more that could be incorporated by including all of the East side of street for parking. The narrow green space will not be enough to counter the need of existing and future residents for parking. This planning seems to go after the renters on the block. While the</p>	

	<p>need for pedestrian safety and bike lanes is understood why eliminate 3/4 of the existing parking spaces when there is a possibility to have safe bike and pedestrian and also some street parking on this block. There are two businesses and at least 64 apartments plus plenty of single family homes. Please Please please consider keeping the entire east side of the street for parking.</p>	
Transit service or amenity	<p>This block currently functions incredibly well due to the buses that use Bryant Ave. It will be sad to see them go. Bikes are great, but many people use them mainly when the weather is warm. The busses allow transportation options that are not as seasonal.</p>	
Other feedback	<p>Consider removing the stoplight here</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
Other feedback	<p>Consider removing the stoplight here</p>	<p>Disagree. This is a busy intersection and the stoplight makes it safer</p>
Transit service or amenity	<p>I like the idea of moving buses to Lyndale to allow for a more creative design, but wonder if the 4 should move to Bryant south of 36th Street to align with the higher density and businesses on this stretch. South of 36th, Lyndale is low density residential.</p>	<p>I agree with this idea of moving transit access to Bryant Avenue South of 36th Street to accommodate higher density housing units, access to parks, and businesses.</p>
Bicycle facility and access	<p>I cannot imagine a shared use path working on Bryant. How will 20MPH ebikes mingle with dog walkers and driveways? Keep the bikes separated or mix the bikes with a *heavily* calmed roadway.</p>	<p>Bikes on a multi use path is a bad idea. Bikes go very fast, they don't observe stop signs, bikes will be too close to lawns. It's dangerous!! The bike lane needs to be in the street!!!</p>
Business access, parking, or	<p>I generally support moving buses to Lyndale to make Bryant a homerun street for bikes and ped (which the current design is not). I just wanted to comment that I will miss grabbing a</p>	<p>I initially thought about this, but most of us live nearby that the extra block or two to walk on/off the bus isn't going to stop us from grabbing a</p>

	donut while waiting for the bus here or popping into the hardware store on my way home when I get off the bus.	donut or stopping by the hardware store, for me it'll probably keep happening regardless.
Business access, parking, or	On-street parking is very necessary on this block and in this area. There is no Alley access on this street. In addition, the 3 homes on the East side of S Bryant (4433 in the middle) have no garage and no driveway going behind or even beside our homes. Two of the homes share a tight spaced, four car parking pad. Losing all of our on street parking would make the car shuffle a daily nightmare. Visitors, deliveries even just clearing the parking pad of snow would have to be a coordinated event with our neighbors. We have used the on-street parking in front of our home overnight for 22 years. While we appreciate the need for safe biking and we love the care for our environment and the city's lakes and streams, we need an exception here. - Thank you for considering our unique situation and thinking outside the box.	
Business access, parking, or	Please do not remove parking from this corridor the businesses and residence need this parking.	
Transit service or amenity	Against moving trust route to Lyndale	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and will cause issues in the winter.	Bump out will be near my house and I'm looking forward to it here! There's been a lot of speeders lately and I'm glad this'll help fix that.
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and will cause issues in the winter.	I agree! When snow plows swerve around these bump outs they leave giant crusts of snow that take away more parking!
Other feedback	Unnesesary. Delete to save cost.	

