BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF DOUGLAS COUNTY, KANSAS

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2015
7:30 a.m. – at Health Department 2nd Floor Mental Health Consortium Sub Committee meeting.

4:00 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

(1) (a) Consider approval of Commission Orders

REGULAR AGENDA

(2) Discussion of Building Code and Inspection Review (Sarah Plinsky)

(3) Consider scope of work for continuation of Margaret Severson and Jason Matejkowski's services on the jail project, and authorize the County Administrator to execute contract for services (Craig Weinaug)

(4) Take action on solicitation for proposals for a design professional for a new mental health crisis center (Craig Weinaug)

(5) H2020 Steering Committee's Issue Action Report (Jeff Crick, Planning Department)

(6) (a) Consider approval of Accounts Payable (if necessary)
(b) Appointments
-Board of Construction Codes Appeals (1) position
(c) Public Comment
(d) Miscellaneous

(7) Adjourn

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2015
-Consider conveying real estate property to Economic Development Corporation of Lawrence (Craig Weinaug)

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2015 – Cancelled

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2015

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16 2015

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 23, 2015

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 2015

***Note**: The Douglas County Commission meets regularly on Wednesdays at 4:00 P.M. for administrative items and 6:00 P.M. for public items at the Douglas County Courthouse. Specific regular meeting dates that are not listed above have not been cancelled unless* specifically noted on this schedule.

DOUGLAS COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
Douglas County Courthouse
1100 Massachusetts Street, Unit 204
Lawrence, KS 66044-3064
(785) 832-5329 Fax (785) 832-5320
www.douglas-county.com

Sarah Plinsky
Assistant County Administrator

MEMO TO: The Board of County Commissioners
Craig Weinaug, County Administrator

FROM: Sarah Plinsky, Interim Director of Zoning and Codes
Assistant County Administrator

SUBJECT: Building Code and Inspection Review

DATE: November 5, 2015

The Commission reviewed and approved an outline for a review of the Building Code and Inspection function. Because of the limited size and scope of the review, staff conducted and informal solicitation process. Two proposals were received and they are attached. Both proposals are within the purchasing limits that can be approved administratively.

Both firms have solid proposals, excellent reputations, and are more than qualified to complete the work.

	Austin Peters	Novak Consulting
Project Timeline	16 weeks	8 weeks
Project Cost	$90 an hour at 102 hours. Estimated $9,180, plus mileage ($682 per trip)	$17,500

Given the estimated costs for the project, staff is recommending Austin Peters. The timeframe for that project is proposed to be longer. If that is a concern for the Commission, staff can try to negotiate an accelerated timeline. Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

Building Codes and Inspection Review

Building Code enforcement is difficult regulatory function in many communities. Building codes ensures that properties are built safely and create an equal "playing field" between builders and contractors. The nature of building codes is precise, orderly, and meticulous. Careful review of plans and thorough inspections protect the public interest. However, a slow review and inspection process is expensive for builders and clients and hampers the development process.

Douglas County Zoning and Codes currently has four staff members and is responsible for the enforcement of building codes and inspection, zoning regulation enforcement, and floodplain management in the unincorporated area of Douglas County. They work in partnership with the City of Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office, which handles most planning items.

The Douglas County Board of County Commissioners is seeking consulting assistance to evaluate the Building Codes and Inspection services function in the following functional areas:

Responsiveness

- Review the total number of inspections, building permits and plan reviews over the last several years
- Determine length of time for plan reviews and compare to comparable governments in the region.

Fair and Professional

- Research what best practices are being utilized by other governments to integrate contractor and builder feedback to ensure that staff interactions are fair and professional.
- Interview and/or conduct focus groups with contractors and builders to solicit feedback on the building inspection process and building code enforcement.

Best Practices Review

For the following issues, the consulting firm will identify regional and comparable local governments and solicit the following information from each.

<u>Value of the Construction, Building Permits and Fee Structure</u>

- Determine how the value of construction is determined and is used in calculating the cost of building permits.
- Do they have policies and procedures for waiving building permit fees?
- How do other communities handle projects that are unable to be completed by the owner? What is maintained in the record on the property?

- Do other communities adjust permit fees if the project's value changes during construction? If so, how do they do it?
- Do other communities have buildings that are constructed without a permit and then are later modified? How do they set the permit fee amount and handle pre-existing code issues?

Building Codes

- What versions of the International Building Code have been adopted?
- What various types of building inspections are conducted?
- What types of tests are used to verify the validity of work performed during inspections?
- If new methods of testing should be considered, how do other jurisdictions do that? What process do they use?



Proposal for Services:
Building Code and Inspection Function for Douglas County, Kansas

October 16, 2015

THE AUSTIN PETERS GROUP, INC.

Rebecca G. Crowder, President
Elizabeth Tatarko, Vice President
P.O. Box 27196
Overland Park, Kansas 66225
Ph (913) 851-7530
Fax (913) 851-7529
www.austinpeters.com

THE
AUSTIN PETERS
GROUP, INC.

October 16, 2015

Dear Sarah:

Enclosed please find our proposal for facilitation and evaluation services for the Building Code and Inspection Function RFP. We understand that there may need to be discussion about the proposed process and possible changes. We are open to visiting with your team to make needed adjustments in the strategy to produce the outcome you are seeking. We believe similar studies we have done for other cities and counties will be beneficial to your project.

I look forward to visiting with you about the project. If you have questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Beth Tatarko

The Austin Peters Group, Inc.
4809 Prairie Vista Drive
Fort Collins, Colorado 80526
970-266-8724 (Fort Collins Office)
913-851-7530 (Overland Park Office)
913-851-7529 (fax)
www.austinpeters.com
etatarko@austinpeters.com

Company Information

About the Austin Peters Group, Inc.

The Austin Peters Group, a small Kansas-based company, brings together experience and energy under the name of Austin Peters. Rebecca Crowder, President of Austin Peters, founded the organization with the commitment that this small company will provide high quality, tailored products to meet the demands of public, private and nonprofit sector customers. According to Rebecca, *"I was frustrated with the lack of personal attention I received from large consulting companies, and the products were generic. I wanted to change the quality of services available, particularly to the nonprofit and public sectors, so The Austin Peters Group was born."*

The Austin Peters Group is a designated Women Business Enterprise (WBE) under the Small Business Administration's certification program. This firm was formally incorporated June 24, 1998. The founders of The Austin Peters Group, Rebecca Crowder and Elizabeth Tatarko, have over forty years of experience collectively in human resource management, strategic planning, leadership and professional development, grant writing, fund development and program evaluation.

Customer Support

Elizabeth (Beth) Tatarko
The Austin Peters Group, Inc.
4809 Prairie Vista Drive
Fort Collins, Colorado 80526
970-266-8724
913-851-7529 (fax)
www.austinpeters.com
etatarko@austinpeters.com

Qualifications and Experience

Elizabeth (Beth) Tatarko, Masters in Urban Planning—Vice President. Elizabeth has served local and state government—as well as nonprofit organizations—for more than 25 years. Prior to joining The Austin Peters Group, she was the Assistant Director of the Kansas Center for Rural Initiatives at Kansas State University. Elizabeth has provided technical assistance to more than 300 local, regional, and state organizations. She provides expertise in evaluation and survey design; community and economic development, citizen involvement and facilitation, community participation, conflict resolution, focus groups, and strategic planning.

Over the past several years, Elizabeth has co-authored nearly all of the studies undertaken by The Austin Peters Group, Inc. She has extensive work experience in government, nonprofit and higher-education settings. She has completed multiple projects with survey research, focus groups, individual interviews, and group facilitation. She has also served as a program evaluator for university and state government programs. Elizabeth has served as an organizer and leader for training programs that

have reached more than 5,000 people. She received specialized training in conducting focus groups from the University of Minnesota under the guidance of Dr. Richard Krueger, the national leader in this field. She holds a Bachelor of Science in Political Science and a Master of Science in Regional and Community Planning from Kansas State University.

Elizabeth also served as President of the Manhattan-Ogden School Board and facilitated a community-wide $97.5 million school bond issue that passed with a 69% vote of the public. This project took several years to see to fruition.

She served as the Project Manager for Johnson County's Performance Evaluation program involving more than 3,000 employees. She also served as co-project manager for the Ford County Organizational Assessment. Professional Memberships and Certifications: APA, SHRM, Myers Briggs Type Indicator, DDI Trainer, Center for Creative Leadership graduate, and Focus Group Facilitator, University of Minnesota.

Project Responsibility: Project Manager, responsible for oversight and detailed involvement of entire project. She has worked for APG for 16 years.
Location: Beth Tatarko is located in Fort Collins, Colorado.

Marla Flentje (pronounced flen.gee) is Senior Consultant for the Austin Peters Group, a Kansas-based human resource management consulting firm with public, private and nonprofit sector clients. She has a 25-year career in public service, much of it in providing services to local governments and nonprofit agencies. Most recently, she served as education director for the Kansas Association of Counties for seven years where her responsibility was to provide teaching, consulting and education management services for elected and appointed persons who serve Kansas counties. In this capacity she helped develop and provide instruction for professional development programs in executive management, supervision and customer service, as well as a leadership development program for county commissioners.

During her career, Ms. Flentje also served in the Hugo Wall School of Urban and Public Affairs at Wichita State University (WSU) for thirteen years, most recently as Associate Director for Government and Community Services where she worked extensively with local governments and non-profit organizations in the region. In addition, she has significant experience in strategic planning, facilitation and mediation.

In her career, Flentje has provided instruction and facilitation for dozens of local governments and nonprofit organizations in the Midwest. She has a master's degree in public administration from Wichita State University. Marla Flentje will serve as a subcontractor on this project.

Project Responsibility: Focus Group Facilitator. She has worked for APG for 10 years.
Location: Marla Flentje is located in Wichita, Kansas.

Rebecca Crowder, Masters in Public Administration, SPHR—President. The founder and President of The Austin Peters Group, Inc., has more than 25 years of local government management experience. Rebecca has provided management assistance to nearly 200 local government clients on a variety of management issues. She has researched and authored more than 100 studies. Rebecca has organized and led training programs for over 5,000 participants on issues such as diversity awareness, human resource management, team building, budget and finance, role of boards, goal setting and strategic planning. Past positions: Human Resource/Administrative Services Director—Merriam, Kansas; Management Consultant—University of Tennessee Municipal Technical Advisory Service; Management Assistant—Janesville, Wisconsin; Budget Analyst—Johnson County, Kansas.

Rebecca's extensive local government experience has touched all local service areas, including: police, fire, public works, engineering, library, mental retardation services, administration, county-elected officials, courts and juvenile justice, and more. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Kansas State University and a Master of Public Administration from the University of Missouri at Columbia. She is a former National Society for Human Resource Certification instructor for four years at Washburn University, teaching the compensation and classification certification (among others). Rebecca has led all projects listed in the experience statement. Professional memberships and certifications include: ICMA, SHRM, DDI Trainer, and Zenger Miller Trainer.

Project Responsibility: Project consultant as needed. She has worked for APG for 16 years.
Location: Rebecca Crowder is located in Overland Park, Kansas.

Michelle Schamberger, Masters in English-Trainer/Consultant. Michelle has more than 15 years of experience in government writing, training and teaching for governments and non-profits. She was most recently the grant writer for Lake County School District, where she secured millions of dollars in the last five years. She was also a lead analyst and designer for instructional design and e-Learning courses for Sprint. Michelle is an instructional designer and technical writer for training initiatives. Prior to working in the field of training, she spent eleven years teaching college-level English. She has developed communications and marketing plans for major corporations and organizations. Michelle has a Bachelor of Arts in English, a Master of Arts in English, and a Proficiency Certificate in French Studies.

Michelle has been with The Austin Peters Group, Inc. for 13 years and prior to that was an Educational Consultant for Sprint Corporation. She has served as an Adjunct Instructor at Colorado Mountain College, University of Missouri Kansas City, Penn Valley, Maple Woods and Johnson County. Michelle would serve as a subcontractor on this project.

Project Responsibility: Report writing and editing. She has worked for APG for 13 years.
Location: Michelle Schamberger is located in Leadville, Colorado.

Similar Projects

Clients and a brief overview of services provided that are similar in nature to this request.

- Consultant for City of Manhattan Focus Groups, Process Improvements for the Community Development Department. Manhattan, Kansas.
- Consultant for City of Grandview, Missouri. Neighborhood Services Department, Performance Review Audit. Grandview, Missouri.
- Facilitator for Citizen Advisory Team for Oklahoma City's Comprehensive Plan.
- Consultant for Ford County for Organizational Development and Assessment.
- Consultant for City of Clay Center, Kansas. Comprehensive Planning and Goal Setting. Clay Center, Kansas.
- Consultant for Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas. Focus Groups. College of Agriculture.
- Consultant, Hilltop Neighborhood Project for City of Wichita.
- Facilitator for Kansas Association of Counties: Leadership Development Facilitation.
- Facilitator for American Planning Association, Kansas Chapter: Strategic Planning and Goal Setting.
- Facilitator for North Central Regional Planning Commission: Delivered retreat for Goal Setting.
- Consultant for strategic planning for Butler County.
- Consultant/facilitator for Johnson County Board of County Commissioners, problem-solving retreat.
- Consultant for Butler County Community College, Leadership Retreat and Goal Setting.
- Consultant for strategic planning, Miami County.
- Consultant/facilitator for joint meeting of REAP, Workforce Alliance, and the Greater Wichita Economic Development Corporation.
- Consultant for planning, Kansas African American Museum.
- Mediator, Garden City Fire Department Improvement Team.
- Consultant for strategic planning, Arc of Sedgwick County.
- Consultant and moderator, Johnson County Leadership Summit.
- Moderator for Public Transit Summit for KU Transportation Center.
- Consultant for strategic planning for City of Rose Hill.
- Consultant, Kansas Health Foundation School Preparedness Summit.
- Consultant for City of Abilene, strategic planning.
- Consultant for Harper County, Focus on Our Future project.
- Consultant for City of Lindsborg, strategic planning.
- Project partner, City of Wichita Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan Update.
- Consultant for Families Together, strategic planning.
- Consultant for Governor's Commission on Healthy and Prepared Schools.

- Consultant for governance training, City of Park City.
- Consultant for Sedgwick County, Nonprofit Chamber of Service.
- Consultant City of La Vista, Nebraska, strategic planning.
- Consultant, Ford County Regional Summit.
- Consultant for Barton County, economic development planning.
- Consultant for governance training, City of Valley Center.
- Consultant for Kansas Diabetes Association, strategic planning.
- Consultant for Historic Wichita Cowtown Board, strategic planning.
- Consultant for Wichita Area Board of Realtors, strategic planning.
- Consultant for Workforce Alliance of South Central Kansas, strategic planning.
- Consultant, KPTS Public Television, strategic planning.
- Consultant, City of Hesston, strategic planning.
- Consultant, Kansas Oil and Gas Fund.
- Consultant, City of Caldwell, Kansas, strategic planning.
- Consultant, Sarpy County, Nebraska, strategic planning.
- Consultant, Andover Chamber of Commerce, strategic planning.
- Consultant, Finney County, strategic planning.

References

The Honorable Glenn Diehl
Ellis County Commissioner
Ellis County, Kansas
Phone: 785-635-7106
County Strategic Planning Project

Kim Goodnight
Former Ford County Commissioner
ITC
500 SW Fairlawn Rd # 101, Topeka, KS 66614-3979
Phone: 785-783-2226
Ford County Organizational Assessment

Kenneth Bryan
Oklahoma City Planning Department
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
405-297-2574
Public Participation Project for New City Comprehensive Plan

Brenda Gunn
City Administrator
La Vista, Nebraska
402-331-4343
Municipal Strategic Planning Projects

A Sample of What Our Clients Say

"I highly recommend the services of The Austin Peters Group to other governments. Our experience was such a positive one that I can say confidently that we would not hesitate to hire your company again." Mayor Dion Avello, City of Derby, Kansas

"The process used by your firm was much more effective [than the City's previous process]. Meetings were organized, the process was structured and the results were markedly better. We moved purposefully through a well-designed process and avoided pitfalls often associated with reaching a consensus on such an important decision. In truth, the process actually served to make the governing body more cohesive. I can recommend to other communities without hesitation, the services of The Austin Peters Group. I can also say, without reservation, that if I ever need these services again, I will not hesitate to call you." – The Honorable Quintin Robert, Mayor of Osage City

"The success at the level we achieved would not have been possible without [The Austin Peters Group's] expert assistance. The accolades from the governing body for their service are unanimous. This is very noteworthy considering it comes from a group that seldom holds a unanimous viewpoint on issues as important and complex as this [City Administrator recruitment]. Ms. Flentje's clients are well served by her and the Austin Peters Group." - The Honorable Mike McNown, Mayor of Valley Center, Kansas.

"Many of our board members expressed praise for the process you took us through and for your true professionalism and skill in getting so much done in such a limited time. I know when I suggest having the next retreat, they will want to engage your services." Carolyn McGinn, President, Kansas African American Museum, and Kansas State Senator

"Our experience with Austin Peters was outstanding. We were in need of direction and had struggled for several years to develop a strategic plan. Our facilitator was professional, knowledgeable and kept 15 very different personalities on task. She helped us accomplish what we had labored and failed to do previously. In a matter of hours we had the building blocks for a strategic plan. She also laid groundwork for the board's later formal adoption of the plan. Kevin Fish, Executive Director, The Arc of Sedgwick County

Scope of the Project

Building code enforcement is a difficult regulatory function in many communities. Building codes ensures that properties are built safely and create an equal "playing field" between builders and contractors. The nature of building codes is precise, orderly, and meticulous. Careful review of plans and thorough inspections protect the public interest. However, a slow review and inspection process is expensive for builders and clients and hampers the development process.

Douglas County Zoning and Codes currently has four staff members and is responsible for the enforcement of building codes and inspection, zoning regulation enforcement, and floodplain management in the unincorporated area of Douglas County. They work in partnership with the City of Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office, which handles most planning items.

The Douglas County Board of County Commissioners is seeking consulting assistance to evaluate the Building Codes and Inspection services function in the following functional areas:

Responsiveness

1. Review the total number of inspections, building permits and plan reviews over the last several years.

APG Approach: This review would include reviewing files for a 36-month period. The staff would assist APG in answering questions, and the work reviewing files would be done onsite. This data would be compiled by APG in a spreadsheet. Estimated number of hours: 8 hours.

2. Determine length of time for plan reviews and compare to comparable governments in the region.

APG Approach: A minimum of six comparable local governments would be used to conduct a comparison study. APG will propose a list for county staff to review and provide feedback. The selected comparable counties will participate in a survey with APG to collect the information. Douglas County planning staff will also be responsible for completing a survey. Estimated number of hours: 40 hours.

Fair and Professional

3. Research what best practices are being utilized by other governments to integrate contractor and builder feedback to ensure that staff interactions are fair and professional.

APG Approach: Two methods will be used for this step. First a literature review of best practices and research on national awardees in this area will be prepared from state and national sources such as the American Planning Association. Second, the questions regarding 'best practices' will be incorporated into the survey, which will be completed with local government peers. Estimated number of hours: 20 hours.

4. Interview and/or conduct focus groups with contractors and builders to solicit feedback on the building inspection process and building code enforcement.

APG Approach: Hold three focus groups in Douglas County to engage stakeholder groups: include a staff focus group, a planning commission focus group, and a contractor/builder focus group. The number of focus groups could be increased if desired by Douglas County. Estimated number of hours: 24 hours.

Best Practices Review

For the following issues, the consulting firm will identify regional and comparable local governments and solicit the following information from each.

5. Value of the Construction, Building Permits and Fee Structure:
   - Determine how the value of construction is determined and is used in calculating the cost of building permits.
   - Do they have policies and procedures for waiving building permit fees?

- How do other communities handle projects that are unable to be completed by the owner? What is maintained in the record on the property?
- Do other communities adjust permit fees if the project's value changes during construction? If so, how do they do it?
- Do other communities have buildings that are constructed without a permit and are later modified? How do they set the permit fee amount and handle pre-existing code issues?

APG Approach: A minimum of six comparable local governments would be used to conduct a comparison study. APG will propose a list for County staff to review and provide feedback. The selected comparable counties will participate in a survey with APG to collect the information. Douglas County planning staff will also be responsible for completing a survey. These questions will also be included in the literature review. Estimated number of hours: included in hours above.

6. Building Codes
   - What versions of the International Building Code have been adopted?
   - What various types of building inspections are conducted?
   - What types of tests are used to verify the validity of work performed during inspections?
   - If new methods of testing should be considered, how do other jurisdictions do that? What process do they use?

   APG Approach: A minimum of six comparable local governments would be used to conduct a comparison study. APG will propose a list for County staff to review and provide feedback. The selected comparable counties will participate in a survey with APG to collect the information. Douglas County planning staff will also be responsible for completing a survey. These questions will also be included in the literature review. Estimated number of hours: included in hours above.

APG will present preliminary results to an internal team consisting of administration and staff prior to finalizing a report for County Commissioners. The report will include Findings and Recommendations. Estimated number of hours: 8 hours.

One onsite meeting will be held with staff and stakeholders. The purpose of the onsite will be to collect information and data, and to conduct focus groups. If Douglas County wants an onsite meeting to present a final report to administration and/or elected officials, that would be additional.

Pricing and Hourly Rate

Our fee for facilitation services for this project is an estimate. We charge $90 per hour, which includes planning, preparation, report writing and follow up.

102 hours @ $90 per hour = $9,180

Timeline: 16 weeks.

Mileage: No charge for one trip. Additional trips will be billed at $.55 per mile from Fort Collins, Colorado to Lawrence, Kansas.

Douglas County

Building Codes and Inspection Review

October 26, 2015

The Novak Consulting Group

Table of Contents

Cover Letter

About The Novak Consulting Group 1

Proposed Personnel 3

Project Approach 7

Cost Proposal 10

References 11

Attachment A – Project Schedule 12

The Novak Consulting Group

October 26, 2015

Sarah Plinsky
Assistant County Administrator
Douglas County
1100 Massachusetts St. Unit 204
Lawrence, KS 66044

Dear Mrs. Plinsky,

The mission of The Novak Consulting Group is to strengthen organizations, for those they serve and those who work in them. We are dedicated to providing management consulting services to local government and nonprofit organizations. The firm was originally established as Public Management Partners in 2001. Since then, we have been providing our clients with the very best thinking and execution in organizational design, development, and improvement.

We are pleased to submit this revised proposal for a Building Codes and Inspection Review to Douglas County. This proposal is based on information provided by the County well as our experience completing similar work for other jurisdictions across the country.

Our project team for Douglas County is comprised of skilled professionals, seasoned in local government with direct experience in all facets of municipal operations, including community development, building, and development review. Our team has had significant success working with many local governments to review operations, processes, and staffing with the goal of improving organizational performance and efficiency. We are confident our customized approach will provide the County with a plan for maximizing opportunities for efficiency while still providing quality services to the public.

We look forward to the opportunity to serve Douglas County in this engagement. Please contact me at (513) 309-0444 or jnovak@thenovakconsultinggroup.com should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Julia D. Novak
President

About The Novak Consulting Group

For nearly a decade, a highly respected management consulting firm named Public Management Partners helped a variety of organizations function more effectively. Through the years the firm built a sizeable client base of predominantly local governments and nonprofit organizations in the Midwest. Projects ranged from those as small as conducting community workshops to those as sweeping as analyzing the operational efficiency of entire departments within a city or county.

In 2009, Julia D. Novak acquired Public Management Partners and founded The Novak Consulting Group, staffed by consultants with decades of collective experience. With The Novak Consulting Group, Julia built on Public Management Partners' reputation for innovation and results while expanding the company's services nationwide. Her company meets a wider range of needs, consulting with governments in the areas of public works, public safety, human resources, finance, planning, IT, and more. We provide our clients with the very best thinking and execution in organizational design, development, and improvement. Our services include:

- Performance Audits
- Organizational Assessment and Optimization
- Process Management
- Performance Measurement
- Organizational Development
- Community Outreach and Engagement
- Facilitation and Training
- Executive Search

The Novak Consulting Group provides unparalleled service to our clients. Leaders in local government and nonprofit communities have come to rely on The Novak Consulting Group for high caliber advice developed through subject matter expertise and customized project approaches.

- **Focused expertise.** Our expertise lies in strengthening two kinds of organizations: local governments and nonprofits. We're consulting specialists rather than generalists, focusing our strengths to do a highly effective job for a very specific group of clients.
- **Flexibility to serve you better.** We employ a core staff of senior-level consultants, and draw from our pool of subject matter experts when their expertise can help us to serve you better. This approach results in a more responsive and efficient project providing the services that you desire and the results that you need.
- **Decades of collective experience.** Our associates and subject matter experts have decades of experience in strengthening local governments and nonprofit organizations. They've served in a wide range of positions, from city manager to public works director to director of management information systems.
- **Personal service from senior-level consultants.** You appreciate it when deadlines are met, phone calls are retuned, and your challenges are given in-depth, out-of-the-box thinking. While a large firm may assign your business to junior-level people, our firm and approach provides exceptional levels of personal service from senior-level consultants.

The Novak Consulting Group is a women-owned firm led by President Julia Novak. The firm is staffed with local government professionals, including full-time associates and subject matter specialists. The firm is headquartered in Cincinnati, Ohio and our staff is based in Washington, D.C., North Carolina, Kansas City, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin, in addition to Ohio.

The Novak Consulting Group and its staff have extensive experience working with local government clients. Our focus is on providing solutions that work within the available resources and culture of the organizations we assist. The most innovative solutions in the world are valueless if they cannot be implemented or will not be accepted by the community. We pride ourselves on our ability to listen, analyze, and work with our clients to find not just a random selection of best practices taken from a manual, but real solutions that can be implemented effectively. There is no value to a consulting study that, once completed, occupies shelf space never to be opened again. We are pleased that our prior engagements have resulted in corresponding actions by our clients to implement the recommendations that we have jointly developed.

At The Novak Consulting Group, one of our strengths is the ability to build on existing capabilities and resources and to help organizations see things from a different perspective. We do this through listening to our clients and really understanding what they have to say. While there are books full of best practices, stock solutions to complex problems are rarely effective. We do not operate with a pre-packaged set of recommendations, and we diligently work to avoid trying to fit our clients into a standard mold. We do not sell boiler plate solutions.

We recognize that there will always be competing interests between level and cost of service. Defining "good enough" is a significant challenge aided by knowing that work is both necessary and being delivered as efficiently as possible. Every organization develops traditions, practices, and routines. It is essential that these be subject to regular review and analysis to be sure that they continue to represent best practices meeting the needs of the community and not simply an excuse to avoid change. Our staff has substantial experience developing performance measures departments can use to track progress over time. We have helped our clients create benchmarks that establish a baseline for performance and objectives for the future.

The Novak Consulting Group is excited about the opportunity to assist Douglas County. Because we came from local government careers, we have sat on the same side of the table as you. Hiring outside consultants to evaluate operations in any organization is challenging: it can be disruptive and intimidating, while at the same time it can be illuminating and exciting. We understand the importance of respecting the staff who are in place to serve the public. We assume good intent and work with our clients to collaboratively develop recommendations for improvement. Without this, implementation of recommendations and lasting improvements are not typically successful. We believe this intentional approach, coupled with our extensive expertise in planning, zoning, development review, and codes, make us uniquely qualified to assist the County.

Proposed Personnel


Our project team is made up of senior-level consultants with direct local government experience. What sets our project team apart is our ability to explore and relate to local community values while at the same time investigating realistic approaches for cost-effective solutions.

Organizational Assessment Practice Leader Michelle Ferguson – Michelle will serve as project manager. She began her consulting career in 2005 following 10 years of direct experience in local government management, which included serving as Assistant County Manager in Arlington County, Virginia overseeing the County's capital improvement program. Michelle is skilled in project management, process improvement strategies, performance measurement, consent building, and public process design. Her special expertise is performance measurement, capital budgeting and financing, project implementation, and process re-engineering.

Associate Jonathan Ingram – Jonathan has over seven years of consulting experience and has developed an expertise in operational and staffing analysis. Jonathan joined The Novak Consulting Group in January 2012, having most recently served as a budget manager for the City of Cincinnati, Ohio. In addition to his expert financial analysis, Jonathan has also conducted numerous reviews of organizations while serving as a consultant.

Analyst Josh Rauch – Josh will provide research and analytical support to our project team. All members of our project team are employees of The Novak Consulting Group. Complete resumes for each of our team members are included.

Michelle L. Ferguson, Organizational Assessment Practice Leader



Michelle has over 18 years of management experience in local government, and she currently serves as the organizational effectiveness practice leader for The Novak Consulting Group, having been with the firm since its inception.

Michelle began her consulting career in 2005 following 10 years of direct experience in local government management, which included serving as Assistant County Manager in Arlington County, Virginia.

Michelle excels at helping local governments continuously improve their organizations and enhance service to the public. She is skilled in project management, process improvement strategies, performance measurement, consent building, and public process design.


As a consultant, Michelle has completed detailed organizational reviews of entire jurisdictions and recommended improvements to processes and departments across the country. Specific department reviews have included the functions of development review, parks and recreation, public works, human services, human resources, capital budgeting, and collections. Additionally, she has provided customized training in the development and use of performance measures to assist numerous organizations continuously improve service delivery.

Michelle is also a skilled facilitator, able to bring diverse groups of people together to articulate shared visions and priorities. She has lead strategic planning engagements at the community, organizational, and department levels, and she has facilitated numerous staff and governing body retreats.

During her tenure with Arlington County, Michelle was responsible for the daily management and implementation of the County's $500 million capital program. She also led the organization-wide performance measurement initiative establishing their Balanced Scorecard. Prior to Arlington County, Michelle served as Assistant City Manager in Overland Park, Kansas.

Michelle earned a bachelor's degree in political science from Loyola University-Chicago and a master's degree in public administration from the University of Kansas. She is a member of the International City/County Management Association. She also served as the president of the Metropolitan Association of Local Government Assistants in Washington, D.C and has presented at state and national conferences on topics such as strategic planning, effective governing bodies, and council-staff relations.

Jonathan Ingram, Associate



Jonathan Ingram has nine years of experience in local government management, most recently as a budget manager in the City of Cincinnati, Ohio Budget Office. Prior to that, Jonathan served as a management consultant and worked in the City Manager's Office for City of Highland Park, Illinois.

During his tenure with the City of Cincinnati, Jonathan was responsible for managing the development and administration of a $1 billion operating budget. In addition, Jonathan also conducted special analysis projects, served on the City's collective bargaining team and co-managed the implementation of an enterprise budget system.


Jonathan is a skilled financial analyst, with extensive experience in budget and revenue analysis; however, he also has extensive experience as a management and operations consultant to local governments in the United States and abroad.

As a consultant, Jonathan has completed operations reviews for multiple local governments, and has helped a broad range of departments, from police to public works, improve service delivery. He has developed staffing and deployment plans for City operating departments, analyzed and facilitated inter-governmental consolidations, helped local governments develop custom performance management systems and facilitated the development of long-term strategic plans.

Jonathan's special expertise is local government budgeting and finance, operations analysis, project management, public safety staffing analysis, process improvement and performance measurement. He is adept at evaluating business problems with equal consideration given to both cost and quality of service.

Jonathan earned a bachelor's degree in political science from Aurora University and a master's degree in public administration from Northern Illinois University. He is a member of the International City/County Management Association and the Ohio City/County Management Association.

Joshua Rauch, Analyst



Josh has experience in several local government settings, most recently with the Economic Development Division of the City of Springfield, Ohio. While there, he assisted with business retention and expansion activities, provided staff support for tax incentive negotiations and reporting, and helped develop the City's marketing strategy.


Josh began his career as an undergraduate intern with the City of Dayton, Ohio. He had responsibility for organizing community engagement events for young adults working in Dayton over the summer months. He built on this experience during graduate school when he began working for the City of Mission, Kansas. There he helped coordinate a variety of community events, including public budget hearings, community input sessions, and a successful attempt to set the Guinness World Record for the Largest Painting Made with Footprints.

Aside from community engagement, Josh has helped formulate, implement, and administer new policies and programs related to transportation funding, social media engagement, code enforcement and neighborhood assistance, information technology, sustainability planning, and performance measurement.

Josh earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Dayton and a master's degree in public administration from the University of Kansas. He is a member of the International City/County Management Association.

Project Approach

To the County's need as outlined in the scope of work for the Building Codes and Inspection Review, The Novak Consulting Group proposes to use our "Six R" approach. This involves soliciting and collecting information on the Zoning and Codes Department Responsibilities, Resources, Requirements, and Results in order to identify possible organizational and operational Revisions with an associated Roadmap to implement positive change. This approach is depicted in the following graphic:



- **Responsibilities** refer to the sources and level of mandate / direction for Department services. These may derive from Federal / State mandate, direction from the local governing body through ordinance or resolution, and/or internal direction derived from annual vision / mission / goals & objectives. We will review all relevant Department services to determine source and level of mandate in order to better understand service level constraints and opportunities for change.

- **Resources** refer to all assets available to the organization to achieve its respective responsibilities. These resources may include the following: time; human resources / available department staffing; management capacity / capability; financial position / forecasts; contractual services (as internal service supplement or replacement); technological assets (hardware, software, communications, training); and, physical assets (buildings, equipment, vehicles).

- **Requirements** refer to the sources of direction to Department management and staff regarding service approach and methodology. These sources provide staff with direction on how they should approach their respective tasks and complete their assignments. These sources may derive from formal law / codes or adopted policies and procedures to less formal mechanisms including continuation of past practice through initial or on-the-job training. We will review and assess Department service and process requirements to better understand existing business processes and opportunities for positive change.

- **Results** refer to the service yield derived from the provided services. These services are the result of rationally developed / utilized process requirements applying available resources in pursuit of prioritized fulfillment of Department responsibilities. The results phase links current operations with future planning through measures of adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness through management reporting to provide operational information resources for better management decision-making.

- **Revisions** refer to the depth and breadth of continuing change necessary to support improved performance as indicated from results and performance reporting. This change can range from a high level involving holistic or systemic issues (i.e., should we be in this business) to strategic issues (should we consider alternative service sources) to tactical issues (improving the productivity, efficiency and effectiveness of the activity or service). Revisions can impact any or all of the previous cycle stages (Responsibilities / Resources / Requirements / Results).

- **Roadmap** refers to the plans to implement revisions in order to improve service delivery and product quality while maintaining or reducing unit costs. The Roadmap provides an action plan for the client that identifies recommended priorities, responsibilities, effort phasing and an expected schedule to reach milestones.

Work Plan

The following details the proposed work plan to complete the Building Codes and Inspection Review for Douglas County.

Task 1: Begin Engagement

The Novak Consulting Group will begin this engagement by meeting with the County to review the details and expectations of this effort and to finalize the project schedule. We will also discuss the County's interest in this review, the strengths and weaknesses of the current operations, and other issues that may be relevant to our work.

We will request and review all relevant background information, such as budgets, previous studies, departmental work plans, workload data, organizational charts, job descriptions, and other similar information to inform our work.

Task 2: Conduct Field Work

In this task, we collect detailed data and information regarding Department operations. This is a significant project effort that serves as the basis for all of the analytical components of the project. We employ several different techniques for obtaining this information in order to collect sufficient data to understand departmental operations. These data collection techniques include the following activities:

- We schedule and conduct confidential interviews with key staff in the department. The interviews cover the organization, structure, and volume of work; the business processes used to accomplish work; supervisory relationships; performance management; and perceived strengths and weaknesses.
- In addition to formal interviews, we may conduct selected operational observations in order to understand how work is actually performed in your normal work environments. This will include walk-throughs in office settings.

Understanding the expectations and experience of the end users of the Department's processes is critical to making lasting improvements. Therefore, The Novak Consulting Group will seek input from contractors, buildings, applicants, and other customers of the Department through the use of targeted focus group sessions. Our trained facilitators use a variety of techniques to actively engage participants in the process. We thoroughly prepare for each session with a detailed agenda. However, each focus group is slightly different, based on the participants. Our facilitators know how to "read the group" and determine the best techniques to use to solicit feedback from participants with different styles: some participants will readily voice their ideas, while others may need prompting or perhaps a written exercise to engage. Regardless of the methods, our goal in any facilitated session is create an environment that allows participants to feel comfortable sharing their honest feedback.

At the conclusion of our field work, we will summarize our learnings.

Task 3: Analyze Data and Research Best Practices

At the conclusion of our field work, we will begin to identify improvement opportunities. We will review available performance metrics as provided by the County and assess operations against the existing policies, protocols, and operational objectives. Additional items to be assessed will include, but not be limited to:

- Improvements to workflow and overall operations;
- Short term and long term strategies;
- Adherence to regulatory requirements, including code provisions;
- Communication, including interdepartmental as well as external;
- Use of technology;
- Response times/cycle times and customer service;
- Policy and procedural improvements;
- Organizational and management structure and staffing;
- Outsourcing and insourcing opportunities;
- Application of best practices; and
- Use of performance measures.

Particular attention will be paid to trends related to responsiveness/turnaround times and the incorporation of input from customers into potential process improvements.

As part of our analysis, we evaluate the performance of the Department as it compares to industry standards of performance. The resulting diagnostic provides a quick and objective overview of both the quantitative and qualitative work activities of the Department.

The Novak Consulting Group has developed industry best management practices (BMPs) in many areas of local government service. This information was developed from our previous work with professional associations and industry groups, as well as other sources. We will compare and contrast practices in the Department with the best practices of other successful organizations, including those jurisdictions determined comparable based on conversation with the County.

Based on our understanding and analysis of the Department, we will assemble a set of suggested best practices as well as relevant measures of service demand, resources applied, customer service, and service outcomes. We will determine where gaps may exist in the Department's current delivery of services. We will develop recommendations for closing those gaps and improving efficiency, based on available resources. Additionally, recommendations for streamlining processes, reallocating personnel, and other appropriate recommendations will be prepared and reviewed with the County.

Task 4: Prepare Deliverables

At the completion of the above tasks, The Novak Consulting Group will prepare a summary of our observations and initial recommendations. We will review the summary with the County. Additional follow up on issues or analysis will be conducted as needed.

The Novak Consulting Group will prepare a draft report. The report will include an executive summary, our methodology and approach, and a thorough description of all recommendations for the Department. The draft report will be presented to the County for review for factual accuracy and to discuss content and approach. We will prepare the final report based on feedback from the County.

Project Schedule

A proposed project schedule is included as Attachment A. We expect to refine this with the County during our initial project meeting.

Cost Proposal

The total, not-to-exceed price to complete the scope of work outlined in this proposal is $17,500, including all professional fees and expenses.

It is our practice to invoice clients monthly, based on the percentage of work completed.

References

The Novak Consulting Group has assisted numerous local governments across the country with organizational evaluations. The following is a sample of just a few recent engagements. We would be happy to provide additional information about these or any of our prior projects.

La Plata County, Colorado engaged The Novak Consulting Group several times since 2013 for multiple organizational assessments. Work completed to date includes staffing analyses for the La Plata County Sherriff's Department, the Human Services Department, and the Motor Vehicles Department. Assessments of General Services, Planning and Engineering Departments were recently completed.

Kelli Ganevsky, Human Resources Director
970-382-6361 Kelli.Ganevsky@co.laplata.co.us

Wilmington, North Carolina engaged The Novak Consulting Group to conduct a review of the City's development review process to identify efficiency and effectiveness opportunities. To inform the study, a survey of process users and employees was conducted. Detailed process maps of the current process were developed and reviewed in a group session with all development review staff to engage them in the process and solicit their ideas for improvement.

Tony Caudle, Deputy City Manager
(910) 341-4658 tony.caudle@wilmingtonnc.gov

Wilsonville, Oregon engaged The Novak Consulting Group to conduct an organizational assessment of the City's Community Development Department. The purpose of this engagement was to review the functions of each division within the department, develop an understanding of the responsibilities of each position, and assess the reporting structures.

Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager
(503) 570-1520 Troha@ci.wilsonville.or.us

Reno, Nevada engaged The Novak Consulting Group to conduct a Core Services Review of the Public Works Department and the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department. These reviews included an in-depth analysis of opportunities for enhanced efficiency and effectiveness, an evaluation of existing services level standards, and an assessment of the City's true 'core services' in in both departments.

Jaime Schroeder, City Manager's Office
(775) 348-3915 schroederj@reno.gov

New Orleans, Louisiana retained the services of The Novak Consulting Group (through PFM, the primary consultant) to develop process maps for key development review functions. The Novak Consulting Group designed the approach for this engagement and facilitated the process mapping for planning and development functions. Following the development of current process maps, recommendations for additional process improvements were provided. The work included focus groups with business stakeholders and process customers.

Dean Kaplan, Public Financial Management
(215) 557-1487 kapland@pfm.com

Attachment A – Project Schedule

Schedule

Douglas County

		start	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		11/16	11/23	11/30	12/7	12/14	12/21	12/28	1/4
Activity 1 - Begin Engagement									
1.1	Conduct project kick-off meeting								
1.2	Request and review background information								
1.3	Finalize project schedule								
Activity 2 - Conduct Field Work		11/16	11/23	11/30	12/7	12/14	12/21	12/28	1/4
2.1	Interview Department Staff								
2.2	Conduct focus group with department customers								
2.3	Summarize learning								
Activity 3 - Analyze Data and Research Best Practices		11/16	11/23	11/30	12/7	12/14	12/21	12/28	1/4
3.1	Analyze department data								
3.2	Research best practices								
3.3	Identify improvement opportunities								
Activity 4 - Prepare Deliverables		11/16	11/23	11/30	12/7	12/14	12/21	12/28	1/4
4.1	Develop preliminary recommendations								
4.2	Review preliminary recommendations with County								
4.3	Prepare project report								
4.4	Present project report								

ADS - Clouse, Julie

From: AD - Weinaug, Craig
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 4:08 PM
To: County Commission
Cc: ADS - Clouse, Julie
Subject: Proposed Contract with Kansas University for additional services on the jail/crisis intervention/mental health court projects
Attachments: Jail Severson Proposed Scope of Work - Final 102715.docx

Commissioners:

Attached please find a proposed scope of work for a continuation of Margaret Severson and Jason Matejkowski's services on the jail project. The services that they have provided to date through the contract with Treanor Architects, are now complete. The contract would be directly between Douglas County and the University of Kansas.

Commissioner Gaughan, the lead commissioner on the jail project, and I both feel that the independent expertise that these two professors have given our process is critical to the ultimate success of what we are hoping to achieve. The attached scope of work provides the detail of what they would be providing.

I will have this on the county commission agenda this coming Wednesday at 4.

Craig

G. Craig Weinaug
Craig Weinaug
County Administrator
cweinaug@douglas-county.com

DOUGLAS COUNTY
1100 Massachusetts Street
Lawrence, KS 66044
Phone: (785) 832-5328
Fax: (785) 832-5148
www.douglas-county.com

Douglas County cares about sustainability.
Please think twice before printing this e-mail.

KU THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
School of Social Welfare

To: Craig Weinaug, Douglas County Administrator

From: Margaret Severson, Professor

Re: Proposal for Douglas County Criminal Justice-Related Activities

Date: October 27, 2015

Craig –

Attached find Part I of our proposal for services to be delivered to Douglas County during fiscal year 2016. The work proposed reflects continuation of the work already underway while this contract is pending, and also work in development as the County moves to establish justice-related programs in Douglas County.

It is important to know that Part II of this proposal, found in the attachment to Part I and contemplated for official acceptance in spring 2016, is critical to the ultimate success of the program development which is anticipated to result from the activities completed in Part I. We would not want to enter into Part I of this agreement without assurance that there is a commitment to securing formal evaluations of the programs ultimately designed and implemented as a result of the activities spelled out in it. We are willing to assist Douglas County in seeking funding to support the County's oversight of the proposed evaluations.

The cost of Part I of this proposal is $46,799. This amount includes salaries, 35% fringe, and nominal expenses for supplies and local travel. The formal contract, including a detailed budget, for these services will be drawn up by the University's Center for Research (KUCR) and sent to you for your approval, and in advance of that, we request that you provide notice (emailed to mseverson@ku.edu) that Douglas County does not pay indirect costs on contracts.

Please contact me if you have any questions about this proposal and the attachment to it. Thank you again for inviting Dr. Matejkowski and me to work with Douglas County in this important process of justice planning.

Margaret

KU THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
School of Social Welfare

Proposed Scope of Work

Margaret Severson and Jason Matejkowski, Professors in the School of Social Welfare at the University of Kansas, will be the Co-Principal Investigators (Co-PIs) involved in the direct provision and/or oversight of all services as described below. The following scope of work assumes evaluation services (outlined in Attachment 1) are an expected, and consequent component of the consultation services outlined in this scope of work. While separated here, the consultation and evaluation services are necessarily conjoint in that the development, planning and evaluation of justice projects such as diversion programs, and a specialty court, are overlapping and complementary activities. Therefore, subsequent to determination of the establishment of a problem solving court and/or crisis/triage center, a new scope of work that encompasses the services identified in Attachment 1 should be established.

Elements of this first proposal coincide minimally with the planned evaluation by Drs. Severson and Matejkowski of the recently funded AID program as described in Douglas County's application to the Bureau of Justice Assistance Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program. The AID program targets specific sub-populations (i.e., females and veterans) while services proposed in this scope of work are designed to reach the broader justice-involved population of people with mental illnesses in Douglas County.

Scope of Work

Part I. Technical Assistance; Facilitation Services; Planning, Operations and Program Consultations; Monitoring and Evidence Based Feedback

A. Provide, for one year and not to exceed 400 hours following commencement of the contract, consultation, where requested, to Douglas County regarding development of alternatives to incarceration, jail expansion, and pursuit of funding support for development or expansion of facility-based, diversion and other models of justice programming.

   (1) Explore the possible catalysts for changes in the Douglas County Correctional Facility (DCCF) population and report findings

B. Provide, for one year following commencement of the contract, technical assistance in the development of diversion opportunities in Douglas County.

   (1) Facilitate up to five meetings of key stakeholders for the purpose of planning one or more mental health courts in Lawrence/Douglas County;

   (2) Assist in identifying and bringing together key members of the community to identify and discuss diversion options as they are identified;

(3) Assist in the planning and facilitation of up to three community "town hall" meetings where information on the planning and implementation of measures to address the use of incarceration in Douglas County and the use of alternatives to incarceration is disseminated;

(4) Upon request, provide up to three reports that capture the state-of-the-evidence in criminal and social justice topics

II. Reimbursables, Fees, and Payments for Services

A. It is understood that Douglas County does not pay indirect costs when entering similar contracts for services.

B. Fixed price agreement for services outlined above: $46,799, including miscellaneous supplies, printing and software.

C. If travel is requested of consultants/evaluators, then associated airfare, accommodations and standard per diem to be paid by County.

III. Termination of Agreement

A. Timeframes identified in Section I above will guide termination of this agreement.

B. During contracted period and following termination of agreement, consultants/evaluators retain the right to maintaining and publishing the data collected during the activities identified above, while keeping personally identifiable information confidential.

ATTACHMENT 1

Scope of Work (Anticipated)

Part II. Program Evaluation, Data Generation and Management, Reports. NOTE: The specific programs listed in A and B, below, are programs currently being considered for implementation and so used as exemplars to detail the terms of this proposal and scope of work. Work includes identification and contribution to the development of up to three funding proposals to support mental health court and crisis center program components and to support the evaluation, by current consultants, of program components.

A. Mental health/problem-solving court evaluation

(1) Identify and establish (with the aid of county, jail, and treatment program stakeholders) the electronic surveillance systems necessary to provide continuous monitoring and routine data collection on MHC-participants

a) Upon commencement of contract and receipt of human subjects approval, immediate implementation and testing of data collection processes to begin with mental health court-eligible participants identified at the Douglas County Jail.

b) Data collection likely to include characteristics of MHC participants (referral source, charges, demographics, information from established screening and assessments [e.g., criminal risk, mental health]); services received (length of stay in the program and reason for discontinuation [e.g., withdrawal, graduation], status hearings scheduled/attended; behavioral health services scheduled/received; sanctions and rewards); outcomes (e.g., reincarceration, hospitalization, crisis calls); and other data as identified by stakeholders. The cooperation of the resource partners in gathering and providing these data will be essential and the evaluators will make every effort to secure this necessary cooperation.

(2) Cleaning and analysis of data identified in item 1b immediately above necessary to support provision of reports identified in item 3 immediately below

(3) Provide one report six months following the commencement of enrollment in the mental health court and another final report one year following the commencement of enrollment in the mental health court. In addition, status updates to be provided quarterly from commencement of contract. Updates will include description of recent progress made (e.g., infrastructure and enrollment); reports will also summarize interim (six-month) and final (one-year) outcomes for program participants and suggestions for modifications and enhancements of the mental health court.

B. Crisis/restoration center evaluation

(1) Identify and establish (with the aid of county, jail, police and treatment program stakeholders) the electronic surveillance systems necessary to provide continuous

monitoring and routine data collection on crisis center consumers referred by law enforcement.

(2) Data collection to include characteristics of consumers referred by law enforcement (referral source, demographics, information from established screening and assessments [e.g., criminal risk, mental health and substance abuse]); services received (length of stay at the center and reason for discontinuation [e.g., AMA, release], behavioral health services scheduled/referred); outcomes (e.g., incarceration, hospitalization, crisis calls); and other data as identified by stakeholders.

(3) Cleaning and analysis of data identified in item 2 immediately above necessary to support provision of reports identified in item 4 immediately below.

(4) Provide one report six months following the opening of the crisis center and a final report one year following the opening of the crisis center. In addition, status updates to be provided quarterly from commencement of contract. Updates will include description of recent progress made (e.g., infrastructure and numbers served); reports will also summarize interim (six-month) and final (one-year) outcomes for crisis center consumers referred by law enforcement and suggestions for modifications and enhancements of the crisis center.

Douglas County, Kansas with Bert Nash Community Health Center is seeking qualifications from interested architectural firms for design professional services for a new Mental Health Crisis Center. It is Douglas County's intention to acquire a dependable design professional with a firmly established base of operations who can offer a competitive rate, quality services, and features to meet the County's needs. The selection committee will have sole authority to negotiate any portion of the proposals received.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Douglas County desires to retain a design professional to perform professional services in relation to a new Mental Health Crisis Center. Douglas County intends to own the facility and it is intended to be operated by Bert Nash Community Health Center. It is anticipated that the facility will be approximately 30,000 square feet containing crisis care and counseling for both inpatient and outpatient services in a facility located in close proximity to the current Bert Nash Mental Health facility. A preliminary program will be made available to the firm selected to provide design services.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Craig Weinaug, County Administrator (785) 832-5268, cweinaug@douglas-county.com

DEADLINE FOR QUESTIONS

All inquiries concerning this Request for Qualification (RFQ) are to be directed to Craig Weinaug at the e-mail address identified. All inquiries/questions requiring a formal interpretation must be submitted in writing no later than **5:00 p.m. (central time), Friday, November 20, 2015.** Written responses to questions will be distributed to all firms receiving the RFQ by November 30, 2015. Only written responses are official.

PRELIMINARY SCHEDULE (TENTATIVE)

Issue – Mail RFQ November 9, 2015

All questions in writing by Friday, November 20

Qualification Statements Due Monday November 30, 5:00 p.m.

Finalist Shortlist Announced Week of December 7, 2015

Finalist Shortlist Interviews Week of December 14, 2015

Recommendation to Board of County Commissioners immediately following

(Notice to proceed following approval)

KEY PERSONNEL

It is essential that the firm provide adequate experienced personnel, capable and devoted to the successful accomplishment of work to be performed under this contract. Specifically, all key personnel should have a minimum of five years experience in a role similar to their role on the project team outlined in their proposal.

If key personnel changes are made the awarded firm shall immediately notify the County. Awarded firm must ensure personnel changes to be with personnel of substantially equal ability and qualifications. Any personnel changes must be approved in writing by Douglas County.

Key points to be addressed in qualifications submission

1. Clearly define the qualifications and experience of each firm making up the team and of each individual proposed as part of the team. Include detailed qualification/experience information of all specific key individuals to be associated with the project. Please note that the County considers individual qualifications to be just as important as firm qualifications in ensuring a high quality project team.
2. Specific demonstrated excellence in all aspects of the design and construction of comparable projects. Include the specific roles performed on example projects by each proposed team member.
3. Design team shall include LEED Accredited Professional, but the project may not be certified through the USGBG.
4. A clear description of the experience and approach for execution of projects with a high degree of environmental stewardship and responsiveness, including utilization of innovative and integrated solutions and approaches.
5. A detailed description of team organization including roles, responsibilities and line of authority of all firms making up the team and of the individuals involved.
6. Demonstrated experience of all team members in the execution of outstanding design solutions, delivery of comparable projects and the administration of construction processes.
7. Demonstrate a clear understanding of and approach for dealing with the complexities and issues of this project type, and achieving operationally driven solutions.

Please note that the County strongly discourages the submission or presentation of any conceptual design solutions for this project. We do not know enough about the project at this point to have solutions presented. Demonstrate your expertise through outstanding similar projects previously completed, a thoughtful project approach, and a clear demonstration of your understanding of the particular issues involved.

The design team will be responsible for evaluating and presenting for consideration: design concepts, building materials and systems with a minimized impact on the local and global environment. It is the intent of the County, at a minimum, to base the design and construction of this project around the Douglas County Sustainability Plan:
http://douglascounty.com/depts/ad/su/su_home.aspx.

We challenge each firm to go beyond the typical qualifications information to clearly demonstrate why their firm/team is a superior choice for the County on this project.

A few last honest recommendations: Reading multiple proposals is quite arduous. Brevity is a virtue and getting to the relevant point even more so. Be focused on the areas that we are concerned with. Minimize marketing "boiler plate" and let your words and pictures tell the true story of what your firm/team is all about.

Memorandum
City of Lawrence/Douglas County
Planning & Development Services

TO: Board of County Commissioners
FROM: Jeff Crick, AICP, Planner II
CC: Craig Weinaug, County Administrator
Scott McCullough, Director, Planning and Development Services
Amy Miller, AICP, CFM, Assistant Director, Planning
Date: For November 11th, 2015 Board of County Commissioners Meeting
RE: Consideration of the *Horizon 2020* Steering Committee's Issue Action Report

Background

At their August 31st, 2015 meeting, the *Horizon 2020* Steering Committee voted 9 to 0 to recommend the Issue Action Report to the Planning Commission, City Commission, and the Board of County Commissioners. The Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Commission also adopted the report 9 to 0 at their September 21st, 2015 meeting.

The effort to identify and prioritize these issues began in the spring of 2014, with the commissioning of a county-wide, statistically valid survey by ETC. This was then followed by a county-wide series of nine Open House meetings, which also included a survey component to help refine the issues and priorities of those identified in the ETC survey. Two Public Forums were also held by the Steering Committee in November 2014 to ask residents what issues should be prioritized out of all of the issues raised through the earlier input processes. Throughout their meetings, the Steering Committee also received a wide-range of public correspondence regarding their topics and findings.

The Issue Action Report will become the Planning Staff's work plan that will guide the updating of the text, as well as the efforts to make the plan less of a technical document and more of an interactive one that is accessible to all members of the community. The Issue Action Report outlines 19 key issues that need to be studied and addressed to update the existing comprehensive plan, including the identified absent pieces that the community values and would like to incorporate into the document with this update.

The Steering Committee will continue to meet to provide guidance and input on key issues within the plan's development, and also continue to oversee the updating process.

Action

Adopt the Issue Action Report from H2020/Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee, and adopt Joint City Resolution No. 7143/County Resolution No. ____, if appropriate.

Comprehensive Plan Update



Issue Action Report

City *of* Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Table of Contents

Final: August 31, 2015

Executive Summary ---- 3

Overview *---- 3*

Process *---- 3*

Purpose / Vision Statement ---- 4

Issues ---- 6

Issue 1: Enhance Readability & Track Performance of the Plan ---- 8

Issue 2: Maintain a Strong & Stable Downtown ---- 9

Issue 3: Address Quality Housing for All Incomes ---- 10

Issue 4: Protect Natural Resources ---- 11

Issue 5: Preserve Historic Buildings & Structures ---- 12

Issue 6: Create Quality Neighborhoods for All Ages ---- 13

Issue 7: Create Employment Opportunities ---- 14

Issue 8: Manage Future Lawrence Growth ---- 15

Issue 9: Plan For the Size & Location of Retail Development ---- 16

Issue 10: Provide Opportunities for Small Neighborhood Retail ---- 17

Issue 11: Encourage Infill Development ---- 18

Issue 12: Consider Increasing Height/Density in Appropriate Locations ---- 19

Issue 13: Enhance Agricultural Uses & Rural Character in Douglas County ---- 20

Issue 14: Encourage/Support Local Food System Development ---- 21

Issue 15: Enhance Sidewalks/Trails/Walking Paths ---- 22

Issue 16: Plan For and Provide Arts & Cultural Amenities ---- 23

Issue 17: Enhance Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety ---- 24

Issue 18: Maintain a Strong System of Parks, Recreation, and Open Space ---- 25

Issue 19: Enhance the Transportation Network ---- 26

Appendix ---- 27

ETC Institute: Findings Report for a Statistically Valid Comprehensive Plan Community Survey ---- 28

Open House Survey Results ---- 888

Public Input Analysis Report ---- 1200

Public Forum Analysis Report ---- 1211

Executive Summary

Overview

A comprehensive plan is a document for the community, which states the vision, goals, and policies for the future growth and development of Douglas County and Lawrence. Since 1998, *Horizon 2020* has been the guiding document for the City of Lawrence and unincorporated Douglas County. While there have been many physical, economic, and environmental changes that have occurred during this time, the plan has continued to evolve and adapt with the changing aspects of our community.

While *Horizon 2020* is relevant today, an update is necessary to ensure that the plan remains current with the changing environment of the community and the needs and desires of its citizens. The Comprehensive Plan Update/*Horizon 2020* Steering Committee (Steering Committee) was created by the Douglas County Commission and Lawrence City Commission with the primary focus to guide the process for amending *Horizon 2020*, the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Lawrence and unincorporated Douglas County.

The Steering Committee is charged with overseeing and guiding the process, including public education and issue identification, prioritization of issues to submit to the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Governing Bodies of the City and County for review, and for reviewing the draft and final plan product. This report is the Steering Committee's prioritization of the principal issues that the community has identified to be addressed in the plan update.

Process

The effort to identify and prioritize these issues began in the spring of 2014, with the commissioning of a county-wide, statistically valid survey by ETC. This was then followed by a county-wide series of nine Open House meetings, which also included a survey component to help refine the issues and priorities of those identified in the ETC survey. Two Public Forums were also held by the Steering Committee in November 2014 to ask residents what they felt should be the strongest priorities of all issues raised through the earlier input processes.

Through those public input processes, additional presentations, correspondence, discussion, and research, the Steering Committee has determined these principal priorities that need addressing for the comprehensive plan to continue to guide growth and development as the residents of Douglas County and Lawrence desire.

The Steering Committee has also developed purpose and vision statements by which to guide development of the plan as follows:

Purpose / Vision Statement

Purpose of the Plan

THRIVE is a comprehensive guide that empowers our citizens to make our community vision a reality. It sets the foundation for the type of welcoming and sustainable community we truly want to be. THRIVE reflects resiliency in an ever-changing world (changes that are short term and multi-generational in nature), and recommends goals to promote a high quality of life in both urban and rural settings. It establishes policies that guide our future growth while carefully managing our natural resources, improve public health and safety, and bolster our economic vitality. This plan is a product of substantial community input. It is intentionally flexible through the public amendment process to accommodate future development ideas and innovations that would help achieve the community vision. THRIVE directs growth in a manner that preserves and enhances the heritage and spirit of our community and creates unique places to live, work, learn and play.

Our Community Vision

The City of Lawrence and rural Douglas County is one of the most desirable places in the United States to call home. A well-educated community with a unique free state spirit, we are diverse, publically engaged, and boldly innovative. We are prosperous, with full employment and a broad tax base. Our development is human-scale and our vibrant and liveable neighborhoods allow people to age in place. We have ample choices for safe, efficient transportation including bicycling, walking and transit. The City's lively and historic downtown attracts residents and visitors for commerce and cultural arts. Our citizens value preserving and enhancing the natural environment for our enjoyment and for future generations. The proximity of rural and agricultural land to the city provides beauty and respite, and we enjoy the economic and health benefits of a robust local food system. We make Lawrence and rural Douglas County a place where creativity thrives, sustainability is a way of life, and community pride is contagious.

We Value
Affordability
Creativity
Education
Health
Innovation
Jobs
Livability
Quality Design
Sustainability

Our Vision Will Create and Maintain:

Live:

- Places and neighborhoods that encourage healthy living for all ages.
- Neighborhoods that are compact, walkable, diverse, and connected, providing for all ages and incomes.
- A convenient and efficient multi-modal transportation system that provides for choice and flexibility and reduces automobile reliance.
- Growth in a fiscally and environmentally responsible manner with the goal of using existing infrastructure and in-fill opportunities before opening new areas for development.
- Preservation and celebration of our rich history, along with new places with unique character.

Work:

- Investment in a growing population with diverse economic opportunities, including local businesses, new primary employers, and thriving creative arts and entrepreneurial communities.
- A robust agricultural sector valued for its economic, health, and cultural contribution, including the emerging local and regional food system.
- Integrated communications networking technology that supports local business, education and entrepreneurship, providing the opportunity to compete globally.

Learn:

- World-class universities that are integrated into the cultural fabric of the local community.
- Strong network of public and private schools that strive for excellence in education and attract new residents to the community.
- Dedication and access to high-quality lifelong learning.
- Investment in alternative vocational and training opportunities, such as The Dwayne Peaslee Technical Training Center and the Lawrence College and Career Center.

Play:

- A thriving mix of activity centers, schools and parks/trails within walking and biking distance of residential uses.
- Conservation, preservation and measured use of our finite natural resources and open space.
- A historic downtown with diverse uses that is the cultural and commercial heart of the region.
- Creative arts and cultural heritage as integral components of community identity.

Issues

The existing *Horizon 2020* document provides clear and strong guidance on many of the issues that are priorities to the community today; however, several issues identified through the Steering Committee input process have little to no policy strength, or are in need of reviewing due to the community's changing needs and desires.

The following is a summary matrix of the identified issues of importance to the community along with the existing policy strength within *Horizon 2020.* Detailed analysis of each issue below is continued on the following pages.

	Issue	*Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength*
1	Enhance Readability of Plan	Low
2	Maintain a Strong & Stable Downtown	High
3	Address Quality Housing for All Incomes	Low
4	Protect Natural Resources	High
5	Preserve Historic Buildings & Structures	Medium
6	Create Quality Neighborhoods for All Ages	Low
7	Create Employment Opportunities	High
8	Managing the Future Lawrence Growth	Medium
9	Plan For the Size & Location of Retail Development	Medium
10	Provide Opportunities for Small Neighborhood Retail	Medium
11	Encourage In-Fill Development	Medium
12	Consider Increasing Height/Density in Appropriate Locations	Low
13	Enhance Agricultural Uses & Rural Character in Douglas County	Medium
14	Encourage/Support Local Food System Development	Low
15	Enhance Sidewalks/Trails/Walking Paths	High
16	Plan For and Provide Arts & Cultural Amenities	Low
17	Enhance Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety	High
18	Maintain a Strong System of Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	Medium
19	Enhance the Transportation Network	High

The issues in need of the greatest attention in the plan update, due to low policy strength in the current plan, are listed below. Action steps are included under each issue on the following pages.

1. Create Employment Opportunities
2. Enhance Readability of Plan
3. Address Quality Housing for All Incomes
4. Plan For & Provide Arts & Cultural Amenities
5. Consider Increasing Height/Density in Appropriate Locations
6. Encourage/Support Local Food System Development
7. Create Quality Neighborhoods for All Ages
8. Update the Parks & Recreation Master Plan

Issue 1: Enhance Readability & Track Performance of the Plan

Analysis & Discussion:

Throughout the public input phase the accessibility of the plan's information and readability of the document itself has been a highly requested change in the future product.

Steering Committee Summary Position: Creating a comprehensive plan that is accessible, concise, and clearly written is a goal of both the community and of the Steering Committee. Ensuring the document is readily available in multiple platforms is integral to increasing the accessibility of the plan so that members of the public can locate answers to their questions. Creating a plan that is accessible in both content and delivery are paramount priorities of this revision.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: Document-wide

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Low** ll While the current document does contain a sizeable amount of information and detail, the depth and scale of the information make the document hard to read for residents, applicants, and for users unfamiliar with the plan. This detail and scale of information also make the document become dated quickly, difficult to reconcile, and confusing for the intermittent reader.

Action Steps:

1.1 Work towards the creation of a document that is digitally enabled, graphically interesting, and accessible. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Information Technology)

1.2 Create more interactive mapping capabilities. (Entity Responsible: Planning, GIS)

1.3 Prioritize readability for all users. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

1.4 Update data annually in demographics. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

1.5 Track progress on achieving the policies and goals of the final document via measureable performance metrics. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

Issue 2: Maintain a Strong & Stable Downtown

Analysis & Discussion:

Downtown is the cultural center of Lawrence and is thriving. The public placed an emphasis on maintaining Downtown as a strong and stable part of the economy and culture of Lawrence.

Steering Committee Summary Position: A key point of emphasis even before the adoption of *Horizon 2020*, the stability and resiliency of Downtown Lawrence is vital in both the cultural, social, as well as economic base of our community. Ensuring the continued momentum of Downtown Lawrence is a key issue, while also ensuring its continued progress, is fundamental.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 6: Commercial Land Use, 11: Historic Resources

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **High** ll For the City of Lawrence and rural residents alike, the Downtown area has been the cultural heart of the community for many decades. The continued return on the decades' worth of investment remains a major priority. This issue was identified throughout *Horizon 2020*, and its continued development and community role is still as vital today. Equally as important is how Downtown Lawrence should change and grow to continue to meet the community's needs and expectations for the future.

Action Steps:

2.1 Continue the biennial Retail Market Study; possibly expand Downtown's study to include residentially used spaces to determine the households located within the area. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Downtown Lawrence, Inc.)