Other feedback	Unnecessary. Delete to save cost.	I agree. The snow plows will swerve around this and leave giant crusts of snow eliminating more parking.
Other feedback	Do not add cul de sac. Unnecessary expense.	I agree that a cut de sac is unnecessary. Please consider putting the rain gardens, swales and other plantings in the Lyndale Farmstead Park right there.
Other feedback	Unnecessary: Delete. Keep costs down.	
Other feedback	Eliminate bumps, save costs.	
Other feedback	Eliminate bumps. Save project costs.	
Transit service or amenity	Commercial nodes need transit support. People will not walk to businesses. Keep transit on Bryant.	
Other feedback	Pedestrian bumpouts not necessary. Please remove, divert costs to Electric Bus.	This is a busy intersection for pedestrians so I actually wouldn't mind having bump outs. I've lived in the apartment building across the street for three years and have never seen an accident or pedestrian safety concerns, but a flashing stop sign in all 4 directions couldn't hurt. As for green infrastructure, Lyndale Farmstead is a huge green space/park and I don't think we need additional green infrastructure here.
Other feedback	Pedestrian bumpouts not necessary. Please remove, divert costs to Electric Bus.	please keep the busses on Bryant. We need bus routes spread out in the city, not bunched up. There is already a bus on Grand. We need one further west than Lyndale. Bryant was designated a transit corridor in the 2040 plan. This is a densely populated corridor. It needs a bus more than Lyndale does. People who live west of Bryant will be less likely to take the bus if you move it.
Other feedback	Pedestrian bumpouts not necessary. Please remove, divert costs to Electric Bus.	Agree with the commenter above that no additional green infrastructure is needed on this block since there is Lyndale Farmstead Park.
Bicycle facility and access	I frequently bike on Bryant to do errands and visit friends, and I would love to see cyclists prioritized	

Other feedback	These bumpouts are not necessary and when snow plows swerve around these they leave giant crusts of snow that relimitate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bumpouts are all unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around these they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	Another unnecessary bump out that snow plows need to swerve around leaving giant snow crusts that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	Another unnecessary bump out that when snow plows swerve around will leave giant crusts of snow that will eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow ploys swerve around them they leave giant crust of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	

Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	I live on this block. I like bump outs. They calm traffic, which helps keep my kids safe. My children's safety is more important than parking or "giant crusts of snow." We have oodles of parking on our block, thank you, we can afford to lose some parking to some for the greater good.
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	Agree with above comment about bumpouts
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	I live on this block as well and don't think the bump outs are necessary. We do not have "oodles" of parking on this block. Perhaps those with garages do. Removing street parking is very Edina-like, where street parking is not allowed in most places. I thought this was the city. Also, as a pedestrian, I find the parked cars help slow traffic. The neighborhoods where street parking has been eliminated (like Hennepin from lake to 36th) have become more like raceways. That is also what happens when one-ways are installed.

Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	Agree with the above comment about bump outs
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	There are several businesses at this intersection. Removing parking with eliminate customer access to the vet, restaurant, hair salon and other busiensses. Please keep all street parking here available.
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	I live at the apartment building here. Super excited for the better access to bike lanes. More curbside room for boulevards and the bump outs are great to help reduce speeding cars.
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	Snow plows already leave giant crusts of snow and the roads are straight. I find it difficult to believe having a moderate curve would actually make snow removal more difficult.
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are unnecessary and when snow plows swerve around them	

	they leave giant crusts of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bumps outs are an unnecessary expense and when snow plows swerve around them they leave giant crust of snow that eliminate more parking.	
Other feedback	These bump outs are an unnecessary expense and when snow plows swerve around them they leave a giant crust than eliminates more parking.	
Business access, parking, or	This is one of the densest blocks along the whole length of this project. The parking study was done b4 the Kolo bldg. was built. There are 3 service people with service vans who live there and park on the street. I think this block needs to maintain more on-street parking. With such a drastic reduction in on-street parking, it would make it extremely difficult to have any visitors, delivery drivers, service people, friends pick up and drop off for carpooling, etc. I observe people putting their flashers on and parking in the roadway to take groceries into their homes. This is not safe. With the current amt. of parking this block is completely parked up and many have to park on 36th and 37th Sts. And when there is a snow emergency I see people circling the block for an hour looking for a place to park. If this is going to remain a snow emergency route the road needs to be as wide as possible for emergency vehicles to get through in the winter time. We have had to go to one side parking when the snow encroaches into the road. Are you going to go to no street parking at all in the future when this happens?	