2.2 Involve key Downtown stakeholders in the city's cultural arts plan and other future plans to maintain Downtown Lawrence as the cultural centerpiece of the city. (Entity Responsible: Cultural Arts, Planning)

2.3 Encourage public and private investment in appropriate planning and development of the riverfront, especially as it relates to Downtown Lawrence. (Entity Responsible: City of Lawrence, Planning, Downtown Lawrence, Inc.)

2.4 Complete an objective study of Downtown Lawrence parking and markets effects. (Entity Responsible: City of Lawrence, Planning, Stakeholders)

2.5 Encourage the activation of alleys when possible to provide a safer, more viable place for people and strengthen economic opportunities for businesses. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Public Works, Utilities)

Issue 3: Address Quality Housing for All Incomes

Analysis & Discussion:

One of the highest priorities registered in the surveys and throughout the county during the public input phase, the Steering Committee has determined that this is an issue that needs further research and analysis to best determine a future course of action.

Steering Committee Summary Position: Housing issues can be very complex, and are not highly addressed within the existing comprehensive plan. As one of the items with the highest amounts of public comment and input, the Steering Committee feels that this is a major issue that must be addressed in a thoughtful and inclusive manner. Options to address this should be based on data and all stakeholders should be invited to participate in finding solutions.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4 (partial): Growth Management, 5 (partial): Residential Land Use

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Low** **II** While *Horizon 2020* does provide guidance on developing and locating residential land use, it does not provide guidance on the economics or cost of housing for residents. With changes seen in both urban development and with the volatile conditions in the economy, there has been a steady increase in the effect housing price has had on personal and the regional economy.

Action Steps:

3.1 Study affordable housing needs and develop policies to address the identified needs, including developing a contextually-specific definition of affordable housing for both the City of Lawrence and unincorporated Douglas County. (Entity Responsible: Affordable Housing Advisory Board, Community Development)

3.2 Incorporate the findings of the Affordable Housing Advisory Board into the comprehensive plan to provide guidance on this issue. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Planning Commission, City Commission, County Commission, Stakeholders)

Issue 4: Protect Natural Resources

Analysis & Discussion:

With the recent adoption of Chapter 16 – Environment within *Horizon 2020*, the overall opinion is this portion of the document is valid for continued future use and should be reincorporated into the document. With accurate data and recent study of best management practices, the key for the future of this item will be applying the existing action steps that are outlined in the present document.

Steering Committee Summary Position: With the recent and on-going work involving this issue, the Steering Committee felt it would be best to incorporate the work of the recent Chapter 16 update, while including the County Resources Survey information to help form a complete study of the community's available natural resources. The continued implementation of the existing Environment action items were encouraged at this time.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 16: Environment

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **High** ll Chapter 16 of *Horizon 2020* was adopted into the existing comprehensive plan in 2011 and is detailed in both study and prescription for the action steps. Implementation of these action steps is viewed as the practical continuation of this chapter for future use.

Action Steps:

4.1 Incorporate the policies of the currently adopted Environment chapter into the new plan and continue to implement the existing action steps and goals outlined within the Environment Chapter. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

4.2 Monitor regulatory language for changes that would impact policies and goals of the comprehensive plan. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

4.3 Review and bolster existing water conservation policies within the Comprehensive Plan. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

4.4 Add policies based upon the adopted Climate Protection Task Force Report. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

Issue 5: Preserve Historic Buildings & Structures

Analysis & Discussion:

Similar to value and sense of community the rural county provides to our community, the buildings and places that span generations also provide a strong sense of place and history for both residents and visitors. The understanding and value of these places to the community is identified in *Horizon 2020*, and vigilant study and conservation of these places provides a multi-faceted benefit to all residents.

Steering Committee Summary Position: The expansion of this portion of the comprehensive plan should include the recent and continued study of resources in the unincorporated Douglas County.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 5 (partial): Residential Land Use, 6: Commercial Land Use, 11: Historic Resources

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Medium** ll A dedicated chapter for Historic Resources has been a part of the existing document, and a revision was started. The continued study and revision of this section to meet changes in the state statutes and continued surveying of cultural and architectural assets should be included.

Action Steps:

5.1 Continue updating and cataloging of these resources throughout Douglas County. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Historic Resources Commission, Douglas County Natural and Cultural Heritage Conservation Council)

5.2 Study trends and development in both preservation economics and markets to understand how to encourage and develop adaptive reuse of these places. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Historic Resources Commission, Douglas County Natural and Cultural Heritage Conservation Council, Planning)

5.3 Include the draft Historic Resources chapter in the adoption process for the new comprehensive plan document. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

Issue 6: Create Quality Neighborhoods for All Ages

Analysis & Discussion:

Widely considered to be one of the fundamental building blocks of the community, the neighborhood's role both in the community's composition and in the comprehensive plan is a vital one. The level of detail and study provided to the neighborhoods within *Horizon 2020* is not as well defined as the community desires at this time.

Steering Committee Summary Position: Neighborhoods for all ages are the essential building block of our community and the Steering Committee feels that this unit of the community is important to expand and include within the context of the community's comprehensive plan. Many of the issues identified in this report can be seen throughout the community, but are also present in scale at this integral neighborhood unit.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4: Growth Management, 5: Residential Land Use, 6: Commercial Land Use, 8: Transportation, 9 (partial): Park, Recreation, Open Space Areas and Facilities

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Low** Neighborhoods play a fundamental role in the formation of the community, as well as in the function of the community as a whole. As people look more towards their neighborhoods to provide for their daily shopping and activities, focusing on how they can become more universal in their design and their amenities will grow in importance in the coming years.

Action Steps:

6.1 Study and define the aspects and details to best address the longer-term need and desires of neighborhoods in the larger community context. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Community Development)

6.2 Incorporate neighborhood planning into the long-term work plan for Area/Sector Plans. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

6.3 Study and develop incentives for projects that implement best practices and that follow the neighborhood plans as adopted. (Entity Responsible: Community Development, Planning, Parks & Recreation, MPO)

Issue 7: Create Employment Opportunities

Analysis & Discussion:

Throughout the public input phase and during discussions of the Steering Committee, the makeup and health of the primary and secondary employment markets has been a constant topic that arose at all stages and throughout the various public input events.

Steering Committee Summary Position: Creating a diverse range of employment opportunities was one of the foremost issues raised during the public input process. While *Horizon 2020* provides depth and guidance on this item, it is clearly an issue of high concern for the community in all facets that needs addressing moving forward.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use, 12: Economic Development

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **High** ll The prominence of Downtown Lawrence as a commercial and cultural commodity is strongly worked into *Horizon 2020* at present, as is the need to grow the community's industrial base. However, *Horizon 2020* needs stronger alignment to other more recent strategic plans, such as the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce that support growing local businesses, as well as a comprehensive review of where large-scale primary employers should locate within the planning period.

Action Steps:

7.1 High tech infrastructures such as fiber, telecoms, etc. are vital to a prosperous economic future. Create policies to support the community's high-tech infrastructure needs. (Entity Responsible: City of Lawrence, Douglas County)

7.2 Identify strategies, such as a dedicated economic development funding source, to help attract, develop, and retain employers, including an emphasis on growing green jobs. (Entity Responsible: City Commission, County Commission, Economic Development Corporation, Chamber of Commerce)

7.3 Study various potential incentives to help promote Downtown Lawrence as a place of employment. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Economic Development, Chamber of Commerce)

7.4 Ensure policies that support and grow local small to medium sized businesses. (Entity Responsible: Small Business Facilitator, Planning)

7.5 Evaluate the current inventory of large-acre lots in the region and the needs of large-scale primary employers, and develop a strategy to provide development-ready sites to this sector of employers. (Entity Responsible: Economic Development Corporation, Planning)

Issue 8: Manage Future Lawrence Growth

Analysis & Discussion:

Throughout the community, the concern over managing Lawrence's growth has been seen in numerous ways. From concerns about loss of prime soils to infrastructure development and maintenance costs, ensuring socially and economically responsible growth of the urban areas has been a theme throughout the planning process. The means have varied; but throughout the public input process how Lawrence grows and how that is guided has been a key concern for both city and county residents since the mid-1970s.

Steering Committee Summary Position: Ensuring the cohesive and efficient growth of the urbanized portions of the community is important to many other issues identified, such as rural land management, density, infrastructure investment, and transportation considerations.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4: Growth Management, 5: Residential Land Use, 6: Commercial Land Use, 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use, 8: Transportation, 12: Economic Development

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Medium** ll *Horizon 2020* was adopted with a Growth Management chapter that establishes the Urban Growth Area, and the corresponding Service Areas. As Douglas County and Lawrence have grown in the 17 years since their adoption, the expectations on infrastructure, environmental considerations, and farmland needs have changed.

Action Steps:

8.1 Evaluate the existing Urban Growth Areas to align with adopted Sector Plans, growth trends, and expected infrastructure trends in the community. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

8.2 Continue further Sector/Area Planning efforts, and work to refine existing Sector/Area Plans to encourage uniformity in document design and mapping symbology. (Entity Responsible: Planning, GIS)

8.3 Study tax base implications and economic considerations for growth management strategy. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Utilities)

8.4 Evaluate the existing service areas to determine their relevance for future growth. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

Issue 9: Plan For the Size & Location of Retail Development

Analysis & Discussion:

In many respects, this issue can be taken as a representation of many other items brought forward by the public throughout the input process. Policies requiring the monitoring of the retail sector help to encourage the use of existing commercial/retail areas, thereby utilizing existing infrastructure investment; fostering growth management, and working to keep neighborhood commercial spaces activated.

Steering Committee Summary Position: A particular issue that was common throughout both the public input phase, and also the discussion of the Steering Committee, to ensure the overall health of the various markets throughout the community. The Steering Committee determined that incentives should be studied to encourage retail development in locations that best fit the community and utilize the community's existing infrastructure and investments. The Steering Committee believed the current policies and retail market study program were serving the community well as a way to maintain a healthy retail market.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4 (partial): Growth Management, 6: Commercial Land Use, 12 (partial): Economic Development

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Medium** ll Aspects of this issue can be seen throughout the *Horizon 2020* document and it does echo many of the issues that are still being cited today.

Action Steps:

9.1 Study incentives that would be desirable to encourage and foster redevelopment in existing commercial/retail areas within the City of Lawrence and unincorporated Douglas County. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

Issue 10: Provide Opportunities for Small Neighborhood Retail

Analysis & Discussion:

Throughout the recent history of Douglas County & Lawrence, most commercial/retail areas have been developed as part of larger commercial/retail center, locating at major nodes throughout the community. However, there is a desire in the community for some daily provisions and necessities to be available to residents without the need to travel to one of the major commercial centers within our community.

Steering Committee Summary Position: As part of the discussion regarding density and the changing patterns of housing and ownership seen throughout the greater real estate market, the Steering Committee recognized that the inclusion of commercial/retail spaces within existing and future neighborhoods is a use that many residents see as beneficial to the overall sense of community.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4 (partial): Growth Management, 6: Commercial Land Use

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Medium** ll Chapter 6 of *Horizon 2020* does note the presence of these commercial locations, but it was envisioned at the time that the concentration of retail/commercial activities would be into auto-centric centers. Retooling portions of the document to better support neighborhood retail activities could strengthen today's preference for this type of use.

Action Steps:

10.1 Study design standards and guidelines to help create context-sensitive commercial/retail establishments. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

10.2 Work to identify modifications to the City of Lawrence Land Development Code to increase the opportunities for these establishments to develop within the existing development patterns of the community. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

10.3 Review and revise adopted Sector Plans as needed to align with new policies adopted with the new code sections. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

Issue 11: Encourage Infill Development

Analysis & Discussion:

Many times, the most efficient resource is the one that is already present. With this in mind, promoting infill development and redevelopment over new greenfield development both encourages revitalization of neighborhoods when appropriate and capitalizes on the existing infrastructure investment of Lawrence & Douglas County.

Steering Committee Summary Position: Any policy that is created to help address this issue must be clearly articulated to eliminate discrepancies in relation to this item. The preferred method to help stimulate infill development as a preferred means should be incentive-based and contextually appropriate for the area receiving the development.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4: Growth Management, 5: Residential Land Use, 6: Commercial Land Use, 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Medium** ll While some policies indirectly address promoting infill development, there are others that encourage the utilization of existing infrastructure and promote the continued use of existing commercial centers and nodes.

Action Steps:

11.1 Study similar examples to identify the optimal policy language to fit our community's needs. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

11.2 Study trends and identify policies related to emerging housing alternatives. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Consultant)

Issue 12: Consider Increasing Height/Density in Appropriate Locations

Analysis & Discussion:

The understanding that growth is going to continue occurring in the community is at the heart of this multi-faceted issue, but one that is crucial to many of the other issues listed in this report. Since 1980, household sizes in Lawrence have decreased 10%, while overall population density decreased 6.5%. During this same time, the acreage of Lawrence has grown by 15%. Seeing the need for changes in the form of development that is typical, both the Steering Committee and Public Input shows there is a concern about continued sprawl development and views increasing height/density in appropriate locations in the community as a method of managing sprawl.

Steering Committee Summary Position: The Steering Committee recognizes that that growth will be a continued part of our community and that it will likely change how Lawrence & Douglas County will further grow and develop. The Steering Committee supported pursuing policies that would allow increased height and density in appropriate areas of the community to accommodate a growing population.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4: Growth Management

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Low** **II** The policies of the existing comprehensive plan are mixed in terms of growth management. While sprawl is discouraged, other policies establish low-density and height criteria by which to grow, which can challenge anti-sprawl policies. With recent economic and market changes, the comprehensive plan should include language to adequately consider changes within the existing urban footprint of the City of Lawrence to accommodate denser, taller areas in appropriate locations.

Action Steps:

12.1 Determine appropriate locations for increased height and density and develop policies to encourage such development. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

Issue 13: Enhance Agricultural Uses & Rural Character in Douglas County

Analysis & Discussion:

Farming of the land and the character of unincorporated Douglas County are primary components for our community. The combination of these items into one issue ensures that they both are studied and addressed in tandem, ensuring the studies, policies, and goals work to ensure they stay a vital part of our community's character and heritage.

Steering Committee Summary Position: The Steering Committee recognizes that this issue is vital to the current way, and quality, of life that is vibrant in our community. The role that agriculture and rural character play in both our economy, as well as the quality of life is an invaluable part of what defines our community. Policies to preserve and conserve high quality farmland should be maintained in the new comprehensive plan.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4: Growth Management, 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use, 9 (partial): Park, Recreation, Open Space Areas and Facilities, 16: Environment

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Medium** ll One of the key foundational aspects of our community's heritage and economy, the existing document does identify the value of the resource, and includes protections and measures to help ensure its continued role in our region.

Action Steps:

13.1 Incorporate by reference the master plan created by the Food Policy Council when adopted. (Entity Responsible: Planning, Food Policy Council)

13.2 Work with the unincorporated County residents to identify resources, development possibilities, and amenities to enhance and strengthen the rural economy. (Entity Responsible: Food Policy Council, Sustainability Coordinator, Planning, Economic Development Corporation)

13.3 Continue to foster economic opportunities through NetWork Kansas. (Entity Responsible: Douglas County, BizFuel Partnership)

13.4 Study and develop land use options to permit and encourage conservation subdivisions within the Urban Growth Area. (Entity Responsible: Douglas County, Planning)

Issue 14: Encourage/Support Local Food System Development

Analysis & Discussion:

A section of the community economy that is developing and new, it is also one that is not adequately addressed within the current context of *Horizon 2020,* or within the community given the presence of "food deserts." With a great potential impact on both the character of the community, but also the regional economy, the local food system has and will be part of our local culture. As a part of the community's cultural heritage and a role as a vital part of our economy and resiliency, the continued fostering of the local food system is an issue that needs stronger incorporation into the overall vision for the community.

Steering Committee Summary Position: While the comprehensive plan can help further overarching policies, the details of a strategic plan should be developed by and maintained with the Local Food Policy Council to tap their expertise and close understanding of the issues, goals, and visions to ensure the master plan is fitting the true needs of the community. The Steering Committee believes that the development of the plan should be conducted by the Local Food Policy Council and incorporated into the comprehensive plan.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 16: Environment

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Low** Chapter 16 – Environment of *Horizon 2020* reflects some of the policies related to the local food system, but does not provide a strong policy foundation for this issue.

Action Steps:

14.1 Establish policies, goals and objectives to enhance the local food system. (Entity Responsible: Food Policy Council)

14.2 Incorporate by reference the master plan created by the Food Policy Council when adopted. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

14.3 Work with local food producers to establish a local food hub and adequate farmer's markets throughout the community. (Entity Responsible: Food Policy Council, Sustainability Coordinator)

Issue 15: Enhance Sidewalks/Trails/Walking Paths

Analysis & Discussion:

While this issue was a high priority for the public in surveys, numerous efforts and advisory committees are working on various aspects of this item; such as filling gaps, creating safe routes to schools, sidewalk maintenance, and recreation paths as examples. The study of these topics at a finer detail by these committees will be weighted by these bodies; therefore, incorporations of their findings and documents into the new comprehensive plan are recommended.

Steering Committee Summary Position: The Steering Committee found that this is a topic that nests itself in many other issues that have been included in this report, but singularly important to note because of its ability to change neighborhoods, as well as the community as a whole. Continuing to work and achieve a stronger network of pathways is a goal for many documents throughout the community, and the Steering Committee feels that the comprehensive plan should continue to further this effort.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 8: Transportation, 10: Community Facilities, 16 (partial): Environment

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **High** ll *Horizon 2020* contains an entire chapter (Chapter 8 – Transportation), which includes bicycle and pedestrian policies, a call for Complete Streets approach to infrastructure development, and taking a long-term analysis of how to ensure the most efficient means of movement for our community.

Action Steps:

15.1 Update the Master Plan for Lawrence Parks & Recreation. (Entity Responsible: Parks & Recreation, Consultant)

15.2 Work to further develop recreation paths as transportation corridors and means of movement. (Entity Responsible: MPO, Public Works, Parks & Recreation)

15.3 Incorporate by reference the plans and documents that are published by the various advisory boards and committees on bicycle and pedestrian issues, including Transportation 2040 and successive versions. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

Issue 16: Plan For and Provide Arts & Cultural Amenities

Analysis & Discussion:

Cited as one of the key qualities of Lawrence & Douglas County, the arts and culture play a major role in defining the character of our community. Arts & cultural amenities affect the community in numerous ways, including economic impacts, quality of life, and in employment attraction. Ensuring that the comprehensive plan identifies and envisions the expansive role arts & cultural amenities play in our community is integral to a culturally rich community.

Steering Committee Summary Position: With a more strategic and focused plan currently being undertaken regarding arts and cultural amenities within the City of Lawrence, the Steering Committee felt that incorporating the forthcoming document would provide a more accurate and encompassing plan than including duplicate work into the comprehensive plan. However, the Steering Committee also determined that including language to further support similar items throughout Douglas County would also be a benefit to the community.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: Not Available

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Low** **II** With an on-going cultural arts plan, the recommendation for this issue would be to incorporate the findings of the plan by reference into the new comprehensive plan.

Action Steps:

16.1 Complete a Cultural Arts Plan for the City of Lawrence. (Entity Responsible: City of Lawrence, Stakeholders)

16.2 Incorporate the Cultural Arts Plan when complete into the comprehensive plan. (Entity Responsible: Planning)

16.3 Complete and incorporate the East Ninth Work Plan (9th Street Corridor Plan) into the comprehensive plan. (Entity Responsible: City of Lawrence, Stakeholders, Planning)

Issue 17: Enhance Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety

Analysis & Discussion:

The economic and planning emphasis towards a more multi-modal community is a priority of the public and local government agencies. Promoting the creation of safe bicycle and pedestrian spaces was highly encouraged throughout the public input, and has been a key item in the community for many years.

Steering Committee Summary Position: This particular issue has policy support from numerous existing documents and from a variety of organizations and bodies. However, the Steering Committee felt it important to plan beyond the current program and anticipate changes that are likely in a longer-term future.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4 (partial): Growth Management, 8: Transportation, 10: Community Facilities, 16 (partial): Environment

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **High** ll The strength for this particular issue is principally driven from *Horizon 2020's* incorporation of *Transportation 2040* into the comprehensive plan document. Given the depth and detail at which transportation is reviewed and planned for in that document, the continued linking of these two documents should be continued. However, it could be supplemented with the findings and recommendations from the many advisory boards and committees currently studying this issue.

Action Steps:

17.1 Continue the strong link between *Transportation 2040* and the comprehensive plan to ensure coordinated transportation planning efforts and land use planning efforts. (Entity Responsible: MPO, Planning, Public Works)

17.2 Update the Lawrence Parks & Recreation Master Plan. (Entity Responsible: Parks & Recreation)

17.3 Incorporate the plans and recommendations from the advisory boards and committees to strengthen support for this issue. (Entity Responsible: MPO, Planning, Public Works, Parks & Recreation)

Issue 18: Maintain a Strong System of Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Analysis & Discussion:

Both a valued community amenity and a component of the transportation network, these spaces provide a far greater return to the community than simply being green space. Besides having transportation and recreation value, they also have economic development benefits, and can provide a variety of services including local food production and environmentally-sensitive land conservation.

Steering Committee Summary Position: The Steering Committee recognized the intrinsic value that these resources have, not just to residents, but also to visitors and to the economy as a whole. Encouraging further cooperation and development of these spaces provides a key long-term benefit for local users and for the community as a whole. Ensuring this system is maintained adequately, and developed further, is an item that needs a strong vision for the future. The Steering Committee was presented information from the Parks & Recreation Department that the Parks & Recreation Master Plan is in need of a major update and the Steering Committee looks forward to reviewing the outcome of this effort.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 9: Parks, Recreation, Open Space Areas and Facilities, 10: Community Facilities, 16 (partial): Environment

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **Medium** ll The value of parks and open spaces was recognized throughout the existing document, but the wishes and needs of the community have evolved in the years since its adoption. Updating the master plan for the parks system, and incorporating that document into the comprehensive plan would ensure that a thorough, proactive plan is established for the continued growth of these resources in our community.

Action Steps:

18.1 Determine the best method for locating and acquiring future park land in the Urban Growth Area and in unincorporated Douglas County. (Entity Responsible: Parks & Recreation)

18.2 Update the Master Plan for Lawrence Parks & Recreation. (Entity Responsible: Parks & Recreation, Consultant)

18.3 Include linear parks and other connections into Transportation planning studies and efforts. (Entity Responsible: MPO, Planning)

18.4 Identify desired open spaces and a program that funds the protection and/or acquisition of these locations for the future enjoyment of the community. (Entity Responsible: Parks & Recreation, Douglas County, Planning)

Issue 19: Enhance the Transportation Network

Analysis & Discussion:

Numerous regional plans and studies have been incorporated into both the existing comprehensive plan, as well as the regional transportation plan. These plans require that the community take a multi-modal approach to the transportation network.

Steering Committee Summary Position: It is the position of the Steering Committee to consider items beyond *Transportation 2040* and consider the ancillary items that can have a direct effect on the overall transportation of the region, not just our community. The Steering Committee understands that many outside influences will have an effect on the transportation network in the coming years, including technology and an ever-evolving shift in transportation mode preference.

Horizon 2020 Existing Reference: Horizon 2020: Chapter 4: Growth Management, 5: Residential Land Use, 6: Commercial Land Use, 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use, 8: Transportation, 12: Economic Development

Horizon 2020 Existing Policy Strength: **High** ll The incorporation of *Transportation 2040* and its subsequent revisions into *Horizon 2020*, the comprehensive plan maintains strong connections to the requirements of the regional needs and analysis of the transportation network.

Action Steps:

19.1 Continue to work with local governments to further strengthen and support our regional transportation plan. (Entity Responsible: MPO, Planning)

Appendix

ETC Institute: Findings Report for a Statistically Valid Comprehensive Plan Community Survey

Findings Report for a Statistically Valid Comprehensive Plan Community Survey

City of Lawrence

Submitted to

The City of Lawrence/Douglas County

By

ETC INSTITUTE

725 W. Frontier Circle

Olathe, KS 66061

(913) 829-1215

June 2014

Contents

Executive Summary.....Section 1

Charts and Graphs .....Section 2

GIS Maps..... Appendix A

Tabular Data .....Section 3

Cross Tabular Data by:

Household Types .....Section 4

Household Income.....Section 5

Whether Respondents Reside in Within the City of Lawrence or Douglas County.....Section 6

Employment Status.....Section 7

Where Respondents Work.....Section 8

Whether Respondents Own or Rent and Length of Residency.....Section 9

Survey Instrument .....Section 10

Section 1
Executive Summary

Comprehensive Plan Community Survey

Executive Summary Report

Overview of the Methodology

ETC partnered with the City of Lawrence and Douglas County to conduct a statistically valid Long Range Comprehensive Plan Community Survey update to help establish priorities for future growth and development. The survey was designed to obtain statistically valid results from households throughout the City of Lawrence and the unincorporated areas of Douglas County. The survey was administered by mail, web and by phone.

ETC worked extensively with City of Lawrence and Douglas County officials in the development of the survey questionnaire. This work allowed the survey to be tailored to issues of strategic importance to help establish priorities for future growth and development.

A seven-page survey was mailed to a random sample of households within the City of Lawrence and unincorporated Douglas County. Leisure Vision/ETC Institute was able to obtain a total of 1,046 completed surveys exceeding the goal of 800 completed surveys. The results of the random sample of 1,046 households have a 95% level of confidence with a precision rate of at least +/-3%.

The following pages summarize major survey findings.

Major Survey Findings

- ***How Respondent Households Rate the Importance of the Following Services that the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County Provide:*** Based on the percentage of respondent households who identified the service as "very important" or "somewhat important," (95%) indicated that it was important for the City of Lawrence and unincorporated Douglas County to create employment opportunities. Other most important services to provide include: Parks, recreation and open space (94%), Preserving historic buildings (92%), managing future growth (91%) and downtown stability (89%).

- ***Most Important Services for the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County Provide:*** Based on the percentage of respondents top four most important issues, (55%) indicated the most important issue that needs to be addressed is creating employment opportunities. Other most important issues include: Downtown stability (39%), quality of housing for all income groups (34%) and managing future growth (33%).

- ***Respondent Level of Agreement with the Following List of Statements that Could Describe the Community Vision About the Future:*** Based on the percentage of respondents who either "strongly agree" or "agree," (91%) agree with the community vision of more employment opportunities. Other similar levels of agreement include: Better protection of natural resources (77%), better management of growth and more sidewalks (72%) and walking paths and trails (72%).

- ***Most Important Statements in the Community Vision for the Future:*** Based on the sum of respondent household top four choices, (55%) indicated that more employment opportunities was the most important statement to describe the community vision for the future. Other most important statements include: Better management of growth (30%) and more affordable housing within the City (30%).

- ***How Respondents Rate Statements that Could Describe Aspects of Life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County:*** Based on the percentage of respondents who stated that the aspect of life in the City was either a "major strength" or a "strength," (93%) indicated *downtown*. Other similar levels include: Quality of life (82%) and availability of arts, music and cultural amenities (81%).

- ***Most Important Statements About Aspects of Life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County:*** Based on the percentage of respondents who selected the statement as one of their top four choices, (45%) indicated the most important major strength was the *downtown*. Other most important major strengths include: Quality of life (42%), unique local identity (33%) and availability of arts, music and cultural amenities (31%).

- ***Respondent Satisfaction with Aspects of the City's and County's Transportation System:*** Based on the percentage of respondent households who indicated they were either "very satisfied" or "satisfied," with aspects of the Cities and Counties transportation system, (77%) indicated they were satisfied with *ease of travel by car on highways*. Other aspects with similar satisfaction levels include: Ease of walking in the City of Lawrence (62%) and ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets (59%).

- ***Most Important Aspects of the City's and County's Transportation System:*** Based on the percentage of respondent households who indicated the aspect as one of their top three choices, (44%) indicated ease of travel by car on major streets as the most important aspect of the transportation system. Other most important aspects include: Safety of bicycling in the City of Lawrence (27%), safety of walking in the City of Lawrence (23%), quality of public transportation (20%) and ease of walking in the City of Lawrence (19%).

- ***Respondent Households Overall Satisfaction with the New Residential Subdivisions in the City of Lawrence:*** Thirty percent (30%) of respondent households indicated that their satisfaction as *neutral* with the new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence. Other levels of satisfaction include: Satisfied (26%), don't know (22%), dissatisfied (12%), very satisfied (6%) and very dissatisfied (5%).

- ***Respondent Households Overall Satisfaction with the Site Layout and Architectural Design of New Commercial Development in the City of Lawrence:*** Thirty-five percent (35%) of respondent households indicated their satisfaction as *neutral* with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development. Other levels of satisfaction include: Satisfied (29%), don't know (14%), dissatisfied (14%), very dissatisfied 4% and very satisfied (3%).

- ***Respondent Households Overall Satisfaction with the Site Layout and Architectural Design of New Industrial Development in the City of Lawrence:*** Thirty-eight percent (38%) of respondent households indicated their satisfaction as *neutral* with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development. Other levels of satisfaction include: Don't know (33%), satisfied (19%), dissatisfied (6%), very satisfied (2%) and very dissatisfied (2%).

- ***Respondent Level of Agreement with the Following List of Statements that could Describe the Future of Retail Development:*** Based on the percentage of respondents who indicated "strongly agree" or "agree," (82%) agree that *available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings*. Other similar levels of agreement include: The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area (69%) and future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods (44%).

- ***Respondent Level of Agreement with the Following List of Statements that Could Describe the Present and Future of Development:*** Based on the percentage of respondents who indicated "Strongly agree" or "agree," (80%) that agricultural uses maintained in the County for present and future development. Other similar levels of agreement include: Mix use development in close proximity to home (72%), major development inside the City limits (58%) and increase in height of development (53%).


- ***Reasons Respondent Households have Difficulty Participating in Public Discussions About the Future:*** Forty-five percent (45%) of respondent households indicated *not enough time* as the reason they have difficulty participating in public discussions about the future. Other top reasons include: Don't have enough information (41%), don't believe they can make a difference (36%) and not sure how to get involved (36%).

- ***Respondent Households Familiarity with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020:*** Sixty-two percent (62%) of respondent households indicated that they were not knowledgeable about *Horizon 2020*. Other levels of familiarity include: Somewhat knowledgeable (21%), not sure (13%), very knowledgeable (2%) and don't know (2%).

Section 2
Charts and Graphs

Q1. How Respondent Households Rate the Importance of the Following Issues in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County Provide


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q2. Most Important Issues Respondent Households Feel Need to be Addressed


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q3. Respondent Level of Agreement with Statements that could Describe the Community Vision About the Future


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q4. Most Important Statements for the Community Vision for the Future


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q5. How Respondents Rate Statements that Could Describe Aspects of Life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q6. Most Important Statements About Aspects of Life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q7. Respondent Satisfaction with the Following Aspects of the City's and County's Transportation System


by percentage of respondents (excluding 'don't know')



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q8. Most Important Aspects of the Transportation System


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q9. Respondent Households Overall Satisfaction with the New Residential Subdivisions in the City of Lawrence


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q11. Respondent Households Overall Satisfaction with the Site Layout and Architectural Design of New Commercial Development in the City of Lawrence


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q13. Respondent Households Overall Satisfaction with the Site Layout and Architectural Design of New Industrial Development in the City of Lawrence


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q15. Respondent Level of Agreement with the Following List of Statements that could Describe the Future of Retail Development


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q16. Respondent Level of Agreement with the Following List of Statements that could Describe the Present and Future of Development


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q17. Reasons Respondent Households have Difficulty Participating in Public Discussions About the Future


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q18. Respondent Households Familiarity with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q19. Demographics: Number of Years Respondents Have Lived in Lawrence/Douglas County


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q20. Demographics: Ages of People in Household


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q21. Demographics: Age of Respondents


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q22. Demographics: Do You Own or Rent a Home?


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q23. Demographics: Best Description of Home


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q25. Demographics: Household Income


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q26. Demographics: Gender of Respondents


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q27. Demographics: Are You or Other Members of Your Household Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Ancestry?


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q28. Demographics: Race of Respondents


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q29. Demographics: Employment Status


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q30. Demographics: Where Do You Work?


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Q31. Demographics: Type of Work


by percentage of respondents



Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute for the City of Lawrence/Douglas County (2014)

Appendix A
GIS Maps

Location of Respondents




2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Comprehensive Plan Survey

Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance of Issues Facing the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County

Question #1

Q1a: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Maintaining Rural Character



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1b: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Preserving Historic Buildings



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1c: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Revitalization of Older City-Center Neighborhoods



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1d: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Development of the Clinton Lake Area



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1e: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Quality Housing for All Income Groups



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1f: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Walking and Biking Trails



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1g: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Maintaining Community Identity



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1h: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Downtown Stability



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1i: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Transportation Alternatives to the Car



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1j: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Availability of Arts and Culture Opportunities



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1k: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Appearance of Multi-family Residential Developments



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1l: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Incorporating Natural Areas



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1m: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Creating Employment Opportunities



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1n: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Parks, Recreation, Open Space



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1o: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Protecting High Value Farmland



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


N
W E
S

- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1p: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Appearance of Commercial Areas



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1q: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Managing Future Growth



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1r: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Activities and Housing for the Retirement Community



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q1s: Respondent Rating of the Level of Importance for Other



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 4-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.75 Very Important
- 1.75-2.5 Somewhat Important
- 2.5-3.25 Not Sure
- 3.25-4.0 Not Important
- Other (no responses)


2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Vision for the Future

Question #3

Q3a: Respondent Level of Agreement with A Stronger Community Identity



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3b: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Attractive City Entrances



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3c: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Parks and Open Space



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3d: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Sidewalks, Walking Paths and Trails



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3e: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Bike Paths and Routes



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3f: Respondent Level of Agreement with
More Restaurants, Entertainment and Cultural Activities Downtown



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3g: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Housing in and Around Downtown



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3h: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Affordable Housing Within the City



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3i: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Employment Opportunities



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)


Q3j: Respondent Level of Agreement with Better Protection of Natural Resources



2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3k: Respondent Level of Agreement with Expanded Public Transportation



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3l: Respondent Level of Agreement with
More Recreational Opportunities Around Clinton Lake



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3m: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Activities for Teens



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3n: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Activities for Seniors



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3o: Respondent Level of Agreement with Improved Access to Local Foods



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3p: Respondent Level of Agreement with Better Management of Growth



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3q: Respondent Level of Agreement with Maintaining the Rural Character of the Country



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3r: Respondent Level of Agreement with New or Expanded Conference Space



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3s: Respondent Level of Agreement with Multi-Use Neighborhoods



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3t: Respondent Level of Agreement with Riverfront Development with a Mix of Uses, Public Access and Activities



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3u:Respondent Level of Agreement with More Arts and Cultural Opportunities



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3v: Respondent Level of Agreement with Development of the Communications Network



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3w: Respondent Level of Agreement with Stronger Retirement Community



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q3X: Respondent Level of Agreement with Other



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S


2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Major Strengths and Weakness

Question #5


Q5a: Respondent Rating of Availability of Arts, Music & Cultural Amenities



2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5b: Respondent Rating of Availability of Retail Choices



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5c: Respondent Rating of Existing Sidewalk Network



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5d: Respondent Rating of Protection of Natural Resources



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5e: Respondent Rating of Public Transportation



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5f: Respondent Rating of Character of Neighborhoods



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5g: Respondent Rating of Availability of Housing Choices



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5h: Respondent Rating of Availability of Parks and Open Space



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5i: Respondent Rating of Employment Opportunities



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5j: Respondent Rating of Historic Buildings and Areas



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)


Q5k: Respondent Rating of Rate of Growth



2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5l: Respondent Rating of Unique Local Identity



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5m: Respondent Rating of Opportunities for Community Involvement



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5n: Respondent Rating of Attention to Environment Issues



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5o: Respondent Rating of Downtown



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5p: Respondent Rating of Population Growth



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5q: Respondent Rating of Presence of Family Farms



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)


Q5r: Respondent Rating of Quality of Life



2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5s: Respondent Rating of Existing Roadway Network



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q5t: Respondent Rating of Other



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Major Weakness
- 1.8-2.6 Weakness
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Strength
- 4.2-5.0 Major Strength
- Other (no responses)


2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Satisfaction with the City's and County's Transportation System

Question #7

Q7a: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Ease of Travel by Car on Highways



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7b: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Travel by Car on Major Streets



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7c: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Travel by Car on Neighborhood Streets



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7d: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Access to Major Streets from Neighborhood



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)


Q7e: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Ease of Walking in Lawrence



2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7f: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Ease of Bicycling in Lawrence



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7g: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Safety of Walking in Lawrence



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7h: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Safety of Bicycling in Lawrence



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7i: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Bicycle System Throughout County



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)


Q7j: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Walking & Hiking System in County



2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7k: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Road System in County



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7l: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Quality of Public Transportation



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q7m: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Other



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)


2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Satisfaction with New Residential Development in the City of Lawrence

Question #9

Q9: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with New Subdivision in Lawrence



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S


2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Satisfaction with Site Layout and Architectural Design of New Commercial Development in the City of Lawrence

Question #11

Q11: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Site Layout & Architectural Design of New Commercial Development in Lawrence



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)


2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Satisfaction with Site Layout and Architectural Design of New Industrial Development in the City of Lawrence

Question #13

Q13: Respondent Level of Satisfaction with Site Layout and Architectural Design of New Industrial Development in Lawrence



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)


2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Respondent Level of Agreement with Retail Development

Question #15

Q15a: Respondent Level of Agreement with Expansion of Retail Development Should be Supported in Downtown Area



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q15b: Respondent Level of Agreement with Future Retail Development Should be Located at Intersection of Main Streets



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q15c: Respondent Level of Agreement with Future Retail Development Should be Located in Small Centers



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q15d: Respondent Level of Agreement with Available Retail Space Should be Utilized Before Building New Retail Buildings




2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Respondent Level of Agreement with Future Development

Question #16

Q16a: Respondent Level of Agreement with Agricultural Uses Maintained in the County



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q16b: Respondent Level of Agreement with Major Development Inside City Limits



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N W E S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q16c: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Shopping Opportunities in or Near my Neighborhood



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q16d: Respondent Level of Agreement with More Employment Centers Near Home



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q16e: Respondent Level of Agreement with Modest Increase in Height of Development



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q16f: Respondent Level of Agreement with Downtown Accommodate More Development



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

N
W E
S

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Q16g: Respondent Level of Agreement with Development with Better Mix Uses in Order to Live, Work & Play in Close Proximity



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Agree
- 1.8-2.6 Agree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Disagree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Disagree
- Other (no responses)

2014 City of Lawrence/Douglas County Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by CBG (merged as needed)

Section 3
Tabular Data

Tabular Data

Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?	Number	Percent
City of Lawrence	792	75.7 %
Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural- Outside City Limits)	254	24.3 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:

(N=1046)

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not sure	Not important	Not provided
Q1a. Maintaining rural character	29.8%	39.2%	16.8%	11.8%	2.4%
Q1b. Preserving historic buildings	51.9%	38.0%	5.0%	3.9%	1.1%
Q1c. Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	40.5%	41.6%	11.9%	5.0%	1.1%
Q1d. Development of the Clinton Lake Area	16.7%	33.7%	21.2%	26.9%	1.4%
Q1e. Quality housing for all income groups	53.4%	29.9%	8.8%	6.9%	1.0%
Q1f. Walking and biking trails	45.3%	38.0%	7.3%	8.3%	1.1%
Q1g. Maintaining community identity.	46.7%	33.4%	14.8%	4.0%	1.1%
Q1h. Downtown stability	60.2%	27.3%	6.2%	5.3%	1.0%
Q1i. Transportation alternatives to the car	39.1%	33.7%	12.0%	14.3%	0.9%
Q1j. Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	38.1%	40.8%	10.9%	9.1%	1.1%
Q1k. Appearance of multi-family residential developments	24.9%	40.1%	20.8%	12.5%	1.7%
Q1l. Incorporating natural areas into development projects	42.1%	32.2%	14.0%	10.7%	1.1%
Q1m. Creating employment opportunities	72.8%	20.9%	3.2%	2.1%	1.0%
Q1n. Parks, recreation, open space	57.3%	35.0%	4.5%	1.9%	1.3%
Q1o. Protecting high value farmland	44.6%	30.0%	16.9%	7.6%	0.9%
Q1p. Appearance of commercial areas	30.8%	50.6%	12.6%	5.1%	1.0%
Q1q. Managing future growth	58.0%	31.6%	6.6%	3.0%	0.8%
Q1r. Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	28.8%	46.8%	15.9%	7.2%	1.3%
Q1s. Other	12.8%	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%	85.0%

Tabular Data

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=1046)

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not sure	Not important
Q1a. Maintaining rural character	30.6%	40.2%	17.2%	12.0%
Q1b. Preserving historic buildings	52.5%	38.5%	5.0%	4.0%
Q1c. Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	41.0%	42.0%	12.0%	5.0%
Q1d. Development of the Clinton Lake Area	17.0%	34.2%	21.5%	27.3%
Q1e. Quality housing for all income groups	54.0%	30.2%	8.9%	6.9%
Q1f. Walking and biking trails	45.8%	38.4%	7.4%	8.4%
Q1g. Maintaining community identity.	47.2%	33.7%	15.0%	4.1%
Q1h. Downtown stability	60.8%	27.6%	6.3%	5.3%
Q1i. Transportation alternatives to the car	39.4%	33.9%	12.2%	14.5%
Q1j. Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	38.6%	41.3%	11.0%	9.2%
Q1k. Appearance of multi-family residential developments	25.3%	40.8%	21.2%	12.7%
Q1l. Incorporating natural areas into development projects	42.5%	32.6%	14.1%	10.8%
Q1m. Creating employment opportunities	73.6%	21.1%	3.2%	2.1%
Q1n. Parks, recreation, open space	58.0%	35.5%	4.6%	1.9%
Q1o. Protecting high value farmland	45.0%	30.3%	17.1%	7.6%
Q1p. Appearance of commercial areas	31.1%	51.1%	12.7%	5.1%
Q1q. Managing future growth	58.5%	31.9%	6.6%	3.0%
Q1r. Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	29.2%	47.5%	16.1%	7.3%
Q1s. Other	85.4%	7.0%	3.8%	3.8%

Tabular Data

Q1. Other

Q1S Other
ACTIVITIES FOR CHILDREN
ACTIVITIES FOR TEENS AND YOUTH
AFFORDABLE ACTIVITIES
AFFORDABLE RES. HOUSING
AFFORDABLE/QUALITY HOUSING
AIRPORT TRANSPORTATION
ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES
ATTRACTING/SUPPORTING SML BUS
AVAILABILITY OF SOCIAL SERVICE
AVOIDING SPRAWL
BAR SCENE FOR OLDER GENERATION
BE MORE RECEPTIVE TO BIG BOX
BETTER BIKE SYSTEMS ON ROADS
BIKE LANE FROM LAWRENCE-LONE S
BIKE LANES ON ROADS
BIKING
BONDING IMPACT ON THE RETIRED
BROADBAND/HIGHSPEED INTERNET
CITYWIDE RECYCLING
CLEAN WATER, AIR AND SOIL
CODE ENFORCEMENT
COMMUNITY GARDEN
CONTAINING CITY SPRAWL
CURB GROWTH OF BIG BOX COMPANI
CURBSIDE RECYCLING WITH COUNTY
DEVEL. NEED DECENT APPEARANCE
DIVERSITY OF POPULATION
DO AWAY WITH PARKING METERS
DOWNTOWN FAMILY FRIENDLY
EAST LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT
EAST LAWRENCE POOL
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
ECONOMIC STIMULUS
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN RURAL AR
EMBRASE EDUCATION
ENCOURAGE BUSINESS
ENCOURAGE DOWNTOWN BUSINESS
ENDING DEVELOPER DOMINANCE
ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS
FAMILY FRIENDLY ACTIVITY
FENCED IN DOG PARK
FINISH BY PASS
FIX OUR ROADS
FIXING OUR POT HOLE FILLED STS
FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY
FUNDING LAW ENFORCEMENT
GROWTH W/DECENT WAGES
HIGH QUALITY WATER SUPPLY
HOMELESS ISSUES
HOUSING FOR LAW INCOME CHANGE
IMPROVED TRAFFIC FLOW
IMPROVED TRAFFIC FLOW
IMPROVEMENT OF COUNTY/RURAL RD
INVESTMENT IN SOCIAL SERVICES
KEEP LAWRENCE IN LAWRENCE
KEEPING COST OF LIVING DOWN
KEEPING DVLPRS FRM RNNING CITY
KEEPING LAWRENCE AFFORDABLE
LESS APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT
LESS GOV'T INTRUSION
LESS GOVERNMENT
LIMITING RURAL DEVELOPMENT
LIMITS DEVELOPMENT
LIVING WAGE
LOWER HEIGHT OF GREEN SPACE
LOWER PROPERTY TAX
LOWER PROPERTY/INCOME TAXES
MAINTAIN AFFORDABLE TAXES
MAINTAIN COMPETITIVE TAX RATES
MAINTAIN STRONG PROPERTY
MAINTAIN WILD SPACES
MAINTAINING AVAIL. INDUST BLVD
MAINTAINING INFRASTRUCTURE
MAINTAINING INTEGRITY OF COMMU
MAINTAINING NEIGHBORHOOD SCHLS
MANAGING PROPERTY TAX
MANDATORY EXERCISE
MEDICAL SERVICES
MINIMIZE KU ATHLETICS INFLUENC
MORE BIKE LANES
MORE FLOWERS
MORE PARKS
NEW BUSINESS INCENTIVES
NIGHT LINE BUS SERVICE
NO APARTMENTS IN NEIGHBORHOOD
NO BUS TRANSIT
NO MORE GROWTH
NO NEW APT COMPLEX
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE

Tabular Data

Q1. Other

Q1S Other

NO RESPONSE
NOT GROWING BIGGER
NOT OVER DOING ALL OF THE ABOV
NOT USING RURAL FOR ECON EXPAN
PARKING DOWNTOWN - FREE WEEKEN
PAVE ROADS
POLICE/PUBLIC SAFETY
PREPARE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE
PROMOTING WATER CONSERVATION
PROMOTION OF SAFE REC AREAS
PROPERTY TAXES
PUBLIC EDUCATION
PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PUBLIC SPORTS VALUES
RAMP ON BYPASS @ WAKURSA STOP
RECYCLING AWARENESS
REGULATION OF CEDAR TREES
REPARING STREETS
RESIDENTIAL SIDEWALK REPAIRS
ROAD MAINTENANCE
ROUND ABOUTS
RURAL INTERNET
SAFETY
SAFETY ON K-10
SCHOOLS
SET GROWTH LIMITS
SIGN CODE IMPROVEMENTS
SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING
SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
STILL NEED A GROCERY STORE
STOP HIGH RISES IN DOWNTOWN
STOP URBAN SPRAWL
STRANGER RELATIONSHIP WITH KU
STREET CONDITIONS
STREET REPAIR
STRONG SCHOOLS
SUPPORT NEEDS OF RESIDENTIAL A
SUSTAINABILITY
SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE
TAX BURDEN IS TOO HIGH
TAXES
TIMING TRAFFIC SIGNALS BETTER
TOO MANY APARTMENT COMPLEXES
TRAFFIC
TRAFFIC FLOW AROUND BUSES
TRAFFIC FLOW, TRAFFIC LIGHTS
TRAFFIC SIGNALS/TRAFFIC FLOW
TRANSPARENCY IN GOVERNMENT
WASTING MONEY ON BAD STUDIES
WATER
WATER QUALITY
WE DON'T NEED MORE ROUNDABOUTS
YOUTH AREAS

Tabular Data

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

Q2. Most Important	Number	Percent
Maintaining rural character	55	5.3 %
Preserving historic buildings	41	3.9 %
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	35	3.3 %
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	14	1.3 %
Quality housing for all income groups	136	13.0 %
Walking and biking trails	32	3.1 %
Maintaining community identity	57	5.4 %
Downtown stability	104	9.9 %
Transportation alternatives to the car	27	2.6 %
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	13	1.2 %
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	5	0.5 %
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	16	1.5 %
Creating employment opportunities	254	24.3 %
Parks, recreation, open space	18	1.7 %
Protecting high value farmland	37	3.5 %
Appearance of commercial areas	6	0.6 %
Managing future growth	72	6.9 %
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	16	1.5 %
Other	51	4.9 %
None chosen	57	5.4 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

Q2. 2nd Important	Number	Percent
Maintaining rural character	37	3.5 %
Preserving historic buildings	37	3.5 %
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	44	4.2 %
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	29	2.8 %
Quality housing for all income groups	103	9.8 %
Walking and biking trails	51	4.9 %
Maintaining community identity	43	4.1 %
Downtown stability	141	13.5 %
Transportation alternatives to the car	57	5.4 %
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	34	3.3 %
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	18	1.7 %
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	21	2.0 %
Creating employment opportunities	145	13.9 %
Parks, recreation, open space	60	5.7 %
Protecting high value farmland	46	4.4 %
Appearance of commercial areas	12	1.1 %
Managing future growth	66	6.3 %
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	27	2.6 %
Other	12	1.1 %
None chosen	63	6.0 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

Q2. 3rd Important	Number	Percent
Maintaining rural character	21	2.0 %
Preserving historic buildings	38	3.6 %
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	48	4.6 %
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	22	2.1 %
Quality housing for all income groups	61	5.8 %
Walking and biking trails	65	6.2 %
Maintaining community identity	39	3.7 %
Downtown stability	100	9.6 %
Transportation alternatives to the car	65	6.2 %
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	48	4.6 %
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	13	1.2 %
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	48	4.6 %
Creating employment opportunities	103	9.8 %
Parks, recreation, open space	79	7.6 %
Protecting high value farmland	60	5.7 %
Appearance of commercial areas	33	3.2 %
Managing future growth	94	9.0 %
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	21	2.0 %
Other	8	0.8 %
None chosen	80	7.6 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

Q2. 4th Important	Number	Percent
Maintaining rural character	30	2.9 %
Preserving historic buildings	49	4.7 %
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	50	4.8 %
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	28	2.7 %
Quality housing for all income groups	54	5.2 %
Walking and biking trails	49	4.7 %
Maintaining community identity	51	4.9 %
Downtown stability	58	5.5 %
Transportation alternatives to the car	46	4.4 %
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	64	6.1 %
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	28	2.7 %
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	49	4.7 %
Creating employment opportunities	77	7.4 %
Parks, recreation, open space	76	7.3 %
Protecting high value farmland	49	4.7 %
Appearance of commercial areas	27	2.6 %
Managing future growth	108	10.3 %
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	40	3.8 %
Other	17	1.6 %
None chosen	96	9.2 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

Q2. Most Important	Number	Percent
Creating employment opportunities	579	55.4 %
Downtown stability	403	38.5 %
Quality housing for all income groups	354	33.8 %
Managing future growth	340	32.5 %
Parks, recreation, open space	233	22.3 %
Walking and biking trails	197	18.8 %
Transportation alternatives to the car	195	18.6 %
Protecting high value farmland	192	18.4 %
Maintaining community identity	190	18.2 %
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	177	16.9 %
Preserving historic buildings	165	15.8 %
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	159	15.2 %
Maintaining rural character	143	13.7 %
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	134	12.8 %
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	104	9.9 %
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	93	8.9 %
Other	88	8.4 %
Appearance of commercial areas	78	7.5 %
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	64	6.1 %
None chosen	57	5.4 %
Total	3945	

Number of Cases = 1046
Number of Responses = 3945
Average Number Of Responses Per Case = 3.8
Number Of Cases With At Least One Response = 1046
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

(N=1046)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't Know
Q3a. A stronger community identity	17.0%	40.9%	34.1%	4.0%	1.1%	2.8%
Q3b. More attractive City entrances	11.7%	35.1%	39.2%	9.9%	2.7%	1.4%
Q3c. More parks and open space	22.8%	44.8%	25.1%	3.7%	1.5%	1.9%
Q3d. More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	34.2%	36.3%	20.7%	5.4%	2.1%	1.2%
Q3e. More bicycle paths and routes	30.6%	29.7%	26.6%	8.0%	3.4%	1.6%
Q3f. More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	13.7%	30.9%	36.4%	13.7%	4.0%	1.3%
Q3g. More housing in and around downtown	8.6%	22.8%	44.8%	17.3%	5.2%	1.2%
Q3h. More affordable housing within the City	34.6%	34.2%	22.8%	4.9%	1.8%	1.6%
Q3i. More employment opportunities	60.9%	29.2%	7.4%	1.0%	0.7%	1.0%
Q3j. Better protection of natural resources	38.6%	37.6%	17.9%	2.9%	1.4%	1.6%
Q3k. Expanded public transportation	24.8%	28.2%	30.0%	8.7%	6.6%	1.7%
Q3l. More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	13.9%	26.1%	38.7%	14.1%	5.9%	1.3%
Q3m. More activities for teenagers	19.7%	37.9%	35.9%	3.7%	1.7%	1.1%
Q3n. More activities for seniors	14.0%	37.2%	41.8%	4.3%	1.3%	1.4%
Q3o. Improved access to local foods	23.2%	36.9%	31.5%	4.7%	2.2%	1.4%
Q3p. Better management of growth	36.1%	34.4%	22.2%	4.3%	1.5%	1.4%
Q3q. Maintaining the rural character of the County	22.3%	34.8%	31.7%	8.1%	2.0%	1.1%
Q3r. New or expanded conference space	5.1%	19.1%	48.2%	19.1%	6.9%	1.6%
Q3s. Multi-use neighborhoods	7.5%	29.6%	46.3%	11.0%	3.3%	2.3%

Tabular Data

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't Know
Q3t. Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	20.4%	39.1%	30.7%	5.4%	2.9%	1.6%
Q3u. More arts and cultural opportunities	16.0%	37.1%	33.4%	8.3%	3.7%	1.5%
Q3v. Development of the communications network (fiber)	32.3%	31.6%	28.7%	4.0%	1.5%	1.8%
Q3w. Stronger retirement community	14.2%	32.6%	44.6%	5.2%	1.6%	1.7%
Q3x. Other	7.5%	0.8%	1.3%	0.1%	0.6%	89.8%

Tabular Data

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=1046)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Q3a. A stronger community identity	17.5%	42.1%	35.1%	4.1%	1.2%
Q3b. More attractive City entrances	11.8%	35.6%	39.8%	10.1%	2.7%
Q3c. More parks and open space	23.3%	45.7%	25.6%	3.8%	1.6%
Q3d. More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	34.7%	36.8%	21.0%	5.4%	2.1%
Q3e. More bicycle paths and routes	31.1%	30.2%	27.0%	8.2%	3.5%
Q3f. More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	13.9%	31.3%	36.9%	13.9%	4.1%
Q3g. More housing in and around downtown	8.7%	23.1%	45.4%	17.5%	5.2%
Q3h. More affordable housing within the City	35.2%	34.8%	23.2%	5.0%	1.8%
Q3i. More employment opportunities	61.5%	29.4%	7.4%	1.0%	0.7%
Q3j. Better protection of natural resources	39.3%	38.2%	18.2%	2.9%	1.5%
Q3k. Expanded public transportation	25.2%	28.7%	30.5%	8.9%	6.7%
Q3l. More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	14.1%	26.5%	39.2%	14.2%	6.0%
Q3m. More activities for teenagers	19.9%	38.3%	36.3%	3.8%	1.7%
Q3n. More activities for seniors	14.2%	37.7%	42.4%	4.4%	1.4%
Q3o. Improved access to local foods	23.6%	37.4%	32.0%	4.8%	2.2%
Q3p. Better management of growth	36.7%	34.9%	22.5%	4.4%	1.6%
Q3q. Maintaining the rural character of the County	22.5%	35.2%	32.1%	8.2%	2.0%
Q3r. New or expanded conference space	5.2%	19.4%	49.0%	19.4%	7.0%

Tabular Data

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Q3s. Multi-use neighborhoods	7.6%	30.3%	47.4%	11.3%	3.4%
Q3t. Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	20.7%	39.7%	31.2%	5.4%	2.9%
Q3u. More arts and cultural opportunities	16.2%	37.7%	33.9%	8.4%	3.8%
Q3v. Development of the communications network (fiber)	32.9%	32.2%	29.2%	4.1%	1.6%
Q3w. Stronger retirement community	14.5%	33.2%	45.4%	5.3%	1.7%
Q3x. Other	72.9%	7.5%	13.1%	0.9%	5.6%

Tabular Data

Q3. Other

Q3X Other

1GOOD FIBER COMPANY
AFFORDABLE CITY SERVICES
ALLOW PERSONAL EXPRESSION
BAID MORE OFF K-10 EAST LAWREN
BAN PANHANDLING
BETTER ACCESS THROUGH TOWN
BETTER CEMETERY
BETTER TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT
BETTER TRAFFIC MGMT
BETTER USAGE OF FUNDS FOR RDS
BIKE LANE FROM LAWRENCE TO LON
BLUE COLLAR JOBS
BRING BACK TRAM
CLEANER DRINKING WATER
COMMUNITY GARDEN
COMMUNITY INPUT ON DEVELOPMENT
COUNTY ROAD IMPROVEMENTS
CRIME PREVENTION
CURBSIDE RECYCLING WITH COUNTY
DECISIONS BASED ON FACTS
DEVELOPING N LAWRENCE RETAIL
DIVERSE POPULATION
DOWNTOWN NEEDS TO BE MORE
EASIER ACCESS TO I-70
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION
EXPANSION OF DOWNTOWN LAWRENCE
FAMILY ACTIVITIES
FENCED IN DOG PARK
FINANCIAL TRAINING FOR YOUTH
FIX OUR ROADS
FREE UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE
FUNDING LAW ENFORCEMENT
GREEN SPACE
GROCERY STORE NORTH LAWRENCE
HEALTH SERVICES
I-70 INDUSTRIAL PARK
IMPROVE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
IMPROVED SAFETY FOR PEDESTRIAN
INCREASED SAFETY NET SERVICES
LAWRENCE BUS SYSTEM
LAWRENCE IS NOT BUS. FRIENDLY
LEAVE RURAL FARMLAND ALONE
LEGALIZE HEMP
LESS APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT
LESS GOVT WASTE
LESS TAXES
LIVING WAGE
LOWER COST OF LIVING
LOWER TAXES
LOWER TAXES - PROPERTY TAXES
MAINTAINING NEIGHBORHOOD SCHLS
MORE IN-FILL DEVELOPMENT
MORE LOCAL RETAIL DOWNTOWN
MORE LOCALLY OWNED RETAIL
MORE PRACTICAL BUSINESSES
MORE STREETS CROSSING CITY
MORE STUFF FOR YOUNG CHILDREN
MORE SUSTAINABILITY
NEED MORE STUFF IN E LAWRENCE
NIGHT TIME BUS SERVICES
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO ROUND ABOUTS
NOT DESTROYING HISTORIC CHARAC
PARKING DOWNTOWN
PAY ATTENTION TO NORTH EAST
PHYSICAL DISABILITY COMMUNITY
POPULARITY OF YOGA PANTS
PRESERVING HERITAGE
PUBLIC EDUCATION
QUIT SPENDING ALL MY MONEY
RECYCLING AWARENESS
ROUND ABOUTS
RURAL ACCESS TO INTERNET
RURAL ROAD IMPROVEMENT
SCHOOLS
SECOND TIER PRO SPORTS TEAM
STOP DISCOURAGING GROWTH
STOP GIVING AWAY TAX DOLLARS
STOP LIMITING BIG BOX STORES
STOP REGULATION AND FEE PERMIT
SUSTAINABILITY
TAX BREAKS FOR BUSINESS
TAX INCENTIVES FOR NEW BUSINES
TIMING TRAFFIC SIGNALS BETTER
TRAFFIC FLOW, TRAFFIC LIGHTS
TRAFFIC SIGNAL/TRAFFIC FLOW
WATER QUALITY MAINTENANCE
WE NEED TO ALLOW MORE BUSINESS

Tabular Data

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

Q4. Best Represent	Number	Percent
A stronger community identity	37	3.5 %
More attractive City entrances	13	1.2 %
More parks and open space	28	2.7 %
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	45	4.3 %
More bicycle paths and routes	14	1.3 %
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	29	2.8 %
More housing in and around downtown	16	1.5 %
More affordable housing within the City	100	9.6 %
More employment opportunities	295	28.2 %
Better protection of natural resources	48	4.6 %
Expanded public transportation	19	1.8 %
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	14	1.3 %
More activities for teenagers	22	2.1 %
More activities for seniors	4	0.4 %
Improved access to local foods	13	1.2 %
Better management of growth	82	7.8 %
Maintaining the rural character of the County	40	3.8 %
New or expanded conference space	1	0.1 %
Multi-use neighborhoods	8	0.8 %
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	14	1.3 %
More arts and cultural opportunities	13	1.2 %
Development of the communications network (fiber)	51	4.9 %
Stronger retirement community	17	1.6 %
Other	48	4.6 %
No response	75	7.2 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

Q4, 2nd Best Represent	Number	Percent
A stronger community identity	20	1.9 %
More attractive City entrances	15	1.4 %
More parks and open space	32	3.1 %
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	56	5.4 %
More bicycle paths and routes	52	5.0 %
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	26	2.5 %
More housing in and around downtown	20	1.9 %
More affordable housing within the City	105	10.0 %
More employment opportunities	138	13.2 %
Better protection of natural resources	66	6.3 %
Expanded public transportation	45	4.3 %
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	33	3.2 %
More activities for teenagers	43	4.1 %
More activities for seniors	19	1.8 %
Improved access to local foods	28	2.7 %
Better management of growth	84	8.0 %
Maintaining the rural character of the County	43	4.1 %
New or expanded conference space	10	1.0 %
Multi-use neighborhoods	7	0.7 %
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	39	3.7 %
More arts and cultural opportunities	12	1.1 %
Development of the communications network (fiber)	43	4.1 %
Stronger retirement community	19	1.8 %
Other	6	0.6 %
No response	85	8.1 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

Q4. 3rd Best Represent	Number	Percent
A stronger community identity	18	1.7 %
More attractive City entrances	27	2.6 %
More parks and open space	30	2.9 %
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	67	6.4 %
More bicycle paths and routes	38	3.6 %
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	28	2.7 %
More housing in and around downtown	18	1.7 %
More affordable housing within the City	45	4.3 %
More employment opportunities	90	8.6 %
Better protection of natural resources	60	5.7 %
Expanded public transportation	46	4.4 %
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	28	2.7 %
More activities for teenagers	47	4.5 %
More activities for seniors	30	2.9 %
Improved access to local foods	35	3.3 %
Better management of growth	83	7.9 %
Maintaining the rural character of the County	35	3.3 %
New or expanded conference space	12	1.1 %
Multi-use neighborhoods	23	2.2 %
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	48	4.6 %
More arts and cultural opportunities	30	2.9 %
Development of the communications network (fiber)	69	6.6 %
Stronger retirement community	23	2.2 %
Other	7	0.7 %
No response	109	10.4 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

Q4. 4th Best Represent	Number	Percent
A stronger community identity	16	1.5 %
More attractive City entrances	29	2.8 %
More parks and open space	30	2.9 %
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	49	4.7 %
More bicycle paths and routes	47	4.5 %
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	25	2.4 %
More housing in and around downtown	13	1.2 %
More affordable housing within the City	60	5.7 %
More employment opportunities	47	4.5 %
Better protection of natural resources	60	5.7 %
Expanded public transportation	38	3.6 %
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	27	2.6 %
More activities for teenagers	44	4.2 %
More activities for seniors	20	1.9 %
Improved access to local foods	42	4.0 %
Better management of growth	67	6.4 %
Maintaining the rural character of the County	39	3.7 %
New or expanded conference space	20	1.9 %
Multi-use neighborhoods	14	1.3 %
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	71	6.8 %
More arts and cultural opportunities	37	3.5 %
Development of the communications network (fiber)	56	5.4 %
Stronger retirement community	33	3.2 %
Other	11	1.1 %
No response	151	14.4 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

Q4. Best Represent	Number	Percent
More employment opportunities	570	54.5 %
Better management of growth	316	30.2 %
More affordable housing within the City	310	29.6 %
Better protection of natural resources	234	22.4 %
Development of the communications network (fiber)	219	20.9 %
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	217	20.7 %
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	172	16.4 %
Maintaining the rural character of the County	157	15.0 %
More activities for teenagers	156	14.9 %
More bicycle paths and routes	151	14.4 %
Expanded public transportation	148	14.1 %
More parks and open space	120	11.5 %
Improved access to local foods	118	11.3 %
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	108	10.3 %
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	102	9.8 %
Stronger retirement community	92	8.8 %
More arts and cultural opportunities	92	8.8 %
A stronger community identity	91	8.7 %
More attractive City entrances	84	8.0 %
No response	75	7.2 %
More activities for seniors	73	7.0 %
Other	72	6.9 %
More housing in and around downtown	67	6.4 %
Multi-use neighborhoods	52	5.0 %
New or expanded conference space	43	4.1 %
Total	3839	

Number of Cases = 1046
Number of Responses = 3839
Average Number Of Responses Per Case = 3.7
Number Of Cases With At Least One Response = 1046
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County.