<p>Business access, parking, or</p>	<p>This is one of the densest blocks along the whole length of this project. I think this block needs to maintain more on-street parking for the workers, therapists and visitors to the Walker.</p>	
<p>Business access, parking, or</p>	<p>This is another very dense block. I think this block needs to maintain more on-street parking. With such a drastic reduction in on-street parking, it would make it extremely difficult to have any visitors, delivery drivers, service people, friends pick up and drop off for carpooling, etc.</p>	<p>I also agree with the above comment. There are several apartment buildings (with 15+ units) on this one block and a majority of the residents only have street parking. The proposed plan only provides 17 parking spots leaving most residents, some elderly and with young children, having to park 1-2 blocks away from their residence.</p> <p>Additionally, this block is used as parking for families who are visiting near by lake Harriet, the Lyndale farmstead sledding hill and park.</p>
<p>Business access, parking, or</p>	<p>This is another very dense block. I think this block needs to maintain more on-street parking. With such a drastic reduction in on-street parking, it would make it extremely difficult to have any visitors, delivery drivers, service people, friends pick up and drop off for carpooling, etc.</p>	<p>This block has many multiple-unit buildings. The 3 buildings closest to 40th are all multi-unit buildings with about 100 people total living in them. There are only a few off street spots for the 3 buildings. The remaining housing on the block is mostly 4-plexes and duplexes. The block is usually 80% parked up in the evenings. 40th street is also usually 80-100% parked up. The park across the street is very busy with activities such as ice skating, walking, sledding and spring/summer/fall children's soccer and other sports using lots of parking. Also, the restaurant on 40th & Lyndale (formerly Harriet's, soon Spice Market) brings a lot of customers to the neighborhood who park on 40th and Bryant. Going from 39 parking spaces to 17 on this block is unrealistic. It punishes people who are already living densely. Trying to carry groceries from 2 blocks away or coming home after dark will be hardship. There are numerous older people and some with disabilities who live here.</p>

Business access, parking, or	This is another very dense block. I think this block needs to maintain more on-street parking. With such a drastic reduction in on-street parking, it would make it extremely difficult to have any visitors, delivery drivers, service people, friends pick up and drop off for carpooling, etc.	I agree! And it's worse in the Winter. Please consider the highest usage time of year and snow emergency restrictions when making these decisions
Business access, parking, or	This is another very dense block. I think this block needs to maintain more on-street parking. With such a drastic reduction in on-street parking, it would make it extremely difficult to have any visitors, delivery drivers, service people, friends pick up and drop off for carpooling, etc.	This block has two massive apartment buildings and is about 90% parked up most of the time. It is dangerous to expect people to park a couple blocks away and walk home after dark. Also, how to carry provisions home? People do not have garages or driveways.
Pedestrian safety and access	All of these bumpouts look great, but I especially like this one, which gets a lot of foot traffic (not just from me!) heading to and from Lake Street.	
Transit service or amenity	Why is there be a proposed bus stop at this location? Does not seem like a large number of riders would be using this bus stop.	
Pedestrian safety and access	Lyndale is currently very difficult to cross at 41st & Lyndale so seems like an un-safe location for a bus stop.	
Transit service or amenity	Removing transit from this location would likely mean that those living in Walker Methodist that have reduced mobility would no longer be able to ride the bus.	It is cruel to consider removing the bus. Many people who both live and work at Walker use this bus line. Moving it to Lyndale will not work. It is not easy to "wheel" over to Lyndale, nor when getting off an 11pm shift to walk over there in the dark. People have worked long, hard shifts and are tired. Do not compromise people's safety. Keep the #4 & the #23 on Bryant.
Pedestrian safety and access	I like the shorter distanced crosswalks here " much safer for businesses!	I agree. This is a very busy pedestrian intersection. I would recommend putting flashing cross walk signs here to increase pedestrian visibility.

Other feedback	Keep bumps and add more ways to slow down cars	
Other feedback	Keep bumps and add more ways to slow down cars	
Business access, parking, or	All of the parking here will be used by people living in the apartment building and those using Guse grocer & hardware leaving no other parking for the rest of the street. Need some additional spots farther down on the street.	