(N=1046)

	Major strength	Strength	Neutral	Weakness	Major weakness	Don't Know
Q5a. Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	34.3%	45.0%	16.4%	2.1%	0.2%	1.9%
Q5b. Availability of retail choices	6.4%	38.0%	29.0%	20.3%	4.4%	1.9%
Q5c. Existing sidewalk network	3.8%	30.8%	41.6%	19.1%	2.9%	1.8%
Q5d. Protection of natural resources	3.4%	25.3%	52.8%	14.1%	2.0%	2.4%
Q5e. Public transportation	4.8%	32.4%	43.2%	15.2%	2.7%	1.7%
Q5f. Character of neighborhoods	9.0%	44.2%	33.7%	10.3%	0.8%	2.0%
Q5g. Availability of housing choices	4.6%	25.7%	39.6%	23.6%	4.5%	2.0%
Q5h. Availability of parks and open space	13.3%	54.7%	23.3%	6.1%	0.7%	1.9%
Q5i. Employment opportunities	3.9%	9.4%	35.3%	32.5%	17.3%	1.6%
Q5j. Historic buildings and areas	14.2%	49.5%	30.4%	3.9%	0.3%	1.6%
Q5k. Rate of growth	3.3%	21.9%	49.2%	18.0%	5.4%	2.3%
Q5l. Unique local identity	32.9%	40.7%	21.6%	2.9%	0.2%	1.7%
Q5m. Opportunities for community involvement	18.6%	45.7%	27.5%	5.6%	0.8%	1.7%
Q5n. Attention to environmental issues	10.2%	35.6%	37.8%	11.5%	2.6%	2.4%
Q5o. Downtown	46.9%	34.6%	11.3%	4.4%	1.2%	1.5%
Q5p. Population growth	4.0%	22.1%	55.4%	11.7%	3.9%	2.9%
Q5q. Presence of family farms	10.3%	33.0%	38.8%	12.3%	3.7%	1.8%
Q5r. Quality of life	28.2%	52.4%	14.2%	2.7%	0.9%	1.6%
Q5s. Existing roadway network	5.7%	29.1%	31.0%	23.5%	8.8%	1.9%
Q5t. Other	1.3%	0.5%	1.1%	1.4%	5.3%	90.4%

Tabular Data

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

(N=1046)

	Major strength	Strength	Neutral	Weakness	Major weakness
Q5a. Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	35.0%	45.9%	16.8%	2.1%	0.2%
Q5b. Availability of retail choices	6.5%	38.8%	29.5%	20.7%	4.5%
Q5c. Existing sidewalk network	3.9%	31.4%	42.4%	19.5%	2.9%
Q5d. Protection of natural resources	3.5%	26.0%	54.1%	14.4%	2.1%
Q5e. Public transportation	4.9%	33.0%	44.0%	15.5%	2.7%
Q5f. Character of neighborhoods	9.2%	45.1%	34.4%	10.5%	0.8%
Q5g. Availability of housing choices	4.7%	26.2%	40.4%	24.1%	4.6%
Q5h. Availability of parks and open space	13.5%	55.8%	23.8%	6.2%	0.7%
Q5i. Employment opportunities	4.0%	9.5%	35.9%	33.0%	17.6%
Q5j. Historic buildings and areas	14.5%	50.3%	30.9%	4.0%	0.3%
Q5k. Rate of growth	3.3%	22.4%	50.4%	18.4%	5.5%
Q5l. Unique local identity	33.5%	41.4%	22.0%	2.9%	0.2%
Q5m. Opportunities for community involvement	19.0%	46.5%	28.0%	5.7%	0.8%
Q5n. Attention to environmental issues	10.5%	36.4%	38.7%	11.8%	2.6%
Q5o. Downtown	47.7%	35.1%	11.5%	4.5%	1.3%
Q5p. Population growth	4.1%	22.7%	57.1%	12.0%	4.0%
Q5q. Presence of family farms	10.5%	33.6%	39.5%	12.6%	3.8%
Q5r. Quality of life	28.7%	53.3%	14.5%	2.7%	0.9%
Q5s. Existing roadway network	5.8%	29.6%	31.6%	24.0%	9.0%
Q5t. Other	14.0%	5.0%	11.0%	15.0%	55.0%

Tabular Data

Q5. Other

Q5T Other

AFFORDABLE HOUSING
AFFORDABLE HOUSING
AFFORDABLE/FAST RURAL INTERNET
AMTRACK,KCI
ASSISTING HOMELESS WITH JOBS
AVAILABILITY OF FAST INTERNET
BIKE PATHS
BROADBAND/HIGHSPEED INTERNET
BUS. INTERESTS TRUMP QUAL/LIFE
CONSTRUCTION ON ROADS
CONTROL APT. DEVELOPMENT
COST OF HOUSING
COST OF LIVING
COST OF LIVING
COUNTY ROADS
CRIME PREVENTION
CROSS TOWN STREETS
DEPENDENCE ON GOVERNMENT JOBS
DEVELOPMENT IN NORTH LAWRENCE
DEVELOPMENT OF LIVING WAGE
DIVERSITY
DIVERSITY OF POPULATION
EAST/WEST TRAFFIC WAYS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
ECONOMY
EXISTING ROADWAY QUALITY
EXISTING SUPPORT FOR SOC. SERV
FINISH SLT NOW
FIX OUR ROADS
FRIENDLINESS-COMMUNITY SUPPORT
GETTING AROUND TOWN TAKES LONG
HARMFUL CITY DEVELOPMENT
HIGH TAXES
INDUSTRY/BUSINESS GROWTH
K-10 IMPROVEMENT
KIDS ACTIVITIES
KU
LAKE RECREATION
LAW ENFORCEMENT
LIVING WAGE
LIVING WAGE
MEDICAL SERVICES
MORE CHILDREN OPPORTUNITIES
NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS
NEW HOUSING
NIGHT LINE BUS SERVICE
NO BETTER PLACE TO RAISE KIDS
NO BIKE LANE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
PARKING DOWNTOWN
PARKING DOWNTOWN
PARKING DOWNTOWN'
PARKING IN DOWNTOWN
PLANNING PROJECTS W/RESIDENTS
PUBLIC EDUCATION
PUBLIC RECREATION
PUBLIC RESTROOMS DOWNTOWN
QUALITY OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS
QUALITY OF ROADS
QUALITY OF STREETS
RATE OF GROWTH SHOULD BE SLOWE
RELATIONS WITH KU
RENEWABLE ENERGY
RENTALS NOT CARED FOR
RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT
ROADS AND SIDEWALKS AWEFUL
ROCK CHALK PARK
RURAL ROADWAYS
SCHOOLS
SEQUENTIAL TIMING OF TRAFFIC
SINGLE FAMILY HOUSES
SPORTS ACTIVITIES AND INTEREST
STABILITY OF NEIGHBORHOODS BAD
STOP LIGHT TIMING
STREET, CURB, AND WALKWAY MAIN
TAX BURDEN
TOO MANY ROUNDABOUTS
TOO MUCH SPORTS
TOWN & GOWN/UNIVERSITY VS REG
TRAFFIC LIGHTS/CONSTRUCTION
TRAFFIC SIGNALS/TRAFFIC FLOW
TURNING INTO JOHNSON COUNTY
UNIVERSITY BENEFITS
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
WASTEFUL BUS SYSTEM
YOGA PANTS

Tabular Data

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

Q6. Most Important	Number	Percent
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	83	7.9 %
Availability of retail choices	18	1.7 %
Existing sidewalk network	8	0.8 %
Protection of natural resources	35	3.3 %
Public transportation	23	2.2 %
Character of neighborhoods	18	1.7 %
Availability of housing choices	35	3.3 %
Availability of parks and open space	23	2.2 %
Employment opportunities	109	10.4 %
Historic buildings and areas	15	1.4 %
Rate of growth	12	1.1 %
Unique local identity	127	12.1 %
Opportunities for community involvement	16	1.5 %
Attention to environmental issues	16	1.5 %
Downtown	149	14.2 %
Population growth	2	0.2 %
Presence of family farms	21	2.0 %
Quality of life	117	11.2 %
Existing roadway network	46	4.4 %
Other	21	2.0 %
No response	152	14.5 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

Q6. 2nd Important	Number	Percent
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	61	5.8 %
Availability of retail choices	28	2.7 %
Existing sidewalk network	17	1.6 %
Protection of natural resources	25	2.4 %
Public transportation	26	2.5 %
Character of neighborhoods	36	3.4 %
Availability of housing choices	45	4.3 %
Availability of parks and open space	39	3.7 %
Employment opportunities	85	8.1 %
Historic buildings and areas	37	3.5 %
Rate of growth	15	1.4 %
Unique local identity	84	8.0 %
Opportunities for community involvement	38	3.6 %
Attention to environmental issues	18	1.7 %
Downtown	151	14.4 %
Population growth	9	0.9 %
Presence of family farms	27	2.6 %
Quality of life	106	10.1 %
Existing roadway network	21	2.0 %
Other	5	0.5 %
No response	173	16.5 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

Q6. 3rd Important	Number	Percent
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	98	9.4 %
Availability of retail choices	41	3.9 %
Existing sidewalk network	19	1.8 %
Protection of natural resources	22	2.1 %
Public transportation	28	2.7 %
Character of neighborhoods	26	2.5 %
Availability of housing choices	36	3.4 %
Availability of parks and open space	54	5.2 %
Employment opportunities	39	3.7 %
Historic buildings and areas	37	3.5 %
Rate of growth	24	2.3 %
Unique local identity	73	7.0 %
Opportunities for community involvement	39	3.7 %
Attention to environmental issues	31	3.0 %
Downtown	100	9.6 %
Population growth	14	1.3 %
Presence of family farms	33	3.2 %
Quality of life	100	9.6 %
Existing roadway network	29	2.8 %
Other	5	0.5 %
No response	198	18.9 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

Q6. 4th Important	Number	Percent
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	86	8.2 %
Availability of retail choices	40	3.8 %
Existing sidewalk network	17	1.6 %
Protection of natural resources	20	1.9 %
Public transportation	24	2.3 %
Character of neighborhoods	34	3.3 %
Availability of housing choices	36	3.4 %
Availability of parks and open space	60	5.7 %
Employment opportunities	22	2.1 %
Historic buildings and areas	38	3.6 %
Rate of growth	26	2.5 %
Unique local identity	58	5.5 %
Opportunities for community involvement	43	4.1 %
Attention to environmental issues	29	2.8 %
Downtown	73	7.0 %
Population growth	15	1.4 %
Presence of family farms	35	3.3 %
Quality of life	115	11.0 %
Existing roadway network	27	2.6 %
Other	9	0.9 %
No response	239	22.8 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

Q6. Most Important	Number	Percent
Downtown	473	45.2 %
Quality of life	438	41.9 %
Unique local identity	342	32.7 %
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	328	31.4 %
Employment opportunities	255	24.4 %
Availability of parks and open space	176	16.8 %
Availability of housing choices	152	14.5 %
No response	152	14.5 %
Opportunities for community involvement	136	13.0 %
Historic buildings and areas	127	12.1 %
Availability of retail choices	127	12.1 %
Existing roadway network	123	11.8 %
Presence of family farms	116	11.1 %
Character of neighborhoods	114	10.9 %
Protection of natural resources	102	9.8 %
Public transportation	101	9.7 %
Attention to environmental issues	94	9.0 %
Rate of growth	77	7.4 %
Existing sidewalk network	61	5.8 %
Other	40	3.8 %
Population growth	40	3.8 %
Total	3574	

Number of Cases = 1046
Number of Responses = 3574
Average Number Of Responses Per Case = 3.4
Number Of Cases With At Least One Response = 1046
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

(N=1046)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know
Q7a. Ease of travel by car on highways	22.1%	53.0%	10.4%	8.9%	3.9%	1.7%
Q7b. Ease of travel by car on major streets	10.8%	35.4%	17.5%	25.1%	10.0%	1.1%
Q7c. Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	9.9%	48.7%	23.3%	12.7%	4.1%	1.2%
Q7d. Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	11.2%	46.6%	23.5%	12.0%	5.0%	1.8%
Q7e. Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	14.2%	44.8%	21.3%	12.0%	2.1%	5.4%
Q7f. Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	5.7%	23.8%	30.4%	18.5%	5.5%	16.1%
Q7g. Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	10.5%	40.2%	23.5%	15.6%	3.9%	6.2%
Q7h. Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	4.7%	16.6%	29.4%	25.3%	8.6%	15.3%
Q7i. Existing bicycle system throughout County	4.4%	14.8%	33.4%	19.8%	7.9%	19.7%
Q7j. Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	5.1%	26.9%	33.0%	14.7%	4.4%	16.0%
Q7k. Existing road system in County	6.8%	40.4%	34.0%	9.2%	2.5%	7.1%
Q7l. Quality of public transportation (bus service)	5.6%	24.0%	36.2%	10.3%	4.4%	19.4%
Q7m. Other	0.6%	0.3%	0.7%	1.1%	4.1%	93.2%

Tabular Data

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

(N=1046)

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Q7a. Ease of travel by car on highways	22.5%	53.9%	10.6%	9.0%	4.0%
Q7b. Ease of travel by car on major streets	10.9%	35.8%	17.7%	25.4%	10.2%
Q7c. Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	10.1%	49.3%	23.6%	12.9%	4.2%
Q7d. Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	11.4%	47.4%	24.0%	12.2%	5.1%
Q7e. Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	15.1%	47.4%	22.5%	12.7%	2.2%
Q7f. Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	6.8%	28.4%	36.2%	22.0%	6.6%
Q7g. Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	11.2%	42.9%	25.1%	16.6%	4.2%
Q7h. Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	5.5%	19.6%	34.8%	29.9%	10.2%
Q7i. Existing bicycle system throughout County	5.5%	18.5%	41.5%	24.6%	9.9%
Q7j. Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	6.0%	32.0%	39.2%	17.5%	5.2%
Q7k. Existing road system in County	7.3%	43.5%	36.6%	9.9%	2.7%
Q7l. Quality of public transportation (bus service)	7.0%	29.8%	45.0%	12.8%	5.5%
Q7m. Other	8.5%	4.2%	9.9%	16.9%	60.6%

Tabular Data

Q7. Other

Q7M Other

ACCESS TO I-70
BICYCLING ON COUNTRY ROADS
BIKE LANES ARE POORLY DESIGNED
BIKES USING EXISTING ROUTES
CLOSING OFF HASKELL
CONDITION OF SOME CITY STREETS
CONNECTIONS OUTSIDE LAWRENCE
CONSTRUCTION BLOCKING ROADS
CONSTRUCTION ON CITY STREETS
COUNTY ROADS BETTER THAN CITY
CYCLISTS NEED TO FOLLOW RULES
DIRECT ROUTES IN/OUT OF LAWREN
ELECTRIC CAR CHARGING
GET BYPASS DONE ASAP
HIGH TAXES TO SUPPORT THAT
HOMELESS SHELTER LOCATION
I-70 3 LANES BETWEEN W LAWRENC
I-70 ACCESS
KU BUSES
MAKE ROUNDABOUTS PROPERLY
MORE BIKE ROUTES
N LAWRENCE STREETS & SIDEWALKS
NEW FORM OF TRANSIT
NIGHT LINE BUS SERVICE
NIGHT SERVICE
NO EASY WAY TO GET ACROSS TOWN
NO MORE ROUNDABOUTS
NO PARKING
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NOT ENOUGH SIDEWALKS
OLD SIDEWALKS
ONE WAY STREETS AND BRICK RDS
PARKING DOWNTOWN
PATH OF SOUTH LAWRENCE TRAFFIC
PAVE GRAVEL ROADS
QUALITY OF STREETS
REGIONAL TRANSIT
ROAD CONSTRUCTION/UPKEEP
ROAD REPAIR/MAINTENANCE
ROUND ABOUTS
ROUNDABOUTS
ROUNDABOUTS
ROUNDABOUTS
ROUTES OF PUB. TRANSPORTATION
RT 40 WEST OF K10
SIDE STREETS
STOP LIGHT TIMING
STREET QUALITY
STREETS
TAXI SERVICE
TIMING SIGNALS FOR TRF FLOW
TOO MANY EMPTY BUS "7"
TRAFFIC
TRAFFIC LIGHTS
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT
TRAFFIC MGMT AT INTERSECTIONS
TRAFFIC ON SOUTH SIDE.
WASTEFUL BUS SYSTEM

Tabular Data

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

Q8. Most Important	Number	Percent
Ease of travel by car on highways	84	8.0 %
Ease of travel by car on major streets	278	26.6 %
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	38	3.6 %
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	25	2.4 %
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	63	6.0 %
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	62	5.9 %
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	60	5.7 %
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	73	7.0 %
Existing bicycle system throughout County	24	2.3 %
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	25	2.4 %
Existing road system in County	39	3.7 %
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	98	9.4 %
Other	27	2.6 %
No response	150	14.3 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

Q8. 2nd Important	Number	Percent
Ease of travel by car on highways	58	5.5 %
Ease of travel by car on major streets	131	12.5 %
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	86	8.2 %
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	53	5.1 %
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	63	6.0 %
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	71	6.8 %
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	106	10.1 %
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	116	11.1 %
Existing bicycle system throughout County	38	3.6 %
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	25	2.4 %
Existing road system in County	42	4.0 %
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	44	4.2 %
Other	6	0.6 %
No response	207	19.8 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

Q8. 3rd Important	Number	Percent
Ease of travel by car on highways	29	2.8 %
Ease of travel by car on major streets	55	5.3 %
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	70	6.7 %
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	77	7.4 %
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	75	7.2 %
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	61	5.8 %
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	77	7.4 %
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	90	8.6 %
Existing bicycle system throughout County	52	5.0 %
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	67	6.4 %
Existing road system in County	54	5.2 %
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	71	6.8 %
Other	6	0.6 %
No response	262	25.0 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

Q8. Most Important	Number	Percent
Ease of travel by car on major streets	464	44.4 %
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	279	26.7 %
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	243	23.2 %
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	213	20.4 %
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	201	19.2 %
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	194	18.5 %
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	194	18.5 %
Ease of travel by car on highways	171	16.3 %
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	155	14.8 %
No response	150	14.3 %
Existing road system in County	135	12.9 %
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	117	11.2 %
Existing bicycle system throughout County	114	10.9 %
Other	39	3.7 %
Total	2669	

Number of Cases = 1046
Number of Responses = 2669
Average Number Of Responses Per Case = 2.6
Number Of Cases With At Least One Response = 1046
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?

Q9. How satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?	Number	Percent
Very satisfied	59	5.6 %
Satisfied	268	25.6 %
Neutral	309	29.5 %
Dissatisfied	126	12.0 %
Very dissatisfied	55	5.3 %
Don't know	229	21.9 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?

Q11. How satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?	Number	Percent
Very satisfied	30	2.9 %
Satisfied	305	29.2 %
Neutral	367	35.1 %
Dissatisfied	149	14.2 %
Very dissatisfied	44	4.2 %
Don't know	151	14.4 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?

Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?	Number	Percent
Very satisfied	23	2.2 %
Satisfied	202	19.3 %
Neutral	401	38.3 %
Dissatisfied	58	5.5 %
Very dissatisfied	16	1.5 %
Don't know	346	33.1 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

(N=1046)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't Know
Q15a. The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area.	31.8%	34.7%	17.5%	9.6%	3.8%	2.6%
Q15b. Future retail development should primarily be located at the intersection of main streets.	5.8%	20.5%	41.6%	25.2%	3.4%	3.4%
Q15c. Future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods.	9.2%	33.0%	32.1%	18.0%	4.8%	3.0%
Q15d. Available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings.	54.5%	25.0%	9.8%	6.1%	2.5%	2.0%

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

(N=1046)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Q15a. The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area.	32.7%	35.6%	18.0%	9.8%	3.9%
Q15b. Future retail development should primarily be located at the intersection of main streets.	6.0%	21.2%	43.1%	26.1%	3.6%
Q15c. Future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods.	9.5%	34.0%	33.1%	18.5%	4.9%
Q15d. Available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings.	55.6%	25.6%	10.0%	6.2%	2.5%

Tabular Data

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

(N=1046)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't Know
Q16a. I would like to see agricultural uses maintained in the County.	43.1%	35.0%	16.4%	2.6%	0.5%	2.4%
Q16b. I would like to see major development directed inside the City limits.	19.9%	35.8%	30.4%	8.9%	1.8%	3.3%
Q16c. I would like to see more shopping opportunities in or near my neighborhood.	11.9%	26.3%	35.9%	17.9%	5.9%	2.2%
Q16d. I would like to see more employment centers located near my home.	11.2%	22.5%	41.7%	16.4%	5.9%	2.3%
Q16e. I would like to see a modest increase in height of development if it means less expansion of the city out into the County.	15.3%	35.9%	29.7%	12.1%	4.0%	3.0%
Q16f. I would like to see Downtown accommodate more development.	13.7%	32.5%	31.4%	14.8%	5.1%	2.6%
Q16g. I would like to see development that includes a better mix of uses in order to live, work, and play in close proximity.	28.6%	41.8%	22.3%	3.2%	1.9%	2.3%

Tabular Data

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

(N=1046)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Q16a. I would like to see agricultural uses maintained in the County.	44.2%	35.8%	16.8%	2.6%	0.5%
Q16b. I would like to see major development directed inside the City limits.	20.6%	37.0%	31.4%	9.2%	1.9%
Q16c. I would like to see more shopping opportunities in or near my neighborhood.	12.1%	26.9%	36.7%	18.3%	6.1%
Q16d. I would like to see more employment centers located near my home.	11.4%	23.0%	42.7%	16.8%	6.1%
Q16e. I would like to see a modest increase in height of development if it means less expansion of the city out into the County.	15.8%	36.9%	30.6%	12.5%	4.1%
Q16f. I would like to see Downtown accommodate more development.	14.0%	33.4%	32.2%	15.2%	5.2%
Q16g. I would like to see development that includes a better mix of uses in order to live, work, and play in close proximity.	29.3%	42.8%	22.8%	3.2%	2.0%

Tabular Data

Q17. From the following list, please check ALL the reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County. (Check all that apply)

Q17a. The reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County.	Number	Percent	
Not enough time	467	44.6 %	
Don't have enough information	426	40.7 %	
Don't believe I can make a difference	374	35.8 %	
Not sure how to get involved	372	35.6 %	
Other	127	12.1 %	
Difficult to travel to meetings	89	8.5 %	
9	42	4.0 %	
None Chosen	5	0.5 %	
Total	1902		

Number of Cases = 1046
Number of Responses = 1902
Average Number Of Responses Per Case = 1.8
Number Of Cases With At Least One Response = 1046
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q17. Other

Q17o Other

AGE - NOT ENOUGH ENERGY
BUSY COMMUNITY FOR REAL MONEY
CAN'T DRIVE AT NIGHT
CHILDCARE
CHILDCARE
CHOICE
CHOOSE NOT TO
CITIZEN OPINIONS DON'T MATTER
CITY AND COUNTY COMMISSION
CITY COMMISSION DOESN'T LISTEN
CITY COMMISSION NOT IN TOUCH
CITY WILL DO IT ANYWAY
COMMISSION TOO LIBERAL
COMMISSIONERS WON'T LISTEN
CONFLICT WITH NEIGHBORS
CONTRACTORS HAVE TOO MUCH PWR
DEVELOPERS CALL THE SHOTS
DEVELOPERS HAVE TOO MUCH POWER
DID NOT KNOW I COULD DO IT
DON'T CARE
DON'T KNOW TIMES
DON'T KNOW WHEN THEY HAPPEN
DON'T MAKE TIME
DON'T WANT TO
ELIMINATE
FOCUS ELSEWHERE
FRINGE ELEMENTS DOMINATE MTGS
GOOD OLD BOY SYSTEM
GROUPS VERY SELECTIVE
HANDICAPPED
HAVE TO DRIVE TO KC FOR JOB
HAVE TRIED FOR YEARS
HEALTH
HEALTH
HEALTH ISSUES
HEALTH ISSUES
HEALTH PROBLEMS
HELD AT TIMES I AM AT WORK
HOLD MEETINGS AT ODD TIMES
I AM REPUBLICAN, NO VOICE
I DON'T KNOW WHERE MEETINGS AR
I HAVE NO DIFFICULTY
I'M AN OLD MAN.
I PARTICIPATE WHEN NECESSARY
I PARTICIPATED
I WORK NIGHTS
I WORK OVERNIGHTS
IMPORTANCE
INPUT IGNORED BY COMMISSION
INTEREST LIES ELSEWHERE
INTERESTS ARE NOT REPRESENTED
INVOLVED IN DEVELOPMENT
LAZY
MEETING TIMES (WORK HOURS)
MEETINGS ARE AT AWKWARD TIMES
MELTING TIMES
MONIED INTERESTS CONTROL PRCSS
MY AGE 93
NEED CHILDCARE
NEW TO TOWN
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NOBODY PAYS ATTENTION
NON-RESPONSIVE LEADERSHIP
NOT ABLE
NOT AWARE OF MTGS
NOT ENOUGH MONEY
NOT ENOUGH NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER
NOT INTERESTED
NOT INTERESTED
NOT STRONG ENOUGH PRIORITY
OLD AGE
ONLY DEVELOPERS HAVE SAY
OVERWHELMING
PARKING AT CITY MEETINGS
PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS
PHYSICALLY UNABLE
POLITICAL BIASES OF COMMISSION
POLITICALLY, I'M A MINORITY
POLITICS
PREDETERMINED OPINIONS
PUBLICIZE EVENTS/MEETINGS MORE
RESIDE IN RURAL TOWNSHIP AREA
SCHEDULING ISSUES
SIMPLY DON'T
SMALL CHILDREN AT HOME
SOMEWHAT NEW TO AREA
SPECIFIC GROUPS HOG THE TIME
STILL NEW IN LAWRENCE
SUCCESS OF RIGHT WING PROPAGAN
SUGGESTIONS ARE NOT WELCOMED
THE BUILDERS RUN THIS CITY
THE DEVELOPERS ALWAYS WIN
THEY DO NOT LISTEN
TIME
TIME OF DISCUSSIONS
TIMES? LOCATION? HOW TO FIND?
TIMING OF MEETINGS
TOO DRIVEN BY SPECIAL INTEREST
TOO LIBERAL OF A COMMUNITY
TOO MANY NUT JOBS
TOO MUCH CONTROL BY NETWORK
TOO MUCH MINORITY RULES
TOO OLD
TOO POLITICAL
WASTE OF MY TIME
WASTE OF TIME
WHEN ARE THEY?
WILL MAKE TIME
WON'T REALLY LISTEN TO ME

WONT LISTEN TO US ANYWAY
WORK
WORK COMMITMENT
WORK DURING MEETINGS
WORK IN KC - ANOTHER LAWR PROB
WORK IN TOPEKA
WORK NIGHT SHIFT
WORK NIGHT SHIFT
WORK OUT OF TOWN
WORK OUT OF TOWN
WORK SCHEDULE CONFLICTS
WOULD NOT BE HEARD
YOU DO WHAT YOU WANT

Tabular Data

Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?

Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?	Number	Percent
Very knowledgeable	24	2.3 %
Somewhat knowledgeable	218	20.8 %
Not sure	134	12.8 %
Not knowledgeable	648	62.0 %
Don't Know	22	2.1 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?	Number	Percent
0 - 2 years	71	6.8 %
3 - 5 years	69	6.6 %
6 - 10 years	111	10.6 %
11 - 20 years	254	24.3 %
21 years or more	528	50.5 %
Not provided	13	1.2 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County? (without not provided)

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?	Number	Percent
0 - 2 years	71	6.9 %
3 - 5 years	69	6.7 %
6 - 10 years	111	10.7 %
11 - 20 years	254	24.6 %
21 years or more	528	51.1 %
Total	1033	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 13
Response Percent = 98.8 %

Tabular Data

Q20. How many persons living in your household (counting yourself), are?

	Mean	Sum
number	4.09	4273
Q20 Under age 10	0.48	502
Ages 10-19	0.49	511
Ages 20-24	0.30	311
Ages 25-34	0.47	491
Ages 35-44	0.50	527
Ages 45-54	0.60	625
Ages 55-64	0.56	584
Ages 65-74	0.39	412
Ages 75+	0.30	310

Tabular Data

Q21. What is your age?

Q21. What is your age?	Number	Percent
Under 35 years	167	16.0 %
35 - 44 years	185	17.7 %
45 - 54 years	252	24.1 %
55 - 64 years	203	19.4 %
65 - 74 years	140	13.4 %
75+ years	77	7.4 %
Not provided	22	2.1 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q21. What is your age?

Q21. What is your age?	Number	Percent
Under 35 years	167	16.3 %
35 - 44 years	185	18.1 %
45 - 54 years	252	24.6 %
55 - 64 years	203	19.8 %
65 - 74 years	140	13.7 %
75+ years	77	7.5 %
Total	1024	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 22
Response Percent = 97.9 %

Q22. Do you own or rent your home?

Q22. Do you own or rent your home?	Number	Percent
Own	852	81.5 %
Rent	175	16.7 %
Not provided	19	1.8 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q22. Do you own or rent your home? (without not provided)

Q22. Do you own or rent your home?	Number	Percent
Own	852	83.0 %
Rent	175	17.0 %
Total	1027	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 19
Response Percent = 98.2 %

Tabular Data

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?	Number	Percent
Single family	853	81.5 %
Duplex/triplex	85	8.1 %
Apartment/condo	79	7.6 %
Mobile home	11	1.1 %
Not provided	18	1.7 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home? (without not provided)

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?	Number	Percent
Single family	853	83.0 %
Duplex/triplex	85	8.3 %
Apartment/condo	79	7.7 %
Mobile home	11	1.1 %
Total	1028	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 18
Response Percent = 98.3 %

Q24. What is your zip code?

Q24. What is your zip code?	Number	Percent
66092	9	0.9 %
66006	59	5.8 %
66025	50	4.9 %
66049	309	30.5 %
66046	171	16.9 %
66050	22	2.2 %
66007	1	0.1 %
65050	1	0.1 %
66044	187	18.4 %
66047	188	18.5 %
66045	3	0.3 %
66079	1	0.1 %
66409	5	0.5 %
76046	1	0.1 %
66524	3	0.3 %
66096	1	0.1 %
66077	1	0.1 %
60049	1	0.1 %
66094	1	0.1 %
Total	1014	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 32
Response Percent = 96.9 %

Tabular Data

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:	Number	Percent
Under 25,000	84	8.0 %
$25,000 - $49,999	172	16.4 %
$50,000 - $74,999	180	17.2 %
$75,000 - $99,999	193	18.5 %
$100,000 - $149,999	207	19.8 %
$150,000 or more	131	12.5 %
Not provided	79	7.6 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is: (without not provided)

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:	Number	Percent
Under 25,000	84	8.7 %
$25,000 - $49,999	172	17.8 %
$50,000 - $74,999	180	18.6 %
$75,000 - $99,999	193	20.0 %
$100,000 - $149,999	207	21.4 %
$150,000 or more	131	13.5 %
Total	967	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 79
Response Percent = 92.4 %

Q26. Your gender:

Q26. Your gender:	Number	Percent
Male	489	48.4 %
Female	522	51.6 %
Total	1011	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 35
Response Percent = 96.7 %

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?	Number	Percent
Yes	45	4.3 %
No	974	93.1 %
Not provided	27	2.6 %
Total	1046	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?	Number	Percent
Yes	45	4.4 %
No	974	95.6 %
Total	1019	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 27
Response Percent = 97.4 %

Tabular Data

Q28. Which of the following best describes your race? (Without "Not Provided)

Q28. Which of the following best describes your race?	Number	Percent
White (Non-Hispanic)	946	90.4 %
Other	31	3.0 %
Native American	25	2.4 %
Asian/Pacific Islander	20	1.9 %
African American (Non-Hispanic)	13	1.2 %
Total	1035	

Number of Cases = 1046
Number of Responses = 1035
Average Number Of Responses Per Case = 1.0
Number Of Cases With At Least One Response = 1011
Response Percent = 96.7 %

Tabular Data

Q28. Other

Q28 Other
AMERICAN
AMERICAN
BLACK/AFRICAN
EURO-AMERICAN
HAITIAN
HISPANIC
HISPANIC
HISPANIC
HISPANIC
HISPANIC
HISPANIC
HUMAN
HUMAN
HUMAN
LATINO
MIXED
MIXED WHITE NATIVE
MY SPOUSE IS LATINO
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NORDIC
PORTUGESE
SPANISH
WHITE/EUROPEAN AMERI
WHITE HISPANIC
WHITE/HISPANIC
WHITE/HISPANIC
YOU DON'T NEED KNOW

Tabular Data

Q29. What is your current employment status?

Q29. What is your current employment status?	Number	Percent	
Full time employment		644	61.6 %
Part time employment		112	10.7 %
Full-time student	13	1.2 %	
Full-time homemaker	30	2.9 %	
Unemployed	29	2.8 %	
Retired	207	19.8 %	
Not provided	11	1.1 %	
Total	1046	100.0 %	

Missing Cases = 0
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q29. What is your current employment status? (without not provided)

Q29. What is your current employment status?	Number	Percent
Full time employment	644	62.2 %
Part time employment	112	10.8 %
Full-time student	13	1.3 %
Full-time homemaker	30	2.9 %
Unemployed	29	2.8 %
Retired	207	20.0 %
Total	1035	100.0 %

Missing Cases = 11
Response Percent = 98.9 %

Q30. Where do you work?

Q30. Where do you work?	Number	Percent
City of Lawrence	466	61.6 %
KC Metro area	96	12.7 %
Other	94	12.4 %
Topeka Metro area	87	11.5 %
Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	57	7.5 %
Not provided	7	0.9 %
Total	807	

Number of Cases = 756
Number of Responses = 807
Average Number Of Responses Per Case = 1.1
Number Of Cases With At Least One Response = 756
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Q30. Where do you work? (without not provided)

Q30. Where do you work?	Number	Percent
City of Lawrence	466	61.6 %
KC Metro area	96	12.7 %
Other	94	12.4 %
Topeka Metro area	87	11.5 %
Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	57	7.5 %
Total	800	

Number of Cases = 756
Number of Responses = 800
Average Number Of Responses Per Case = 1.1
Number Of Cases With At Least One Response = 750
Response Percent = 99.2 %

Tabular Data

Q30. Other

Q30-o Other		
5 COUNTY AREA	KU	RETIRED
ALL OVER NE KANSAS	KU	RETIRED
BALDWIN	KU	RETIRED
BALDWIN CITY, KS	KU	RURAL DOUGLAS, SHAWNEE, WABUNS
BUSINESS OUTLET	KU	SELF EMPLOYED
CONSULTANT	KU CAMPUSES	SELF EMPLOYED
CONSULTING-KANSAS/MISSOURI	KU ENDOWMENT	SELF EMPLOYED
DENTAL OFFICE/SELF EMPLOYED	KU/PAOLA	SELF EMPLOYED
DOWNTOWN	LAWRENCE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL	SELF EMPLOYED
EAST INDUSTRIAL PARK/LMH	LAWRENCE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	SELF EMPLOYED
EASTERN KANSAS	LEAVENWORTH COUNTY	SELF EMPLOYED
EDGERTON	LENEXA	SELF EMPLOYED AT HOME
EMPLOYER IN KC METRO	MISSOURI	SELF EMPLOYED. CONSTRUCTION
FARMER	NATIONAL	SOMETIMES WICHITA
FINANCIAL PLANNING CO	NE KANSAS	SPOUSE WORKS IN LAWRENCE
FLINT HILLS	NE KS REGION	SPRING HILL
FRANKLIN COUNTY OTTAWA UNIVER	NO RESPONSE	STATE OF KANSAS
FRANKLIN COUNTY, CITY OF OTTAW	NO RESPONSE	STATE OF KANSAS
FROM HOME	NO RESPONSE	SURROUNDING AREA, MOSTLY LAWRE
FT. LEAVENWORTH	NO RESPONSE	TOPEKA, MANHATTAN, SALINA
GARNETT, KS	OLATHE/LENEXA	TRACK ONLINE @ HCC & UMKC
HOME	ONLINE	TRAVEL
HOME OFFICE	OTTAWA	TRAVEL FOR NATIONAL COMPANY
HOME OFFICE/TRAVEL	OTTAWA, KS	TRAVEL THROUGHOUT WORLD
IBEW MEMBER	OTTAWA AND OVERLAND PARK	UNIVERSITY
IN HOME	OTTAWA STATE OF KANSAS	UNIVERSITY OF KS - LAWRENCE
INSURANCE AGENCY/FARM	OUT OF MY HOME - SELF EMPLOYED	USD497
INTERNATIONAL/TELECOMMUTE	OUT OF STATE	WASHINGTON D.C.
JEFFERSON COUNTY	OVERLAND PARK	WORK FROM HOME
JOHNSON COUNTY	OWN MY OWN BUSINESS	WORK FROM HOME
JOHNSON COUNTY KS	P1	WORK PT FROM HOME
KS TERRITORY	PILOT FOR A DALLAS AIRLINE	
KU	PRIVATE MEDICAL OFFICE	

Tabular Data

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?	Number	Percent
Educational Services (University/College)	109	14.4 %
Health Services	105	13.9 %
Other	93	12.3 %
Professional Services	78	10.3 %
Educational Services (Pre-school-12th grade)	71	9.4 %
Scientific or Technical Services	54	7.1 %
Administrative or Support	45	6.0 %
Finance, Insurance, or Real Estate	45	6.0 %
Government	43	5.7 %
Retail	40	5.3 %
Manufacturing	33	4.4 %
Food, Hospitality, Entertainment	26	3.4 %
Construction	20	2.6 %
Agriculture	17	2.2 %
Transportation and Warehousing	11	1.5 %
Not provided	4	0.5 %
Armed Services	3	0.4 %
Wholesale Trade	2	0.3 %
Total	799	

Number of Cases = 756
Number of Responses = 799
Average Number Of Responses Per Case = 1.1
Number Of Cases With At Least One Response = 756
Response Percent = 100.0 %

Tabular Data

Q31. Other

Q31 Other

ACCOUNTING
ADVOCATE WORKER WITH DISABLED
AIRLINE EMPLOYEE, RETIRED
ARCHITECT
ARCHITECT/DESIGNER
ATHLETIC COACH
ATHLETIC FACILITIES
BAR/RESTAURANT
BROADBAND/TELECOMMUNICATIONS
CATHOLIC CHURCH
CHURCH MINISTRY
CLERGY
CMHC
CONSULTING
COUNSELOR
COUNTY EMPLOYEE
CREATIVE DESIGN
CUSTOMER SERVICE
DISABLED
DISABLED HOUSEWIFE
ED SERVICES, PRESCHOOL - ADULT
EDITING/PROOFREADING
EDUCATION FOR ADULTS
EDUCATION TRANSPORTATION
ELECTRIC GENERATION
ELECTRIC UTILITY
ENGINEERING
EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT
FREELANCE ARTIST
FREELANCE ILLUSTRATOR
FUNDRAISING
GOLF ADMINISTRATION
GOVERNMENT CONSULTING
HALLMARK CROWN CENTER MRKTNG
HEALTH INFORMATION MANAGEMENT
HEALTHCARE I.T.
HOMEMAKER
HOMEMAKER
HOMEMAKER
HOMEMAKER
HOMEMAKING
HOMEWORK
HOUSE PAINTER
HOUSEHOLD MANAGER
HOUSING
HUMAN RESOURCES
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
INVESTMENTS
IT
KU - CUSTODIAL/SAFETY OFFICER
KU PROFESSOR
LEGAL
LIBRARIES
LOOK AT QUESTION 29
MAINTAIN 30 RURAL ACRES
MEDIA
MENTAL HEALTH/CHILD WELFARE
MGMT CONSULTING
MNGT AUTO REPAIR
MUSIC AND ARTS
MY SPOUSE DOES ODD JOBS
N/A
N/A
NIGHT STAFF (O'CONNELL YOUTH R
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NO RESPONSE
NON PROFIT
NON PROFIT
NON PROFIT
NON PROFIT MGMT
NON PROFIT ORGANIZATION
NON-PROFIT
NOT EMPLOYED
NURSING INDUSTRY
OIL
OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT
OWN OUR OWN BUSINESS
PARTIES
PAYMENT SOLUTIONS FOR BUSINESS
PHOTOGRAPHY
PRINTING
PROFESSIONAL SALES BUS. TECH.
PROPERTY MANAGEMENT
PROPERTY MANAGEMENT
PUBLIC SAFETY
PUBLIC SERVICE
QUALITY ASSURANCE FOOD INDUSTR
RAISING RESPONSIBLE ADULTS
REAL ESTATE
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
RESEARCH ASSISTANT
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED

RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED
RETIRED - DO NOT WORK
RETIRED FROM 14
RETIRED GOV. INSPECTOR
SALES
SALES
SALES
SALES
SALES
SALES
SANITATION WORKER/KTA EMPLOYEE
SELF EMPLOYED SERVICE
SERVICE INDUSTRY
SOCIAL SERVICE
SOCIAL SERVICES
SOCIAL SERVICES
SOFTWARE ENGINEERING
SOLID WASTE DIVISION, LAWRENCE
SPOUSE - AUTOBODY REPAIR
STAY AT HOME MOM
TECHNOLOGY
TELECOMMUNICATIONS
TELECOMMUNICATIONS
TELECOMMUNICATIONS
TRAINING
URBAN HOMESTEADING
UTILITY
UTILITY COMPANY
UTILITY SERVICES
VET W/ MANAGEMENT EXP
VIDE PRODUCTION
VOLUNTEER
VOLUNTEER & ADVOCACY SERVICES
VOLUNTEER WORK
VOLUNTEERING

Survey Question #10: What is the One Most Important Action You Feel Should be Taken to Improve New Residential Development in the City of Lawrence

1	Do not care
6	Less parking on streets where driveways are available.
7	NO ROUNDABOUTS! Stoplights, please.
8	Bus stops that do not block cars when they stop; bus stops that the bus pulls in and [does] not block the street.
10	Fix the existing roads before adding new ones.
11	Fix your streets. It is impossible to get around Lawrence, and discourages doing business in Lawrence.
12	Learn how other growing cities are improving their developments.
13	Open spaces and parks
15	Cut down on through traffic in family areas.
17	Make it affordable, but not cheap housing.
20	End tract housing.
21	Improvement on sidewalks
22	Take permits and fees away. Only a money pot scam for the county and city, and all you can't build on five acres!
25	Affordable family housing and quality jobs.
29	High quality buildings so they last -- hold contractors accountable.
31	Work on expansion to the east with nice neighborhoods.
34	Keep new development closer to the business districts.
36	Find real planners.
40	Quality of home construction.
42	Don't develop flood plains; build quality housing (energy efficient).
44	Improve existing neighborhoods.
45	More green space areas.
46	Blind spot parking
48	City to plant trees, require sidewalks.
50	More affordable housing/curb 1% Johnson County corporate commuters.
51	In and out easy.
53	Local parks (green spaces).
55	Stop the proliferation of additional apartment buildings.
56	Re-use of existing space.
57	Slow down on the apartment complexes.
61	No more tall buildings downtown!
62	Integrated with service, not sequestered suburban model.
63	Roundabouts need signs on yielding. People don't know how to use them.
64	No more apartment complexes with boxes of apartments.
67	Stop putting apartments in residential neighborhoods.

70 Make sure they are realistic developments supported by real interest.

72 Maintain uniqueness and character of Lawrence.

73 Senior living takes too much money.

75 Maybe gentrification of existing neighborhoods (e.g. east Lawrence).

76 Limit apartment sprawl.

78 More neighborhood developments with pools and club buildings to create a family-friendly environment.

81 Quality of homes should be held to higher standards. Builders get away with way too much.

82 Mix controlled income housing and retail into residential areas (multi-use).

84 Stop going west!

85 Make sure we don't overbuild.

87 Given the Johnson County style of architecture, don't allow it!

88 Affordable housing integrated into new neighborhoods and housing developments.

89 Less city regulation.

90 Quality of construction.

92 I like the energy standard for new construction, but it seems like the homes are very large.

94 Quality of construction.

96 There seem to be apartments and multifamily scattered everywhere.

97 Enforce covenants to ensure cleanliness.

99 Fewer apartments and larger acreage for single family zoning.

101 High quality, affordable, multipurpose residential areas.

102 Finish the SLT!

104 Lighting of streets, speed bumps in neighborhoods.

107 Highway through without stoplights, west to east.

108 Make affordable for working class families, and make accessible by public transportation.

109 I think the new residential development should provide tax dollars to new schools that will be required by the development.

111 Create more jobs, attract new business.

112 Hiking and biking trails.

113 Stop being the servants of developers maximizing their profits with public subsidies. Terrible downtown decisions contradicting historical preservation law.

114 Controlling rentals, number of tenants/building.

116 Ease of access to schools.

Need developer who will stop doing the same old thing -- be innovative. Subdivisions shouldn't be cookie-cutter, but should have aesthetic concession. They are ugly and uninspired. Do not take advantage of south sun, nor incorporate eco-
118 friendly features.

119 Open green spaces, landlord upkeep.

120 Build fewer apartments.

121 Leave the development to those developers who know what they are doing.

When it comes to concrete and street repair, the city (Steve Lashley) needs to follow the guidelines for concrete repair put into code enforcement by the city. The cookie
122 cutter repair is horrible.

123 No roundabouts.

125 Safety of bicycling in city

127 Multi-use zoning.

129 Require better materials and better inspections.

130 More recycling accessibility in multi-family communities.

131 Look less like Johnson County or suburban Topeka.

133 Fewer apartment developments, more private homes.

134 Don't have only one level of housing.

135 Less taxes

I think the building of apartment complexes needs to stop. I think these will be the ghettos of the future. The complex on 6th St. near Wal-Mart looks like a
136 concentration camp!

137 Affordable housing.

138 Ensure there are natural areas incorporated.

140 Disclose what is happening with the wetlands vs. roadway expansion.

141 More sidewalks

142 Availability of quality housing for low income.

144 Teach drivers how to use the roundabouts. I hate them.

145 Streets -- right hand turn lanes at intersections.

147 Don't concentrate apartment developments.

148 Don't build anymore -- take current structures and remodel.

155 Get city out of it.

156 Do nothing.

158 Keep multi housing separate from single family homes!!

I'd prefer that the question asked the same about existing and older neighborhoods.
159 We haven't had curbs on our street for 20 years!

161 Every house looks the same -- streets in new areas confusing.

165 Controlling the amount of garbage construction crews leave behind.

167 Require complete streets.

168 Getting traffic lights synchronized to improve traffic flow.

169 Safety of walking on sidewalks from bicycles and skateboarding.

I would recommend tax incentives to grow and renovate our existing
170 neighborhoods, instead of a bunch of new neighborhoods!

171 More architecturally interesting residences!

172 Incorporate public green space into neighborhoods.

174 Ease of transportation in development areas.

175 Walking and bicycle paths.

Land costs are high due to city's restrictive development policies. Open up several
177 hundred more acres for development, and land costs will decline.

179 Strict code enforcement, improved codes.

Hold landlords accountable for quality of housing in student neighborhoods,
180 especially management companies.

181 Walking and bike paths should be build at same time.

184 No roundabouts would be great; removal of selected roundabouts.

I would have it mixed with old neighborhoods and have it north, south and east of
185 the city.

187 Do not pile neighborhoods on top of each other and space houses 10 feet apart.

188 Parks and recreation

189 Do not put in multi-lane roundabouts in residential areas.

191 Let all homes have their own character, design and color.

192 Limit number of developments to prevent empty lots.

We are at capacity with apartments -- NO MORE. Add more pedestrian crosswalks
195 with lights on Bob Billing and around grade schools.

196 Creating affordable, quality housing, not just new luxury homes.

197 Limit growth.

198 Less sprawl and more mixed use.

199 "Curb appeal" -- entrance into neighborhoods.

202 Easier access to green space, and friendly parks in west Lawrence.

205 Starter homes for our young people to keep them here!

207 Moderate income housing on east side.

211 Higher quality of building material, and longer lots with trees.

212 No more apartment complexes.

213 Increase population.

215 Restrict the suburb mentality. West Lawrence looks like Johnson County Junior.

217 Make sure streets are built to last.

218 Stricter design standards.

220 Making the homes for all incomes, and not just college based.

223 Ensure the developments are unique and quality built.

224 Ensure road access is matched to the number of new residences.

225 Less apartments.

227 A reduction in the number of apartment complexes.

228 Limit it! City is growing too rapidly and haphazardly!
231 Better access to collectors and arterials.
233 Too much regulation, involvement and difficult.
234 Push for more entry level homes that are new.
235 No roundabouts!
236 Quit building so many apartment complexes.
237 Pay as you go.
238 More separation of multi-family and single family neighborhoods.
239 More manageable housing costs.
240 To build bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure along with new housing.
241 Affordable single family homes.
243 Stop building so many [darn] apartment complexes!
248 Availability of housing (cost).
249 Pricing.
250 Require greater attention to water conversation/management.
251 Slower growth, more community centers, neighborhood oriented.
252 Sidewalks so children can walk to school, room on roads for bicycles.
253 Inspections of exteriors, and relocate the homeless shelter to an area close to downtown.
255 Control the development and maintenance of apartment complexes.
256 Hire local contractors, reduce outside workforces.
258 Better traffic planning in new residential developments.
260 Stop cramming, leave slightly larger plots.
261 Neighborhood street lighting.
263 Communication with neighboring residential developments.
264 Off street parking.
265 Bigger lots, sidewalks on both sides of street, pocket parks.
266 Keeping housing costs reasonable.
269 Entry level housing is too expensive for new home owners.
270 Sidewalks.
271 More connections to regular streets, fewer cul-de-sacs.
273 New employment opportunities.
274 Improve east Lawrence from Mass St. to Cider Art Gallery.
275 More connected bicycle routes.
276 Stop it!
278 Re-engineer roadways to increase traffic flow.
279 Take out small street islands on side streets. Make large roundabouts seeable 360 degrees. One level accessible housing.
280 Slow down! Stop giving incentives to builders. They make enough money without our tax dollars.
281 No more apartment complexes.

282 Slow down development, include more space between houses.
284 Extend the existing city grid into the developing area.
285 Limit apartment buildings.
286 Affordability.
287 Better planning.
288 Less disparity; they are either future slums or palaces.
289 Affordable housing for all.
290 Ease of getting to major roads.
291 Slow the apartment and duplex growth. More single family residences.
292 Walk -- pedestrian. Walking, cycling.
293 Better integration/proximity of neighborhoods with retail services.
294 Plant and maintain trees.
297 Cessation of mixed use in neighborhoods.
298 Mixed use multi-family housing downtown.
299 More attention to open spaces, walking/biking, maintaining natural resources.
301 All schools should have sidewalks adjacent to the property on all sides of the school. Langston Hughes Elementary has the least number of sidewalks adjacent to the property out of all the elementary schools in Lawrence. We want to promote walking.
302 Development of more housing for non-students (like leases that aren't a year from August through July, for starters).
304 More green space, more trees required in new development, make streets wider.
305 Closeness to neighborhood school.
306 Maintain green space -- limit apartment development.
308 Trees and natural beauty.
309 Repair maintenance schedule.
310 Are they on a bus route?
311 No roundabouts.
313 More grocery choices on southeast side of town.
316 Stop allowing developers to charge above fair market value on homes.
317 Better planning and access to services.
318 Tornado shelters for neighborhoods or townspeople.
319 Remove traffic circles.
320 Building less apartment complexes.
321 Better retirement-compatible housing.
326 Price needs to be affordable to middle class.
327 Property taxes are high!
328 Offering transportation to those currently in new neighborhoods.
329 Better tax breaks for business (small and large).
330 More parks, and fenced dog park.
331 Straight streets.

334 Less apartment complexes.
335 Stop building so many apartment buildings. Renovate the old ones.
336 Stop building roundabouts.
337 Clean up Kentucky and Tennessee, and do away with parking on them.
338 Affordability.
340 Stop sprawling towards Topeka.
344 Stop it.
346 Adequate spacing between buildings so to allow for greenery.
347 Most I think have houses too close to each other, and they all look the same. Very boring, not pretty.
348 Increase walkability.
351 Stop building everything as a townhome -- it's too cookie cutter.
352 Less large scale apartment complexes, especially at entrance to city.
353 Mom and Pop grocery zoning.
355 Walking and bicycle paths.
357 More good jobs.
358 Faster action.
360 To maintain natural habitats.
361 More affordable housing.
362 Quality of building materials.
363 Revitalize older neighborhoods over constant westward expansion.
364 Manage within your budget in a down economy; why build a library?
365 Limit apartment development.
366 Less expensive apartment complexes being developed.
367 Don't let existing apartment complexes become dilapidated.
368 More accessible housing?

370 Dedicated bike lanes on every street, and wide sidewalks connecting to major streets.
371 Walkability to community schools, businesses, resources.
372 Not over-building.
374 Better selection of builders.
376 Too few varied developers, same ones all the time.
377 Needs assessment! Do we really need more apartment buildings?
378 Uniqueness. Most new neighborhoods look like ones here or in any similar city.
380 Better road system in south Lawrence.
381 Mixed use neighborhoods should have retail connection.
383 Quality of the homes; maintain natural vegetation (trees) if possible.
385 Lawrence is already over-building. Nothing.
387 Attention to parking on streets.
388 Hardened shelters.
390 More single family homes, less apartments.

391 Energy and water efficient standards for all new construction. Emulate what the city of Hays is implementing.

393 Revitalize older neighborhoods.

394 Diversity in homes.

395 Build one family homes only.

397 Understand the influence of housing on road congestion.

399 Don't take any more farmland.

400 We need to make sure we have adequate water resources.

402 Recover the streets that really need to be recovered. I live on a street that hasn't been recovered in 30+ years.

403 Stop the building of cheap, cookie cutter houses out west; focus on revitalizing existing areas.

405 The development of housing 'clusters' of like-looking homes is overwhelming. Homes, outside downtown and middle, are being built on top of each other. No character.

407 Do not like multi-family residential areas.

408 They seem excessive when there are so many empty houses and apartments.

409 Plant more maple trees.

411 Less mega apartment buildings.

412 Stop making cookie cutter houses.

414 Too much cookie cutter houses with similar colors and roofing materials.

415 Wider sidewalks that connect, and bicycle lanes.

416 Quality housing.

418 Make sure it makes sense.

420 Bring lots on the market in greater numbers, not the dribbling few at a time.

421 Bicycle paths.

422 The homes are all built with sticks, generic looking and still expensive. Encourage unique building styles and neighborhoods.

423 Improve road/gutter/curb connections on residential streets (Overland Dr).

424 Resolve the image of the city as 'difficult to work with' while keeping developers from running roughshod over the rules.

425 Reduce restrictions to lower price.

426 Connect major trails.

427 Better walking-as-transportation options outside of downtown area (which is already good).

428 Make it affordable.

429 More space between homes.

432 Wider streets for on-street parking.

433 Stop building apartments.

438 Plan for bicycles.

440 Creating walkable business areas (restaurants, etc.) for each neighborhood.

441 Planning and follow up.

442 Access to local food -- garden/farm areas -- access to basic needs without driving.

443 Larger lots.

444 Develop smartly, have basements, build character (no cookie cutter houses).

445 Stop wasteful use of land and continually spreading away from downtown. Fill vacant stores first.

448 Fix the timing of stoplights.

450 Quality construction.

452 Build in and around downtown.

454 Public transportation needs significant improvement!

455 No more circles!

456 Too many apartments! Too many vacant buildings.

458 Stop developing multi-family housing in and near single family housing.

460 Less cookie cutter, more diverse, more energy efficient.

461 Slow it down a bit.

462 Using old west Lawrence as a start for appearance.

463 Build better housing, energy efficient, low upkeep, tornado and wind resistant.

465 More retail and restaurants downtown.

467 Green space connections to other neighborhoods/developments.

468 Activities for teens and young adults.

469 Better design and planning -- green space management, building standards, no standards of fencing, poor, look at Johnson County standards.

471 Growing major streets to handle growing traffic with growing population.

472 Stay traditional. Modern is not long-lasting. Please no more roundabouts!

473 Revitalization of the area known as the 'student ghetto'.

474 Attention to the actual need of housing, rather than catering to certain builders.

475 Electronic public transport, specifically a tram serving both downtown and old west Lawrence and KU campus!

476 Fewer McMansions.

478 Construct new streets so they last longer and can handle construction traffic.

483 Careful examination of architectural styles.

484 More single family dwellings.

485 Incorporate natural surroundings and environment into development.

486 Quality affordable housing. Stop the cookie cutter house neighborhoods.

487 Take care of older streets, not ignore.

489 Needs to slow down on building.

490 Less multi-family additions.

491 Develop east Lawrence/single family.

492 Less isolation of housing, meaning more integrated with commercial, school, and recreation areas.

493 Install separate sidewalks and bike paths!
494 Restrictions to prevent excessive density -- too many apartments.
496 Don't be ridiculous about inspections on buildings, and building permit price.
498 Affordable housing for middle class retirees.
499 Better zoning -- poor quality of building.
500 Lower cost, or add more neighborhood parks.
503 More single family homes, less apartments.
507 Longevity, apartments that stand up over time.
508 More one level homes.
510 Limit them.
512 Lower property tax.
513 Quality of homes is substandard.
514 Build in green spaces.
515 Hold developers accountable for long-term housing quality.
516 Affordable housing for middle class.
520 Improve width of roads, existing and new.
521 Limit the number of apartment buildings; proliferation is rampant.
522 Biking -- very dangerous to bike in Lawrence.
523 More affordable condos for seniors near/in downtown.
526 Stop building new residential. The population is not growing that much, and it's not sustainable!
527 Infill. Stop expanding west.
528 Less apartments.
530 They are cookie cutter and boring, with no character. Porches, old neighborhood feeling would be nice.
531 Quality!
532 Affordability.
534 Fix our roads! Too many potholes!
535 Gray water system creation (protect natural resources, water).
537 Develop more mixed use housing.
538 Stop building so many apartments.
539 More houses, less apartments/student type housing.
540 Urban sprawl, no diversity.
541 Ease to get to major roads or highways.
542 Control outward expansion; need to build in city center. No more parking garages that aren't multi-use! Why weren't there shops on main floor of library parking garage?
544 Require approval by landscaping and spatial architect. Wider residential streets.
545 Don't allow downtown high-rise buildings.

546 Don't destroy downtown by putting high-rises and too many parking garages. Keep it small and local, more character.

547 Require diversity in home plans and colors of exteriors (they all look alike).

551 Environmental issues and planning for future of downtown as focal points of shopping and cultural hub.

552 More local businesses; protect the farmer's market.

553 Less expensive housing.

556 Single family housing, not apartments, townhomes, or HOAs.

557 Affordable for middle class.

558 Incorporate small natural, park-like areas within residential development.

559 Fix the old first.

561 Pedestrian safety -- even sidewalks, streetlights, crosswalks.

562 Appearance.

565 Stop.

567 Build road system to support new residents in area.

568 Slow down on it. Put more resources in existing residential areas.

569 Limit sprawl and new residential development.

570 More cafeteria-style restaurants.

574 Walks, parks, not overcrowding.

576 Dedicated parkland developed with citizens' input and a parks/recreation master plan that is current so the parks adequately serve the build out of development.

577 Affordable housing, vs. high end housing, leads to attracting middle class.

579 Look how it affects traffic and road improvements.

580 Sidewalks.

581 Make them accessible to market on foot.

582 Do not move into valuable farmland. More moderate homes, less high dollar homes.

586 Stop the building of apartments in Lawrence. Not needed.

587 More individual housing for rent/purchase, less subdivisions.

591 A look at the use of streets before new residential development.

592 Less apartments, more single family.

594 Make it affordable.

595 To incorporate a variety of styles of housing -- multi-family, single/small family, student, single person -- for a variety of incomes.

599 Reduce urban sprawl.

600 Adequate green space within each development, including water runoff catch basins that are functional, more than gratuitous.

601 Strict rules on litter cleanup/public dumping.

602 The apartments across from Wal-Mart are ugly! Too many apartments.

604 No more large apartment complexes downtown. Preserve downtown.

605 Impact on existing adjacent neighborhoods.
606 Consolidated schools.
608 Proper amounts of natural resources.
609 Don't allow cookie cutter homes.
611 Quality housing for all income groups.
615 Green space.
617 More diversity in house type. They all look more or less the same.
619 Stop trying to micromanage it.
621 Slow it down. Renovate existing and improve. The new is so big it gobbles up the view.
622 Landlords have too much power and get too many breaks.
623 Allow growth without all the hassle.
624 Make custom houses with bigger lots, no fenced yard.
625 Less apartments, more single homes or duplexes.
626 Find a way to make average renter income and cost match up.
627 Biking/walking access to the rest of Lawrence.
628 Infrastructure.
629 The necessity of so many large apartment complexes.
632 Less apartment development.
633 They should not be allowed to over-build.
636 Nature preservation.
638 Green space -- walking paths within the residential developments.
641 They should fully pay for new required infrastructure.
642 Street quality and reduction of cars curbside.
643 Keep green space in every development.
646 Incorporation of natural landscape with development.
647 Eliminate stop signs on Wakarusa.
648 Rental that is not an apartment complex.
649 Some more space between houses.
652 Limit amount of multi-family (student) housing in areas.
653 Combined use retail and housing: local integrated neighborhoods.
654 Park space added.
655 Open space, mixed use.
656 Cost of housing.
657 More distance between homes. No more cookie cutter neighborhoods.
658 Diversity.
660 Residential developments are downgraded with apartment complexes.
662 Affordable quality housing.
663 Stop building little boxes all alike, and strengthen quality with more demanding building codes.
665 Sidewalk access down both sides of every street.

667 Improve what exists and limit expansion.
668 No new roundabouts.
669 Ease of entering and exiting development.
670 No more 3+ story buildings downtown.
671 Stop the cul-de-sacs!
673 Ensure easy access to major roadways.
674 Stop building apartment complexes and start building affordable homes.
675 New highway development through city to avoid semis on busy streets.
678 Allow trash service to be outsourced. The city does need to handle trash -- let another company do it.
681 Fewer apartment complexes.
682 Affordability to first-time homeowners.
683 Bigger backyards.
684 Create more housing in established areas. Decrease subdivision sprawl.
685 Eliminate blight! Especially east of Mass.
690 Not comfortable with two lane roundabouts.
692 Don't build homes by use of repetition, the same floor plan over and over again in the same area of development. Subdivisions lose character.
694 Include sidewalks, mixed density.
696 Require sidewalks, streetlights.
698 More development in the east part of town, not just west.
699 Less bland, boring structures. No more tan/brown!
700 Make neighborhood streets wider, and limit parking to one side of the street.
701 Allow other contractors, etc., to come in.
702 Clean things up.
704 Affordable single family homes.
705 Consider multi-family/generation zoning.
707 Provide sidewalks.
708 Go back to five acre building lots.
709 Upkeep on east side housing.
710 More homes, less apartments.
713 Less of it.
714 More infill. The Commons did not work in NW Lawrence.
717 Quality, appearance and safety. Cheap housing invites crime.
718 Less government involvement/market based.
719 Mix of uses.
721 More sustainable expansion (if that's not an oxymoron!).
722 Stop doing cul-de-sacs. Need more entrances and exits for a subdivision.
723 Hold all developers to the same requirements.
724 Cheaper.
728 Provide green space in new residential subdivisions.

729 Planned green space and parks.

731 Increase lot size (minimum).

734 They need to be less general.

735 Incorporate bike and walking trails.

736 Less apartments, more single family housing.

737 More jobs.

739 Create walking communities where groceries and stores are within walking distance.

740 Efforts should be made to maintain and improve existing residential areas, and green space in new developments should be preserved.

741 Plant trees.

742 Maintain heritage, use native materials, keep students' needs in mind.

743 More street lighting in areas.

749 Separation of single family and apartments.

750 More affordable housing.

752 More space required between new homes.

753 Make the developers build sidewalks in every neighborhood, and parks.

754 There should be more diversity in architecture, landscaping, and more shopping opportunity in residential neighborhoods, especially north from 6th St.

756 More unique architecture.

757 Rent control.

758 More/better options for low-income families.

759 Less of them, more affordable.

760 Affordable housing.

761 Affordable housing.

762 More green space.

763 Parks and public spaces in the residential neighborhoods paid for by the developers and residents!

768 Developer should pay for all roads, curbs, sidewalks and utilities.

770 Stop expanding. No new business south of K-10 and 59.

773 Access to public transportation.

775 Stop.

776 Appraisal/architected/city blueprint.

778 More trails.

782 Neighborhoods should have walkable access to shopping, recreation, and schools.

783 Variation -- all the houses are the same!

784 Less apartments.

788 Affordability.

789 Design environmentally friendly and walkable developments (include green spaces as key component).

791 Good oversight on planning and quality of building, not just allowing quick cheap housing to go up.

792 Solar and wind power should be used.

793 Housing for seniors and for all income levels.

794 We need low density housing. Lawrence is already too dense.

796 Forget new, and improve what is already built.

799 Need more businesses to come to Douglas County.

801 Improve infrastructure.

803 More affordable homes. Who is buying all the new $500K homes being built?!

804 Affordable for low income families.

805 Neighborhood parks (see Fort Collins, CO).

806 Affordability.

807 School centered closer to residential areas.

809 Better maintenance of the sidewalk of residential areas.

810 Highway loop around city.

811 Lower rents.

813 Less housing for students, more housing for the poor.

814 Get rid of the cheap, closely spaced, cookie cutter houses going in.

816 Attention to environmental issues.

818 Make sure there is adequate green space/park areas.

819 Affordable!

821 More room between houses. Give them a yard.

822 Parking downtown needs to change. Apartment residents should be able to acquire parking that won't vanish during large events downtown.

825 Look of things.

826 Straight forward streets, reduction of 'same name' streets, Terraces, Circles, Courts.

827 Do not incorporate rentals in residential neighborhoods.

830 Affordable housing with good quality.

831 Affordability.

832 Controlling sprawl.

835 Encourage renovation, and appropriate infill in old neighborhoods.

836 Parks and open space.

837 Put an end to them. Lawrence doesn't need new residential development.

839 Better road planning and access.

840 Too many apartment complexes!

841 Need less new development.

842 More parks and green space to include more trees.

844 Impact of traffic volume and flow generated by new development should be accommodated with improvements to make traffic arteries.

846 More open space.

847 Maintain quality and appearance.

849 There are too many apartment complexes in the middle of residential neighborhoods. Zoning issues.

850 This community is too crowded for quality biking/walking safety.

852 Good sidewalks and bike lanes.

853 Neighborhood Watch/police patrol.

854 Stop the sprawl and high density building.

855 Space between structures; homes are too close to one another.

859 Free public transit for residents.

860 Off-street parking should be available for all residents.

863 Varied zoning.

866 Enforcement of city codes.

867 Control growth. Do not overbuild, especially apartments.

868 Lower taxes.

869 Multi-use and sustainability is ignored (mostly).

870 Stop building townhome sections and apartment buildings.

871 More space between housing, more homes, less apartments.

873 Don't destroy a natural area and then name the development for the thing now absent; instead, be sure to preserve a significant percentage of the natural character.

877 Place focus on inner city revitalization.

878 Diversity.

879 Do not expand over historic areas.

881 Less development.

882 Stop developing west! Lawrence is almost to Lecompton.

884 More condo development in urban core suitable to middle income seniors.

885 Quit giving developers total preference over the residents.

886 Less boring cookie cutter architectural styles!

887 Houses are too close together.

888 Townhouses, duplexes and apartments should stop. Affordable, non-attached single family homes are the American Dream.

889 Better city planning.

891 Increase in mode of transportation like buses.

892 Having the infrastructure in place to handle new development and growth.

893 Developers pay for most or all of infrastructure.

895 That it only occurs if existing developments are 100% occupied.

896 Incorporate more green space, more trees planted.

898 More architectural variance.

899 Get rid of the roundabout intersections. They are overused in Lawrence at small intersections where they tend to impede, rather than help, traffic flow.

900 Over 55 communities.

902 More green space in all developments.

903 Quality and character improvement of new developments.

904 Require sidewalks on both sides of the streets.

908 Affordable housing combined with greater public transit.

909 Fewer apartments.

910 New quality housing that's affordable, and not geared towards students.

911 Sidewalks on both sides of streets, and walking areas in neighborhoods.

914 Continue to improve infrastructure.

915 Discourage cookie cutter housing developments -- ugh.

918 Increase density and public transit access.

922 More senior living, improving eastern Lawrence.

923 I want individual buyers building their own homes, not mass construction, or at least model communities of Old West Lawrence style (give it character).

926 Quality housing that will look nice 20 years from now.

928 Affordability/quality.

931 Encourage more single family homes.

932 Don't mix multi-unit housing with single family developments. The multi-family units are always used as rentals, and are poorly maintained.

938 Seems like there is an over-saturation of apartment complexes.

939 Jobs.

941 More through streets.

942 Access from subdivisions to major streets.

944 Less apartments.

948 More affordable single family dwelling development, $200K and under.

949 Sidewalks and lighting.

951 Incorporate more accessible housing, especially new apartment complexes or rental units.

952 More affordable housing options included in plans. Increase ratio of market ratio to subsidized.

954 Make it easier for people to create co-housing and off-grid living with less cost and administrative hassles.

956 An architectural style for new neighborhoods.

957 Don't build a new nice area, and then put apartments and duplexes in that area!

959 Honestly, don't know.

962 Careful thought in regards to the environment.

965 Limit the westward expansion.

967 Sidewalk maintenance in older neighborhoods.

968 More affordable housing.

970 Limit large, poorly built apartment complexes and townhomes built to rent.

971 More affordable housing.

972 Build better quality housing.

973 Less apartment complexes.

974 Zoning.

975 Sustainable, regenerative design -- develop sites serviced by existing infrastructure, limit green field development.

976 Inclusion of all economic levels.

977 Limit number of new development, too many apartments, not taking care of existing structures.

978 Affordable single family homes. Already enough apartments and high-cost homes.

981 Family friendly neighborhoods.

982 More research on traffic flow in and out regarding existing residential neighborhood impact.

983 Equality between east and west side.

984 More individuality in construction.

986 My preference is for smaller one and two-story homes. Large homes with tiny yards do not appeal to me.

987 No new developments. Revitalize existing neighborhoods.

989 Make it affordable -- no more ridiculous apartment prices.

990 Quality low-income housing.

991 Too much cookie cutter-looking houses.

997 Affordability.

998 Build more homes for single family, low to moderate income, for purchase, not rentals.

999 More parks and open space.

1001 More community neighborhoods. Knowing your neighbors. Neighborhood Watch areas, neighborhood events.

1003 Expand low income housing.

1004 Good roads and sidewalks. Safety first!

1005 Don't fix all roads at once in one area.

1006 Having green space.

1009 Consideration of lower income groups.

1011 Stop building apartments.

1012 Preplan neighborhoods and then stick with the plan so that how they develop is predictable.

1014 Too many apartments -- need more affordable single family homes.

1017 You need to stop the sprawl. Redevelop existing neighborhoods, and quit spreading into all the farmland, pasture land, etc.

1018 Too many apartment complexes.
1019 Affordable and sustainable.
1020 Multi-use neighborhoods, high building standards.
1024 Develop good paying jobs.
1029 I don't think we need new residential development.
1035 Find a place for a big meeting for the town to come to.
1036 Encourage increased density.
1038 Street repair.
1042 Lower priced housing.
1043 More gray field development; stop green field development.
1045 More affordable housing.
1049 More planning, and get input from neighbors.
1050 Access to grocery stores.
1051 Infill always improves residential developments.
1052 Wider streets! Our street is so narrow!
1053 Affordable, meaning based on minimum wage pay since there are few living wage opportunities in Lawrence.
1055 Incorporate green space/parks.
1057 Stop the westward expansion, and gentrify older neighborhoods.
1058 Provide sidewalks.
1059 Don't allow a bunch of rentals added to a single family dwelling owned street.
1060 Require more trees along street property lines, and landscaping in general.
1061 Incorporating natural areas.
1062 Access to public transportation and recreation/fitness options.
1063 Make them more affordable.
1064 Quit building apartment complexes, and focus on single family homes!
1065 Replace roundabouts with stop signs.
1066 Throw the Fritzel family in jail.
1068 Slow down on building multi-residence (apartment) buildings.
1069 Need access to public transportation.
1070 Do we really need all of the apartments? If so, better landscaping, look, especially the apartments on 6th -- ugly!
1071 Parks.
1072 Quality workmanship.
1073 No more big apartment complexes -- enough is enough!
1074 Apartment buildings over subdivisions.
1075 Attention to walkability (walkscore.com) and sustainability, impact on downtown.
1076 Prevent sprawl -- define a limit for city growth and create incentives to build within set boundaries.

1077 The majority of new housing is $250K or more, and they are too close to one another.

1079 Cut down on apartment complexes!

1082 Space.

1084 How about to construct a new airport.

1085 Better traffic control = roundabouts, etc. Also denser, walkable multi-use neighborhoods.

1088 Quality -- taking time/effort to do it well and not just quickly.

1089 Multi-use neighborhoods.

1092 Encourage more mixed-use residential/commercial space.

1093 Focus more attention on affordability in non-student housing.

1099 Cost effectiveness.

1100 Traffic lights for congestion.

1101 Stop building.

1106 Stop the environmental nuts.

1107 Green, renewable and diversified creative architecture.

1108 Inclusion of bike lanes (cars and bikes should not share the road).

1109 Higher quality, less cheap student apartments.

1110 Increase density.

1111 Building quality should be a factor so they aren't rundown too quickly, in regards to apartments/duplexes, etc.

1112 Drive down the cost of land.

1115 Better quality residential streets and curbs.

1116 Affordable housing for seniors.

1117 More spacing between houses.

1118 Keeping the roads smooth -- free of bumps, dips and potholes.

1119 Multi-purpose use residential development matching the character of Lawrence downtown.

1121 More spacious, not so close together.

1122 Eliminate roundabouts.

1123 Less of the sprawl, more infill to replace deteriorating existing structures.

1125 Housing for two generations.

1127 Lower property tax.

1128 Stop it; no growth.

1129 Better engineering/construction/inspection of new roadways.

1130 Subdivision layout for solar access.

1132 More single/multi-family homes, NOT giant apartment complexes.

1135 Less restrictions, but not on quality.

1136 More lights on crosswalks for school areas.

1137 Don't over-regulate.

1139 Quit the suburban sprawl -- huge houses eat up green open space. It's ugly, expensive, and does not add to character of Lawrence! Need more cottages, smaller dwellings, and affordable housing/housing options for all citizens of the community!

1140 More quality, pet-friendly, low income housing.

1141 Slow down.

1142 Require more green/open space.

1145 Restrict future apartment buildings.

1147 Keep green space.

1149 Too much too close together/apartment complexes within single family homes neighborhoods -- bad idea.

1152 Reduce apartments, increase townhomes/4-plexes.

1155 More affordable housing for low income groups.

1156 More affordable housing.

1157 Fewer apartments.

1158 More space in between houses, and more diversity of home construction.

1159 Less apartments.

1160 Limit apartment building.

1162 Insisting on matching look of new development with area. Insisting on remodeling older units over building newer units.

1165 More affordable housing for low income people.

1166 Sidewalks, wide streets.

1167 Consider mixed use, avoid sprawl.

1168 Affordability.

1169 Affordable housing -- under $500/month rental.

1171 Some of them are just plain ugly -- they are two and three car garages looking for a house.

1173 More attention to community members' opinions on new developments.

1174 Affordable housing in neighborhood subsystems.

1176 More single family, less apartments.

1177 Less large apartment complexes.

1178 A park west of Wakarusa, or planting trees in new neighborhoods.

1179 They should not all look the same.

1180 Make it quality.

1182 Low quality throw up homes.

1184 New building needs to be sensitive to the uniqueness of the city, and not mimic Johnson County.

1185 Smaller, better maintained, better integrated into existing residential and commercial.

1187 Roundabouts are a detriment, as are traffic circles.

1189 It should be well planned and meet zoning requirements.

1192 Better infrastructure to accommodate growth.
1193 Grid system and alleys.
1194 Fiber internet everywhere in county!
1195 Sidewalks east of Iowa.
1196 Require basements.
1197 Larger lots, attractive landscaping, including trees.
1198 Quality, eco-friendly construction.
1199 Managing growth so new developments are neighborhoods, not just a bunch of apartments and look-alike houses.
1201 New downtown development should be historically correct.
1202 Limit multi housing mixed with single housing.
1203 Affordability.
1205 Ensure easy access to walkable commercial areas.
1206 More development on east side for those who commute to KC.
1207 Planning!
1209 Manage roads and traffic signals so that there is no traffic jam during rush hour every day.
1211 More green space.
1212 Less zoning regulations and building codes.
1213 Fewer apartment complexes.
1214 Cost of housing.
1215 Discourage overbuilding.
1216 Limit the number of new apartments!!!
1217 Limit sprawl.

1218 Quality buildings that suit more than just undergrads (multiple types of dwellings).
1219 Checking landlords' licenses, and speaking with renters.
1220 More green space.
1222 Give them more character so they stand the test of time.
1223 More connectivity of roads, even if it is only walking paths.
1224 More affordable.
1226 Put an end to the enclave mentality.
1227 Incorporate senior and younger age groups.
1228 Less apartment complexes.
1229 Build streets to accommodate bus stops, so don't stop traffic flow.
1230 Stop building tiny traffic circles.
1231 Higher speed bumps to slow traffic through neighborhoods down. No one slows to 25 mph, and they cut through speed bumps.
1233 Green considerations.
1234 More affordable single family detached homes.
1235 City oversight of the developers.

1236 More incorporation of natural settings.

1239 Fewer taxes.

1241 Not have multi-family dwellings in all areas or neighborhoods.

1242 Much more infill development and far less sprawl.

1243 Restraint.

1244 Be concerned about the east side.

1245 Encourage more affordable housing development.

1247 Bigger lots -- houses are too close together.

1248 More single family homes.

1249 Stop new residential development, and rehabilitate old neighborhoods. We're losing beautiful countryside to crappy new houses that won't last. Not visually stimulating, same look as always, boring. Look at Boulder, CO. They did it right!

1250 Maintain older homes.

1252 More collector streets in them.

1253 Mixed use planning.

Survey Question #12: What is the ONE Most Important Action You Feel Should be Done to Improve New Commercial Development in the City of Lawrence?

1 Have some.

6 Easier access to commercial shops due to turning left into those areas.

7 Tax incentives to attract new business, which will lead to more job availability.

10 Make sure you have businesses to come into town before you spend a bunch of money to build new roads. Example: Venture Park, East Hills is still empty.

11 Enforce existing codes -- don't be so anti-chain restaurants. We take our dollars to other cities that are more friendly to business. Example: Not allowing Olive Garden to come into town simply because they are a chain.

12 Not allow "No Bid", "Sale Source" projects to happen.

13 Think about where you put business.

15 Create new industries that help overall growth of our community.

17 Too much emphasis on downtown. It's hard to park and get around. Need to move more to outer edges of town.

20 No more Walmarts.

22 Take all permits and fees off of everyone!

29 I dislike the curvy road into Wal-Mart on 6th. Keep grid design in place. It works. Landscaping does improve appearance and environment. Follow-up to make sure it lives after planting.

31 Signage -- no signs on poles -- ground level.

34 Stop being a hindrance to new prospects, i.e. Menard's.

36 Make the buildings blend in better.

38 Stop letting downtown stop new businesses build in town.

40 Continued good planning practices.

41 Less "big box" development, more small local areas.

42 Keep development within existing city limits; revitalize older/blighted areas.

44 Keep downtown alive and well, not just bars.

45 More business and more jobs.

46 Safety

48 Ensure that commercial development maintains design aesthetic that blends with existing historic character of surrounding areas.

50 Be certain to add 1% for arts in every development. Currently, this is a disgrace for a community that pretends to support arts and culture.

51 Looks of buildings.

53 Unsure -- perhaps a 'business park' in an outlying area (that is, not close to downtown).

56 Affordable choices of retail stores.

57 Quit giving away so many tax dollars to developers who create unnecessary projects.

62 There is no design; every new development is the same stock suburban design everywhere else in the country 'designed' for the lowest common denominator by developers.

64 Integrated into neighborhoods

67 Tax abatements.

68 Lower sales taxes.

69 Another bridge into town to the new park.

70 Limit large chain businesses; dedicate new development to practical, useful businesses.

72 Maintain uniqueness and character of Lawrence.

75 Move sites/room for small business owners.

76 Limit sprawl, coordinate access and traffic patterns.

77 Standardize. Prohibit distinct commercial eyesores. McDonald's should look like everything else, except for a small sign. No arches, fake haciendas, etc.

81 Fritzel and Compton should not be able to do whatever they want in this town.

82 Low rate loans for new business loans.

84 More control (backbone). Don't allow contractors to set the code!

85 New business.

86 We need Menard's to be on the west side, not by Home Depot.

87 No tax breaks.

88 City not over-riding advisory committees in development issues.

89 Remove barriers to development (HRC, red tape and City Hall).

90 Parking stalls much be wider; quality of construction.

92 The payoff should be some better paying jobs.

95 More parking.

96 I think entire blocks should be master designed so access is safe and makes sense. Sixth and Wakarusa is a great example of a terrible design for access to retail. The intersection about 100' from the corner between the McDonald's and Dillon's' lot is a prime example of poor planning at a new development.

97 Larger parking areas to pull into and back out of.

98 Continue to find ways for downtown and outlying commercial areas to coexist in a relationship that benefits both.

99 Better availability and control of design in north Lawrence.

100 Increase incentives to encourage new development.

101 Limit new development when existing properties are under-utilized.

102 Don't be so hard to get approval. Lawrence and Douglas Co. should be as big and vibrant as Johnson or Wyandotte Co.

103 More high-end shops so that you don't have to go to KC for everything, not just shops for students.

104 Are "maze" streets necessary? You should be able to keep going in one direction and find a major road. Some new areas are very confusing.

105 Be careful what you change. Apply market forces.

106 Quit trying to dictate where business can/cannot build.

108 Build up, not out. Sprawl's a [pain] for walkers and bikers.

109 More input from voters -- for instance, Rock Chalk Park should have been approved by voters.

110 Keep politics out of it. It's apparent the developers are in the pockets of the decision-makers (i.e. Compton and Fritzel).

111 Be more business-friendly.

113 Stop being the servants of harmful developers extracting money for their profit motives. Serve the people, all of them.

114 Planning long-term.

116 Adhere to city codes and regulations.

118 Building methods are archaic. Subdivisions are hodgepodge of bad design and layout.

119 Better schools to attract higher quality business personnel.

120 City council says one thing, and then the developers do what they want -- e.g. Oread Hotel.

121 Eliminate commissioners and/or their control.

122 Quit making companies put small versions of their normal stores in our city, i.e. Wal-Mart on 6th, smallest Home Depot ever! Quit chasing jobs and companies away to other cities with better incentives and less red tape, i.e. American Eagle, Target Distribution.

123 New city council.

128 Quit allowing new building when there are existing empty buildings.

129 Need companies that promote middle class job growth and stability.

131 Look less like Anywhere, USA, and more like Lawrence, Kan.

134 More berms, trees, plantings -- no pole signs!

135 Less taxes

136 Stop restricting the size of stores! We have miniature Walmarts, a miniature Home Depot. Let the retailer decide!

138 Ensure there are natural areas incorporated.

139 Easier entrance/exit access considering traffic flows. 6th St. and Bauer from entry/exit is a mess with traffic on 6th.

140 Inspect houses thoroughly. My house is 13 years old and I see various shortcuts the builders did. I feel ripped off because of shoddy construction.

142 Employment opportunities for Lawrence residents.

145 Also sync lights.

147 Respect for neighboring residential areas.

148 Stop giving tax abatements and making residents pay higher rates at those locations (Wal-Mart on 6th).

152 I recommend that the process be streamlined as much as possible.

154 A strong Chamber of Commerce.

155 Leave it alone.

156 Do nothing.

158 Need for major retail stores.

159 Fewer restaurants, more permanent businesses and full-time workers.

161 Stop D. Compton from continuing to build large monuments to himself downtown.

162 Fiber optic high speed internet.

163 Environmentally friendly parking lots.

165 Use different architects.

167 Require to really meet code.

169 Block off 7th to 10th on Mass for walking and shopping.

170 Too many restrictions have been put on new structures, such as the latest hotel being built downtown. At the other end of the spectrum, the new (taxpayer paid) library is very ugly in my opinion.

171 More upscale businesses!

172 Incorporating public green space into new developments.

174 New development that caters to others than the university student population.

175 Improve industry and commercial will follow.

177 Allow more TIF and CID tax districts to fund new improvements and new construction projects.

179 Better use of existing space before new development.

180 There could be more advertisements for locally owned and operated businesses. They often suffer due to lack of advertising resources.

181 Keep in mind competition with downtown businesses.

185 Maintain parkways; commercial development should have one or two entrances from parkways to a great number of stores; stop so many curb cuts.

187 Be sure they do not make homeowners' taxes increase.

188 We need mainstream stores outside of downtown.

189 Quit having special tax districts where money goes to developers.

191 Make sure it fits the character of Lawrence, not just a way to aid a developer. It must fit into the neighborhood -- expand into north Lawrence.

192 Limit signage height, provide adequate parking, promote downtown redevelopment.

196 Protect downtown area, but encourage quality developments in other areas of town.

197 Need to build north of river, ditto with housing.

198 Less low density big box with too much parking. Plan for people, not cars.

199 Blend in with historical buildings.

207 Do more on east side.

209 Have a plan and stick to it. Don't let Doug Compton design this city.

211 There should be an incentive to locate to Lawrence, yet commercial enterprises should meet "attractive" standards.

212 Limiting size of new commercial development, i.e. Home Depot.

213 Just do it!

214 People need all information before issue comes to a vote.

215 Must do a better job of rebuilding/rejuvenating existing areas.

216 Less Compton influence.

217 Be welcoming to new entrants.

218 Higher design standards that better fit existing historic architecture.

220 More restaurants and entertainment.

223 Architecture must be attractive and unique.

224 Traffic flow

227 Require integration of new development into the existing character of Lawrence. Keep Lawrence unique.

228 Keep it within city. Keep rural areas rural.

231 Better design of ingress/egress.

233 Get some!

234 Better planning/approval process. Restrictions are a hindrance to businesses wanting to locate in Lawrence.

235 No tall buildings.

236 Not everything needs to be in west Lawrence. How about more commercial by Tractor Supply, a new grocery store!

237 Tax abatements.

238 Be more open minded and inviting to growth of retail commercial, and corporate development.

239 More family sustainable careers.

240 Fairness -- no sweetheart deals that ultimately affect the character of the city and county.

243 Treat all developers the same. No TIFS or other back door benefits. If they got a good idea, let them do it, and quit having the taxpayers foot the bill.

250 Complete the South Lawrence Trafficway.

251 North and east Lawrence zero, south and west Lawrence too much. How about evening it out?

252 Development follows other development (Menard's by Home Depot), instead of being spread around. Not sure city can affect these decisions.

255 Control taxes, review zoning regulations.

258 Retail development in other areas of city besides south Iowa St.

259 Let more in -- the city fathers are self-involved.

260 Encourage more variation, fewer eating establishments.

261 Keep it local, discount for local/small business, and charge extra to the corporations.

263 Do not infringe on quality of life in nearby residential areas.

264 City/county should not overly financial assist.

265 Hiding cars on the backsides of buildings doesn't improve appearance of strip mall, if side facing the street has ugly signs blocking windows, and blocks of electrical meters (6th and Wakarusa).

266 Improve parking areas in the downtown area.

269 Eliminate tax abatements and special tax districts. These are signs of weak leadership.

271 Parking in back, buildings close to the street.

272 There are less and less of individual shops or restaurants now compared to 20 years ago. I don't want to shop in all name brand/chain stores. Totally uninterested in shopping in Lawrence.

275 Control look and feel on 23rd St./Clinton Parkway.

276 Put some thought in the architecture.

278 Increase infrastructure for new facilities.

279 Correct readable signage, landscaping.

281 Get them here, help them stay. We have lost several retailers recently -- Sears, Old Navy, and K-Mart before.

282 Build on old, vacant lots before building a new site.

285 More variety of commercial businesses.

287 Planning, rather than slap up a store than only lasts a year.

288 Less big box [nonsense]!

289 Better traffic control, lights in and out of places.

292 Creation of living wage jobs.

293 Better attention to balanced retail mix.

294 Ensure than the architectural designs of public buildings be not only functional, but have graceful and beautiful designs.

297 Water retention ponds are dangerous.

298 Less restrictions and process for potential developers in downtown.

299 Maintain scale, i.e. don't build big when surrounding buildings are small.

301 Provide affordable commercial space.

302 Keep the original buildings as much as possible, which you are doing well.

304 Be more welcoming to larger box store developments.

305 Easy access.

306 Make developers keep their word and pay for their own developments, not taxpayers.

308 Wide range of price points.

310 Research placing them in north Lawrence.

311 Diverse retail -- we keep getting more of the same thing.

312 Don't annex non-contiguous land, e.g. 1-10 and N 1800 Rd!

313 Less retail space, and more green space or recreational choices.

316 Build a mall.

317 Better planning of locations, and improved design.

318 Trees/flowers.

320 Too many vacant commercial buildings.

321 Better use of downtown -- less Bart t-shirt shopping.

322 Higher quality construction, more green space -- less cookie cutter design and multi-unit dwellings.

327 The taxes that are put on commercial properties, which is passed on to businesses, is high. Therefore, it makes it hard to stay in business, especially downtown.

328 No more huge existing buildings to downtown Lawrence!

330 Create more jobs.

334 Stop making it so difficult for new development (business) to come to town. Not everyone needs to go downtown.

335 Need better home improvement stores, large chain stores that have better selections and less large apartment buildings. I have to go to Topeka or Overland Park for these services!

337 Restore historic buildings for business.

338 Leave out politics, and fill in empty buildings and strip malls first.

340 Less [lousy] high-rise development in downtown.

343 Compressed natural gas filling station for public use.

344 Limit it.

346 No more box stores.

347 Utilize existing commercial property before building new.

348 Increase walkability/access via alternative modes of transportation.

352 Maintain aesthetics consistent with the city.

355 Safe and easy bicycle access.

357 We need to be more pro-business.

359 Check wants against needs. People cannot afford more taxes for rec centers and libraries we do not need.

361 Few apartment buildings.

362 Continue to push for innovative design and material use.

363 Don't kill downtown.

364 Finish the bypass; finish barrier wire on K-10.

366 Affordability for non-chain businesses.

367 Allow equal access to commercial development.

370 Walking and biking, and public transportation friendly layout; more incorporation of natural environment (such as lots more trees, bushes, etc).

374 Less use of ugly buildings.

376 Too many banks, banks, banks!!!

377 Continue to repurpose old buildings for new commercial ventures. Also, appropriate size of commercial parking lots, e.g. Home Depot, Target parking lots are huge. Why?

378 More of it! We need tax income to support all the 'special needs/accommodations' (I don't mean ADA or handicapped) things our community seems to insist on.

381 Incorporate it into neighborhoods (including existing).

383 You have to improve parking. You have to walk too far for older people and families with young kids, also during bad weather. I'd rather not go downtown rather than deal with the parking, finding a spot and walking too far.

385 They need to stop building new stores when they have so many old stores sitting empty.

386 Limit strip malls, no more Walmarts.

388 Simplify traffic movements through developments.

391 Continued requirement of parking for commercial properties.

392 Repair of streets.

393 More planning to limit empty buildings, and more businesses downtown, not restaurants.

395 Diversify types of industry.

399 Need more building supply stores, such as Lowe's, Menard's. Home Depot has its own monopoly in Lawrence.

402 Give them a tax break; we could create more jobs.

403 Stop building cheap strip malls. We do not want to look like Johnson County.

405 Less chain, more local.

407 #1 appearance.

408 It is not attractive, with the exception of downtown.

410 Keep with existing structures. Don't make them all look like new buildings.

411 Stop protecting (bowing down) to Mass St. and let businesses come to town.

413 Gee, we are almost dead last nationally. Almost anything to make businesses want to come here. Really.

414 Should emphasize classical architectural details, instead of contemporary ugly boxes.

415 I like what has been going on. Clinton Lake needs residential development.

417 Antique rail system, 23rd to north of river, could be an antique bus on the cheap.

420 Approve it! Embrace growth and let it happen, don't discourage it. Have the guts to help this city grow and create new jobs.

422 Trees, shrubs, less lawn. Encourage artistic architecture. See Columbus, IN.

423 Build a Lowe's!

424 Encourage compact development rather than huge parking lot developments, i.e. concentration around a center like Legends rather than Kohl's/Old Navy area.

425 Increase speed of approval!

427 Less strip mall structure, more walking friendly.

428 Allow more national chain restaurants, stores, etc.

432 Wider parking spaces.

438 No more giveaways like Rock Chalk Park and downtown high-rises.

440 Create better traffic flow and access points.

441 Following existing rules, instead of changing rules to fit new project.

442 Pay closer attention to existing guidelines, and stop allowing development variances.

443 More landscaping.

444 Build character. It all looks so much like anywhere else. It is very sad.

445 Bring in a Trader Joe's.

448 Travel time -- fixing stoplight timing would correct this issue!

449 No more high-rise buildings in downtown!

450 Emphasis on science and technology.

451 Have the city say what development is needed, instead of the developers telling the city. Do required permit inspections before permits are approved.

452 Design long-lasting architecture, something of the quality of the courthouse.

454 Enforcement of building height regulations.

455 Let the big box shopping stores in. Why do you put up roadblocks?!

456 Why can't Lawrence have Old Navy, Olive Garden, Red Lobster, Lowe's? Who makes these decisions? Tom and Doug?

458 Not unique -- looks like Overland Park's development is moving southward. Try harder at pushing north available locations to prospects to help all of Lawrence, not just westside.

459 Get rid of roundabouts!

460 Less cookie cutter, more diverse, more energy efficient.

461 To watch out for commercial sprawl.

462 More of it.

463 Require landscaping and architecture pleasing to the eye. If concrete walls are part of a structure, insist on budget for artistic enhancement, e.g. wall murals, plantings. Also abandon extensive tax abatements.

465 Keep Rock Chalk Park small, not too big!

467 Love the way the Mass St. Dillon's blends into the neighborhood. Keep on in that manner.

469 Poor planning, too close to streets, no green space, access roads or planning always poor.

471 Keep the standard identity very high; don't need bad looking areas in town.

472 Cohesive integration. Make the new blend in with the existing.

473 Removing failing commercial buildings or updating them.

474 Less contracts awarded to specific builders without paying attention to need.

475 Maintain downtown for small businesses, and keep large box stores on south Iowa and/or 31st St.

476 Haven't been to Bauer Farm/W. 6th, can't say.

477 Limit multi-storied buildings downtown.

478 Continue to attract development to fill the spaces that have a track record of longevity.

483 Be careful of the Fritzels and Comptons.

484 Develop more in areas other than downtown for new businesses to enter (but maintain downtown).

485 Keep the development centralized to reduce impact on agriculture.

486 Allow growth! As a lifelong, fourth generation Lawrencian, I've seen our 'city fathers' block so much growth and potential in commercial/retail areas. Stop being afraid of growth and progress. Get real shopping here, i.e. full size stores. Have you been in the Lawrence JCP and Kohl's? We shop these same stores in KC or Topeka because Lawrence doesn't offer the full line of these stores.

488 More forward thinking -- too much based on recent past.

489 Not reduce their taxes.

490 Olive Garden and Red Lobster.

491 Strip malls not unique/library awesome. Keep Lawrence less Johnson County.

492 Higher quality construction with more attention to aesthetic design.

493 It's killing other developments and turning them into meth houses.

494 We should hold out for developments that keep Lawrence unique in look and offering.

495 Well to fill all of the potholes in the roads, and restaurants.

496 We need big companies, not just small business for employment. Tax breaks? How does Topeka do it? We need something besides KU.

498 Allow business to come into the city.

499 Let people in -- tired of everything being kept out!

500 Modern architecture.

505 Parking.

507 Resist the urge to build more big boxes; there are too many empty ones already.

508 Stop allowing developers to do anything they please, and money spent by city to support developers, including tax abatements.

509 Less sprawl, ugly signage.

510 Encourage more small businesses rather than big business.

512 Less government regulations.

513 Maintain natural space within developments; decrease density of commercial and retail in these developments.

515 Limit development when numerous commercial properties are vacant (such as now).

516 Bring in other chain franchises.

518 Bring Dillon's/Wal-Mart to east side of city.

521 Renovate old commercial areas, i.e. Bob Billings and Kasold; existing infrastructure is there but outdated.

522 More local shops/restaurants on Mass.

523 Be sure not to duplicate existing stores, i.e. why Menard's when we have Home Depot? Why a new grocery at Bauer Farms when we have Dillon's/HyVee in the area?

526 Be more strategic by focusing on successful small business, and not recruit outside business; prioritizing the preservation of natural resources.

527 Businesses need to be within walking distance of consumers.

528 Better access, stores/services we actually need.

529 Stop subsidizing big box and tacky development. Use existing buildings. Stop driving out local, unique, small businesses. Encourage them instead of favoring big box stores; encourage variety.

531 Art, landscape.

532 Maintain community identity.

533 Why do you keep name restaurants out of our area?

534 Fix our streets!

535 Creation of water gardens and gray water systems to reduce and reuse water.

537 Densify.

538 More large retail stores -- clothing, furniture, etc. Shopping close to home seems like a nice idea (walking distance), but what is truly lacking are larger retail stores with more options. It's better to have those than a lot of small stores offering the same basic things.

540 Rather chaotic, makes no sense. No unifying architecture style.

542 Light rail within Lawrence, from KU parking lots, through campus, down to Mass St. The 'traffic' engineer needs to be more concerned about pedestrians and safety, and less concerned about moving traffic and more roads. Lawrence promotes driving cars everywhere.

544 Require approval by landscaping and spatial architect. Internal shops similar to Legends, but better outside visually.

545 Don't allow downtown high-rise buildings.

546 Maintain fair rental prices.

547 Provisions for parking. Some lots in new developments should be a bit larger.

551 Integration with style and substance of downtown and university.

552 More signs for historical places, so people can know the history.

553 Make it easier for businesses to locate in Lawrence.

555 Ease up on restrictions -- we lost Lowe's because the city felt that they need more about the business than they did. We may lose Menard's if we are not careful.

556 Stop building high-rise, poor quality buildings with taxpayer funds.

557 Affordability.

558 Allow small business to locate within county outside city limits. Use existing empty space -- shops, offices, etc. -- before building new space. Better promotion of empty areas.

559 Make sure the bus system will have connections. Have buses to transport persons to Ottawa and Topeka.

561 Feels impersonal, out of character, but it's necessary.

562 Attractive, unique design.

563 Street access.

564 Don't rezone lightly, and keep tighter reigns on developers.

565 Stop it all.

568 Too much too fast.

569 Limit new commercial development on edges of town. Revitalize retail areas in the middle of town.

570 The North Lawrence Corridor should have a grocery store that doesn't charge higher prices than Dillon's and Wal-Mart!

574 Easy access, landscaping.

576 Allow the stores that Lawrence residents drive out of town to shop (like the Legends) to build in Lawrence. These corporations do feasibility studies before investing in building in Lawrence. The myth that this hurts downtown is flat out wrong. The items and prices they go out of town to stop anyway with Lawrence losing out on sales tax.

577 Bring in manufacturing to new business park -- do it now!

578 Pay more attention to the natural setting and aesthetics of each setting.

579 Quit building roundabouts.

580 More parking.

581 Use less real estate.

582 We did NOT need a second Wal-Mart. Limit commercial expansion out west.

586 Follow existing city codes -- ensure and enforce uniformly.

587 Build a mall, renovate movie theater on Iowa.

588 Make the developers adhere to the city's desired image.

591 Add more choices of restaurants.

592 More big box retailers.

597 Let businesses stand on their own. Don't protect existing businesses by not letting new businesses build.

598 Make it more available.

599 Should be easily accessible on foot.

601 Promoting smaller local businesses.

604 No more large apartment complexes downtown. Preserve downtown.

606 Employment and wages.

608 Rebates on number of employees.

609 Locate outer edges of town.

611 Safety issues need to be considered across the board.

612 Retail food center EAST side of town.

614 A Price Chopper on the south end of Lawrence on Iowa.

615 Push to utilize empty properties.

619 Get the city out of it.

620 The entrance to the city on K-10 is embarrassing and ugly. The traffic on 23rd is terrible! And the buildings on that side of town are all in need of updating.

621 Incorporate an established feel to the new development. The new development is so large and looks cookie cutter.

622 We already have too many empty commercial properties unused; use what we have before we develop more.

623 Allow growth.

626 Consider existing square footage and commercial needs to avoid over-building.

627 Less high occupancy structures, less rentals, more ownership.

629 Openness and considering of city council when considering commercial development proposals.

632 Give tax breaks to restaurants downtown.

633 There is very little -- not enough jobs with salaries to support living here.

636 Finish the South Lawrence Trafficway!

640 Job opportunities.

641 Better circulation within and out of centers.

642 Parking access, safety.

643 Design.

645 Bring in work places.

646 Mixed use development.

647 More choice for restaurants.

652 Give commercial development hometown feel and incorporate with housing -- easier ways to get there. Would be nice to have more places we could walk to.

653 Connection with alternative (bike and sidewalk) transportation networks.

655 Allow it.

657 Stop developing just south area.

659 No more TIF.

662 Appearance of buildings.

668 Stop the proliferation of bland, characterless strip malls.

664 Allow companies not now in Lawrence to come in with less hassle.

665 Truly adequate parking to meet the actual demand.

666 It seems as though there should be a smidge more commercial development on the east side of town. There is not even a grocery store.

667 Keep within a single commercial area, and don't keep spreading new shopping districts.

668 The style of the building should be nice.

669 Housing is so expensive, commercial companies may not feel they can relocate here and recruit new employees.

671 Avoid repeat of 6th and Wakarusa node -- we blew it.

673 Consider access roads on major streets to help the flow of traffic.

674 Access by improving traffic flow.

675 More available parking areas on north side of the downtown area.

678 Allow more restaurants to come in, Olive Garden.

679 Fewer restaurants and bars downtown. High quality retail for personal shopping (I do almost all my shopping out of town). More higher usage small business.

681 Save prime farmland (i.e. commercialization by South Trafficway).

684 Rein it in somewhat. West Lawrence might as well be Johnson County. That's what it looks like and feels like.

685 It needs to be sodded and kept up while waiting to attract business.

687 Discourage development from chains and big corporations like Wal-Mart and Starbucks. Encourage investment from local investors.

690 A larger buffer system between commercial and residential.

692 Attention to the environment.

694 High quality of construction blending with existing structures.

696 Landscape and no more rear-facing buildings on through streets (i.e. 6th and near Wakarusa strip -- buildings face interior parking, so view from street is back doors and utility meters). Appropriate facing or landscaping should be required to maintain attractive frontages.

698 Go ahead and allow more of it = more jobs.

699 It isn't innovative. The new library is a disappointment. More creative insight needed. Livelier, less earth tones.

700 Allow more outside business into Lawrence. Example -- Lowe's.

701 Lower the price of commercial buildings to allow more businesses to come in.

705 Ensure downtown stays strong by avoiding corridors of strip malls on Iowa/23rd/6th and Wakarusa.

707 Avoid creating strip malls.

713 Require parking lots that are less treacherous to navigate.

717 Filling empty buildings and tearing down empty buildings that are in decay on Iowa.

718 Less restrictions; let major retailers in.

719 Mix of uses.

721 Less westward expansion, more north Lawrence.

722 Allow more in for better choices -- stop protecting local owners in the political arena. Encourage new chains to come in like Denny's, Olive Garden, instead of protecting to local folks.

723 Hold all developers to same standards, and require continuing main to continue to meet those standards.

724 Trees in the parking lots.

728 Attractive buildings and landscape.

729 Connect quality wages to any tax incentives.

731 It should not be limited for industry to be pushed to one place that does not have access to I-70. East Business Park needs direct access to I-70 for it to draw real industry.

733 Maintain a high level of curb appeal for all commercial buildings.

734 Too generic! West Lawrence looks like any other newer suburban area in the US. It's probably cheaper for developers to build this way since all the pieces and parts are cheaper due to economy of scale. Doesn't make it good!

735 Have small retail hubs in neighborhoods.

736 If it is not necessary, we don't need it.

740 Should not draw retail business away from downtown and city centers. No more big box stores.

741 Invite 'green' business (i.e. solar panels).

742 Fiber internet.

743 Utilization of existing buildings for new business.

748 Put some things in east Lawrence.

749 Locations and layout.

750 Ease of street access around sites.

751 Include plenty of trees within/around parking lots.

752 Ease of access to commercial plaza parking lots.

753 You make it too difficult for local businesses to develop their business with all the rules and costs. Then the huge franchises can afford to meet the city's demands, but the little guy can't afford it. Then you just have a [lousy] town with big box stores, and put the little guy out of business.

754 Use already existing buildings instead of tearing down and building new.

756 Streamline governmental approvals.

757 Rent control.

759 Plan first, develop later.

760 Employment opportunities.

761 More employment opportunities.

768 Keep the city/county planning departments out of the process.

770 Get the buildings meant for retail used -- too many are empty.

771 Quit forcing companies willing to build in Lawrence to downsize their stores. Examples: Home Depot, Wal-Mart. Lost tax revenue is now haunting Lawrence because of this. I don't wish to have to travel to Shawnee to buy items at Lowe's or bigger Home Depots when I could buy here.

773 Environmentally friendly.

775 Fix old roads in Lawrence.

776 Location.

777 Bring in restaurant chains, i.e. Cracker Barrel, Red Lobster.

778 Sign code improvements.

780 More variety of stores.

783 Material variation on buildings and paving.

789 Better architectural design which incorporates green space and LEED guidelines.

790 Finish bypass road in SE section.

791 Making sure it maintains community culture.

792 I crave some Popeye's Chicken. How long must I wait?

793 Love large nice restaurants, rather than fast food.

794 Invite in the big box stores. Too many people do all their shopping outside of Lawrence. Even the students don't shop here.

796 Improve/clean up what is already built, i.e. 23rd St.

798 New business to grow cultural activities.

799 Need a higher standard for what new shopping centers should look like. Bauer Farms is a travesty vs. what was proposed.

801 Regulated growth and development.

803 More new jobs!

804 Need industry that pays good. Lawrence won't let industry come into city. Mars went to Topeka instead of Lawrence.

805 Remove Berry Plastics building.

807 Commercial development should not receive tax breaks.

811 A shopping mall would be nice!

816 Attention to environmental issues.

818 Make sure it fits the existing character of the area.

819 Let in new types of businesses, new restaurants. Quit chasing businesses away!

820 To do away with all roundabouts. They are more harmful than help. Everyone hates them.

822 IKEA, Costco, or something like that could do very well here and bring in money. Payless doesn't cut it, and there are no decent furniture stores in town.

825 Roads.

826 Sometimes it appears shortsighted when commercial development is a long-term investment in the community.

827 Reduce rent costs downtown to increase vendors and visibility.

831 Use existing vacant commercial sites.

832 It should be more unusual -- unique to Lawrence instead of Johnson County.

834 Process too difficult and not consistent. No trust with planning at all.

835 Encourage redevelopment of old, abandoned sites.

837 Stop it.

839 Consistency of style.

840 Bring in employment opportunities, not empty retail space.

841 Keep the personality and character of downtown -- no more big developments.

842 More green space, and lots more trees.

843 Make it more accessible by walking or bus, especially grocery stores.

844 Consider location to limit sprawl; encourage reuse of existing commercial spaces.

846 The same incentives for existing businesses as new.

847 Quality and emphasis on local companies.

848 Go south or east.

849 Rent is too high. We lose Old Navy, chain retailers, the strip mall at Bob Billings/Wakarusa, the 23rd St. Kwik Shop, Blockbuster -- empty, too much because of high rent.

850 Some bulldozing east Lawrence commercial -- clean it up.

852 Include in bus routes, fill existing available space, help for new businesses.

853 Access to parking lot from street, parking.

854 Better organized.

855 Allow businesses to realistically think about coming to Lawrence. I doubt that many feel they have a chance to locate here.

859 Conserve natural resources (electric, gas, etc.).

863 Preserve the character of downtown.

865 Too many vacant businesses on south Iowa.

866 Improve code requirements for quality and appearance of buildings, green space and trees.

867 Better separation of commercial and residential areas.

868 Lower taxes.

869 Control sprawl.

870 Make them pay the taxes.

871 Keep family-based businesses!

872 Allow more development at 6th and Wakarusa. Let free market decide store size and makeup. NO MORE APARTMENTS!

873 Include lots more trees, greenways, permeable paving. We need cooling shade in summer, and natural ways to deal with downpours of rain.

876 Stop.

877 Appearance.

878 Increase variety and more effort into maintaining, rather than focus on growth.

879 Do NOT affect the historical areas.

881 Less development.

882 Decide whether we are going to become a big city, or whether we are going to stay small town.

884 Create mixed use development that is more walkable, cycling friendly.

885 Redevelop some old abandoned areas before allowing new sites.

886 Continue to improve the already admirable balance between downtown establishments and outer strip (Iowa, 6th, 23rd) ones.

887 Reduce the barriers, i.e. city council.

888 Stop losing jobs to KC.

889 Architecture doesn't go with current architecture. Fancy changes should not be in developed areas.

891 Get more business and market[s] in Lawrence.

892 Recruit larger companies with more professional or higher paying wages than what retail pays.

893 Developers/businesses pay their share instead of wanting the city and taxpayers to foot the bill.

895 That it be unobtrusive to open space, prefer to operate out of existing buildings before newly developed.

896 Blah -- don't turn more areas into strip malls with a bank, sub shop and nail place.

898 Bring employment.

899 Control sign size.

901 Bring more jobs to town $50,000+.

902 More jobs that pay decent wages.

903 Less modern/industrial/urban please.

904 Stop the Johnson County-style suburban blight (McShopping malls).

907 Stop giving tax breaks.

908 Lower sales tax.

909 Not allow development wherever developers want.

910 A tech school, higher wages.

911 Make sure it fits with neighborhood.

914 Green space, sidewalks, employment opportunities.

918 Reduce sprawl.

919 Limits.

923 Diversify our shops and bring more mom & pop shops that serve basic functions -- pharmacy, general store, shoe repair, hardware…

926 Accessibility for both employees and consumers.

928 Aesthetic integrity.

931 Stop discouraging box stores.

932 Have aesthetic control over new apartment complexes. The newest one on 6th and Wakarusa looks like military barracks.

938 Rent too high. Perhaps encourage existing business and new to stay or start downtown some way. I think the major draw of Lawrence for people deciding to move here or visit is our fabulous downtown. We must preserve that integrity. I drive through downtown Topeka several times a week -- it is awful, like a ghost town with the Capitol a block or two away!

939 Jobs.

941 City government to make it easier for commercial development.

943 Need more retail stores and restaurants that are chains (ex. Menard's, Lowe's, Old Navy, kids clothing stores) that would attract people to Lawrence. Lack of them, so people go to Topeka and KC to shop there. Total lack of fun centers for kids. Places that have go-karts, mini golf, skating, all things that a city of Lawrence's size should have and is lacking!

944 Keep the community feel.

946 We need retail. Why are we sending our dollars to Johnson County?

948 Encourage development for small and large businesses that offer career-oriented, living wage employment opportunities.

949 Less commercial development.

952 Require developers to use local contractors to complete construction projects to increase jobs and money in Douglas County.

954 More integration of commercial, retail and residential, so cars would not be as necessary.

959 Seriously consider concerns of citizens regarding new commercial development.

960 More v.o.w. or green space between streets and development of parking.

961 Fair bidding process.

965 More rural support stores (lumber yard, farm supply, home improvement) on the west side of town.

967 Public access without car.

968 More local businesses.

970 Reviving the east side of the city.

971 Maintain downtown.

972 More transparency.

973 Incorporate walking/bike trails that link across the city and county.

975 High quality sustainable design, not flimsy, formulaic patterns.

976 Support for locally owned and/or operated businesses.

977 Limit size of new development, too tall development downtown.

978 I can't think of anything.

981 Need to consider what is wanted by most working families.

983 Neighbor area friendly.

984 More input by uses, prospective users.

986 I am not strongly dissatisfied now.

987 Refurbishing of historic buildings.

989 Stop bringing in poor wage businesses and call centers.

990 Maintain historic character.

991 Blocking traffic while building -- library, LAC.

994 Trader Joe's and Whole Foods.

996 Less restrictions on retail business.

997 Don't make tax higher in that development; makes people less likely to go there.

998 Ensure that downtown shops stay vibrant and alive, while offering select, additional retail and restaurant options. Be judicious when reviewing permit requests.

1001 Expand the pool of contractors -- minority contractors for major projects. We are controlled by a few of the people. Doesn't look good. There are other talented people! Reach out!

1003 Better retail stores.

1006 Not over-saturate with like businesses. Get and maintain healthy competition, and maintain green space. We have lost too much green space in downtown due to overbuilding on every lot.

1012 Stop over-zoning for commercial. Current business people can't predict well enough to plan ahead because demand is so unpredictable. This is true also for multiple family developments.

1013 K-10 bypass.

1014 Not make it so difficult for out-of-town retailers to establish; eliminate tax abatements for the good ol' boys (i.e. Compton and Fritzel) in Lawrence who seem to benefit from special treatment.

1015 More stores on east side of Lawrence, particularly groceries.

1017 Sprawl. Underused space, empty buildings, urban blight, but you let developers build new neighborhoods, spreading and sprawling while the city of Lawrence has rotten spots all over the middle of it.

1018 More welcoming and helpful to small business; don't give all the breaks and tax help to the big companies.

1019 Fewer big box stores. More boutique stores.

1020 Don't allow strip malls until you have commitments of new occupancy. Encourage development of empty buildings before new construction.

1024 Downtown is dull and dirty. Clean it up!

1026 Stop giving taxes away to big developers and expecting property taxes to make up the difference.

1035 A stronger community identity for new development.

1036 Update long-range plan and adhere to it.

1038 Less of it.

1041 The planning commission is very difficult to work with, and do not appear to be consistent in their decisions.

1042 Local, not franchise businesses.

1043 Rein in Doug Compton, or insist that he get a new architect.

1045 Be environment friendly.

1049 Better planning, and talk to neighborhoods.

1050 Input from new ideas/developers.

1051 Infill always improves commerce.

1052 Good quality and good landscaping together.

1053 Stop high-rise construction in downtown area!

1055 Make sure it is incorporated into neighborhoods so people can walk/access it from residences.

1056 Add light to medium manufacturing.

1057 Use more frontage roads for ingress and egress.

1058 Stop building big box stores in the outskirts of town.

1059 Don't limit size, or people will go shop in KC or Topeka, like me.

1060 More islands in parking lots with trees.

1062 Build for the long term, sustainable. Encourage responsible resource stewardship now.

1063 Try to keep development downtown.

1066 Throw the Fritzel family in jail.

1068 Utilize existing empty commercial buildings instead of building new construction.

1069 Develop public transportation along.

1070 Layout is fine, but seems like a lot of unleased/empty space on 6th/Wakarusa general area.

1071 Parks.

1072 More quality restaurants.

1074 Maintain rural surroundings.

1075 It seems dominated by a couple of builders/developers whose 'vision' supersedes a public vision.

1076 Mixed use density -- commercial at ground level and businesses/housing on upper levels. Create incentives for development to do this!

1077 Lots of empty commercial space available, yet new is being built.

1079 Curb the encroachment on downtown!

1080 It would seem functional buildings could also be aesthetically pleasing.

1081 Larger pad sites to accommodate larger businesses/companies. We need an I-70 business park!

1082 Space on lots.

1083 Accessibility/parking.

1085 Don't overdevelop.

1088 Quality -- taking time/effort to do it well and not just quickly.

1090 Better architecture! Enough with the strip malls!

1092 Quit allowing cheap big box retail building.

1093 Less focus on keeping everything downtown. Growth.

1100 Traffic lights for congestion.

1101 Occupy space already sitting empty.

1105 Kudos to the ongoing revitalization going on in east Lawrence!

1106 Let the free market work its magic.

1107 Green, renewable energy creative architecture.

1109 Less of it.

1110 A mall.

1111 Control variety (i.e. no need for ten Walmarts or McDonalds).

1112 Ensure easy access in and out of development.

1115 Hold developers to current and future rules and codes.

1117 Make it easier for new commercial chains to enter Lawrence.

1119 Match character of downtown Lawrence.

1121 Occupy the existing empty buildings instead of building more.

1123 More carefully planned and actually meeting community need, such as grocery stores in north Lawrence.

1124 Easy access from highways or streets.

1125 Less like Johnson County.

1127 Lower tax on businesses.

1128 Don't let the developers have their way.

1130 Four story height limit should be on Mass!

1132 No more multi-million dollar parking garages.

1133 More parking throughout downtown area.

1133 Less restrictions.

1133 More access roads for commercial areas.

1137 Don't play favorites! Make all follow the building code.

1139 Quit multi-story buildings in downtown -- they detract from the character of downtown. Need more local businesses in downtown. The rents need to be affordable to encourage local business, not just bars, hotels and restaurants (don't need or want another Aggieville!).

1141 Slow down.

1142 Adequate parking.

1145 More retail, less restaurants in downtown Lawrence.

1147 Develop east Lawrence downtown.

1148 It needs to be more condensed, like downtown. New development uses too much space, and creates too much non-porous surface area.

1150 Do not over-compete with downtown commercial district. Downtown (Mass St.) is a huge draw to the city.

1152 Bring in tech and healthcare jobs, jobs that match the cost of living rise.

1155 Different architectural style, more aesthetically pleasing.

1157 Become pro-business, rather than making companies jump through hoops. *Unless you are Compton or Fritzel, of course, and you can do what you want and get paid by the government to do so.

1158 Needs to blend in with community.

1159 Less restrictions on development; grocery store in north Lawrence area.

1160 Continue to focus on appearance and layout of new developments.

1162 Avoid expansion while ignoring abandoned commercial areas.

1166 Maintaining character for the area.

1167 There is a lot of opportunity for infill, both downtown and on major streets. Would like to see dense/better designed developments in the aging or empty/neglected spaces.

1168 Need more rehab/reconstruction of existing commercial areas instead of building new and watching the existing deteriorate.

1169 Putting more to work enabling them to pay your high rental rates and support their families.

1173 None -- continue keeping major franchises out of downtown.

1174 Downtown is nice, needs continued attention. NEEDS FREE PARKING. But neighborhoods also need developed commercial segments.

1176 Better access by car, foot, bike from streets.

1178 Satisfied.

1180 Environmental friendliness.

1182 What new commercial development; Lawrence fights more jobs than they allow.

1184 Allow voting before large projects, example Rock Chalk Park.

1185 Fewer big box stores; don't put on edge of town.

1186 Adequate parking.

1187 Make them easy in and out.

1189 There's too much focus on retail, and not enough on business infrastructure.

1190 Invest more in downtown and keep its uniqueness.

1192 Better infrastructure to accommodate growth.

1193 Neighborhood community. Distribute within walking distance, and bring a Costco to Lawrence.

1194 Need more hobby shops! Have none! i.e. model airplanes, RC cars, etc.

1195 Complete bypass around Lawrence; get more aggressive in bio-tech industry.

1196 Make certain it fits the culture and history of Lawrence.

1197 Attractive landscaping.

1198 LEED certified.

1199 I am not a fan of the high-rise buildup downtown, no matter how it looks.

1200 Appropriate access to site while maintaining traffic flow.

1201 Continue to enforce green space in parking areas to avoid acres of nonstop pavement.

1202 Update downtown post office! Commercial development seems to be progressing appropriately.

1204 Allow more development.

1205 Develop local business, rather than just importing cookie cutter chain stores.

1206 Ensure new doesn't lead to neglect of existing/empty.

1207 More local, fewer national chains, utilize existing vacant structures before building more.

1209 Better traffic management and bike friendly traffic.

1211 More attempts to integrate designs into existing structures (including height).

1212 Lower taxes and regulation of business.

1214 More blue collar jobs.

1215 Require adequate parking.

1216 Quit changing zoning on every request.

1217 Limit sprawl.

1218 Preserve local/small town identity with responsible companies.

1222 Incorporate better urban design principles, i.e. green space, use of palazzos, walkability.

1223 More centrally located, particularly grocery type stores near center of town.

1224 Stop putting everything downtown and on south Iowa.

1226 Commercial development in Lawrence is boring.

1227 Obtain more commercial -- make sure building is pleasing to the eye and structurally strong.

1229 Allow full size stores, rather than scaled down versions.

1231 We need open minds to bring large retailers and restaurants to the community to add growth of jobs and population.

1233 Preserve existing structures.

1234 Revitalize/reuse older commercial development for new development.

1237 Move the process quicker.

1239 Fewer taxes.

1242 Stop allowing construction of cookie cutter, suburban-style commercial development.

1243 Support companies that offer living wages.

1244 Reach out to more commercial business so there can be more jobs.

1245 Encourage more major retail development.

1247 Get some real business in town.

1249 Strong zoning laws: No big signage. Buildings should have some style!

1250 Limit downtown expansion of tall buildings, i.e. hotels.

1252 Less bias towards university; parochial attitude towards manufacturing, less influence from select wealthy inhabitants and developers.

1253 Develop riverfront/mixed use.

Survey Question #14: What is the ONE Most Important Action You Feel Should be Done to Improve New Industrial Development in the City of Lawrence?

1	Let there be some.
6	Not sure where it's referring to.
7	Tax incentives for new businesses.
11	I think tax incentives should be used judiciously, so that they public doesn't bear the burden of a here and gone business.
12	Lower taxes to bring in more business opportunities.
13	Placement should be more thought out.
15	No knowledge of this plan.
16	Have some development.
17	I think that it is good to use the Farmland plant for industrial area development.
22	Stop controlling everything!
25	Better quality jobs.
34	Allow it in the city; the last expansion for Berry Plastics was in the county.
36	Quit trying to save downtown.
40	Sound ecology and environmental impact.
42	Get some industry in town that actually manufactures something.
44	Need industry, no "road blocks", but the best industries with good-paying jobs for all, environmentally friendly.
45	Traffic lights!
48	Continue to expand shovel-ready locations for new industrial development.
50	Out of sight, out of mind. Make it green.
61	Access to K-10 from East Lawrence Business Park is dangerous -- poor placement of traffic lighting.
67	Tax breaks to companies supplying high-paying jobs.
68	No tax abatements.
70	Utilize existing space before developing new locations.
72	Maintain uniqueness and character of Lawrence.
75	Efficient zoning.
76	Focus on brown fields.
81	Keep it all contained to one area.
87	No tax breaks.
89	Lessen red tape.
90	Zoned to one area of county/city.
91	Encourage it, welcome it, recruit it, make it a priority.
96	Make sure the view from K-10 is somewhat pleasing, since it is major entrance to the city.
100	Encouragement of development in east and north.

101 New development should compliment existing development.

104 Jobs to employ our families on a living wage. Living, not existing.

105 Promotion.

109 Once again, more input from voters.

110 Land major firms to bring more jobs -- I've commuted for 16 years because wages here are so low.

111 Need to attract industrial business first.

113 Do not give tax or credit subsidies. The money lost is never made up.

114 Site planning.

116 Accessibility to major roadways.

119 Don't offer enormous tax breaks, especially to some people. So many businesses fold and we lose money.

121 Take your hands off everyone's affairs!

122 STUPID ROUNDABOUTS! Cost too much money, and are deteriorating too quickly.

123 Lawrence is anti-business; sign ordinance is ridiculous. Unfair [that] competitors can operate in county for a nominal fee and do not have to pay commercial expenses.

129 Make sure it's pro-jobs and pro-environment.

135 Less taxes

138 Incorporated natural areas.

140 I have not noticed any industry growth -- only houses.

142 Employment opportunities for Lawrence residents.

145 Continue to develop intersections/byways.

148 Utilize current structures.

152 A plan to handle the toxic waste that might be generated by new industrial development must be developed.

154 Planning.

155 Don't have anymore.

156 Do nothing.

159 Those that bring in more opportunity to middle wage workers, not just high tech.

165 Make it easier for more companies to move or start up here.

171 Fewer tax incentives!

172 Consider impact on neighborhoods.

175 Attract new industry, support existing industry.

177 Revoke the misguided efforts to preserve farmland, and focus on job creation. Open up the area around the airport for industrial development.

185 Have more of it.

187 What new industrial development?

188 Keep it outside of KU.

189 What new industrial development? A warehouse on Farmers Turnpike?

191 Look for high tech, good paying firms to move to the area, even in new industrial, not just usual warehouse jobs.

192 Provide adequate public transportation to remote sites in industrial development.

197 Question not clear. Which new industry are you referring to?

211 Industry should be encouraged to locate here, but have reasonable zoning requirements.

212 Traffic congestion on Hwy 10.

213 Need to have more of it.

217 Promote strongly the new site (old fertilizer plant).

228 Keep it within city limits. Keep rural areas rural.

231 Maintain adequate and diverse supply.

233 Get more development.

234 What new industrial development?

235 You're doing good. Former Farmland is best point.

236 Do all you can to keep good industry and add more.

237 Tax abatements.

243 Improve roadway access around town, and maybe a manufacturing base will show up here.

250 Focus on creating good jobs in east Lawrence.

251 We need an anchor industry; manufacturer would be good!

255 Control the taxes.

256 Stop dumping it in rural areas and creating light pollution.

258 Need more industrial development.

260 Encourage more manufacturing.

261 Non-obtrusive aesthetics.

269 It must be tax and business friendly.

272 Create a park or walking trail so that workers can enjoy outdoor beauty.

276 Be more creative!

281 Get it here.

282 Easy access to trucks/transportation.

286 Reasonable incentives.

287 Hate to repeat, but PLAN BETTER!

289 Continued night line services for workers.

290 Ability to provide qualified employees, and ability for employees to get to the industrial areas.

293 Providing ongoing training and professional development opportunities.

294 Keep it all in one place.

299 Keep it away from commercial and residential areas.

304 Attract more industry.

306 Develop within existing planning initiatives.
307 Ten year tax abatement.
308 Trees, natural beauty.
310 Research places in north Lawrence.
313 Keep it attractive to look at.
317 Bring some to existing sites.
318 Safe access (entrance and exit) roads for heavier traffic.
321 Need to tamp down anti-development/jobs attitudes.
328 Making sure these new industrial developments provide safe atmosphere.
330 Bonds, easy access, transportation.
338 Leave out politics, make new developments pay their taxes.
344 Limit it.
346 Incorporate green technology.
355 Appropriate traffic solutions.
357 Easy road connections.

359 I think you should let new retailers like Lowe's, Olive Garden, etc., come to Lawrence.
364 Clean up Farmland and build.
370 Increase natural landscaping and environmental requirements.
374 More economic incentives to attract businesses that will use the new areas.
376 What industrial development in the city of Lawrence?

377 Not sure, but the current improvements of the old Farmland space are starting well.
378 Negotiated accommodations, not always tax related.
381 Have some -- there has not been much in 50 years.
385 Better paying jobs.
388 A more unified planned development.
393 More attention to developing existing sites.
395 Limit number of restaurants downtown.
403 Is there industrial development? We need more of it to create jobs.
407 Appearance.
411 Pursue businesses with incentives.
413 Make Lawrence want them, instead of trying to figure out why they would not be good citizens.
422 Not sure -- trees, shrubs, artistic design, less lawn.
424 Be consistent with all projects, and hold tax abatements accountable for results.
425 Reduce restrictions.
430 Legitimate input from the community.
432 Include industrial zoning in multi-use neighborhoods.
440 Beautification and environmental sensitivity.
441 Long-range planning, and following the plan.

442 Sustainability -- protect natural resources, encourage alternative energy sources.

445 Keep industrial development in/around Farmland.

450 High quality employment opportunities.

451 More aesthetically pleasing. Everything is beginning to look the same.

452 Integrate the Home Depot area to downtown; bikeways?

454 Environmental protection.

455 Study more the tax abatement. It doesn't seem to work.

458 Give better support to the ones already here. Their recommendations to new prospects will speak volumes.

459 Tax credits.

460 More energy efficient.

461 Maintain architectural/environmental integrity.

462 More of it.

463 Safe working environment, appropriate wages.

465 Continue clean up of east Lawrence.

466 Entice new jobs.

469 Have new development align with culture and history of city. Improve infrastructure/road systems. Get right kinds of industrial development. No plan!

471 Growth; need more jobs so there aren't so many going to KC and Topeka.

472 Make it be for the citizens of Lawrence! We are tired of being a 'bedroom' community. We would love to work, live, and play here!

474 What industrial development?

475 Develop the potential office park area east of Lawrence on K-10, and make an effort to attract software/high tech businesses.

476 Get some industry in the industrial developments!

478 Make sure it is environmentally safe.

486 Stop blocking businesses from coming to town!

488 Too much based on specific leaders and their influence.

490 Land big customer.

493 Put some experts in charge of economic development.

494 Scrupulous attention to environmental safety.

500 More modern/technology looking.

508 Change the attitude of city elites who think that only businesses that require PhDs are desirable.

510 Industry development should be more concentrated in one area.

514 Make it aesthetically pleasing.

522 Fill in empty spaces on Mass -- more businesses.

523 Locate so as not to downgrade neighborhoods.

526 Again, be strategic. Just growing jobs does not indicate economic health.

527 Jobs need to be accessible by public transport and bike.
528 Having sites actually ready and available to go.
529 Why do you take it for granted Lawrence should go to industry?
530 Keep green spaces.
531 Quality and design.
532 Environmentally friendly.
534 Fix out streets!
535 Manage ability to access highways -- need a 'ring' road around city.

542 Figuring out how to attract industry without giving away too much in tax breaks, etc.

544 It doesn't cost any more to require more aesthetically pleasing buildings and landscape. Look at the nicer areas of Scottsdale, AZ to get some good ideas.
545 Fiber network.
546 Don't sell out and step on the community.
551 Better environmental impact attention and compliance.
552 Incorporate natural resources in the city.
553 Encourage industrial growth.

556 Stop giving away tax breaks to developers who are not accountable for their performance.
558 Recruit industries that will offer employment opportunities.
559 Hire persons that live here in Lawrence first.
562 "New" industrial development?
563 Quit trying for only high paying jobs.
565 No more industrial park.
568 Focus more on existing areas.
570 There should be more industrial jobs closer to the city.
574 Landscaping.
576 Clean up the process, and give incentives to those new businesses.
578 Be more sensitive to Native American population.
582 Simply always mindful of environment and hazards.
588 All industry should be surrounded by trees and bushes.
591 Make it easier for new businesses to come to Lawrence.
594 What industrial development?

597 Provide potential employers with trained employees. We need vo-tech type training facilities.
601 Expand business areas to the east of Mass. St.
606 Transportation and parking.
609 Locate outside of town.
619 Allow it to happen.
622 Make use of what we have before we build more.
623 Allow growth.

626 Improve drainage, and mandatory green space.

627 Only high paying employment, especially if they are given tax incentives/abatements.

629 Provision of attractive land in appropriate locations.

632 Marketing improvement.

633 The integrity of downtown should be maintained, and north Lawrence should be developed more. Old spaces should be used before new built.

640 Consider the environment/neighborhoods.

642 Parking, safety.

646 Provide more direct access to I-70/K-10 for industry traffic/trucking.

647 Move away from residential and commercial.

652 Improve the look and feel.

653 Appropriate siting to balance environmental and social needs.

657 More green space.

662 Size and location.

668 Set exterior design standards that exclude concrete boxes.

667 Limit negative environmental impacts.

674 Get trucks and commercial vehicles off our city streets.

675 More improvement in west side areas.

678 Just allow them to come in -- don't fight so much.

681 Again, save prime farmland.

684 What new industrial development? Are you referring to former Farmland site?

685 Provide natural space between industry and residential zoning.

690 Take advantage of existing sites first.

696 Landscaping to include some green space around/between buildings, parking in rear when possible.

698 Ease up and allow more of it.

700 Encourage and pursue it!

701 Better parking.

705 Attract new industry for jobs should be a priority -- use tax abatements as needed.

707 Work for clean industry (non pollution of water and air).

718 Less restrictions and obstacles.

719 Diversity.

723 Require protection of environment.

724 Build it.

725 Quit fighting with people who are trying to help downtown!

728 Attractive areas.

729 Connect quality/living wages to any incentives.

731 I-70 access to East Business Park (period).

732 See more higher wage employers.

737 More industrial jobs.

739 We should be sure to use our current industrial sites first before building more.

742 Not too many incentives and tax breaks for industry moving in.

748 Put a grocery store in east Lawrence on K-10, and one in north Lawrence. We are just as good as those in west Lawrence.

749 Mixing the old characteristics with the new.

755 Attract industry.

756 Need more inventory.

764 Having the opportunity to vote on city decisions of acquisitions, or building multi-million dollar projects.

768 Encourage more development with tax incentives.

770 The city of Lawrence didn't need to buy the old Farmland place. Money wasted.

773 Access to public transportation.

776 Parking and entrance.

778 More industrial sites.

788 Green space ratio/landscaped -- more is better.

788 Get more.

789 Again pay attention to LEED guidelines, green space, access on foot.

792 Employees need a living wage.

794 Maintain the streets.

798 Job growth.

801 Improve schools and infrastructure.

803 More new jobs!

804 Let industry come to Lawrence.

805 Remove Berry Plastics building.

807 Keep it [in] outlying area of county.

816 Attention to environmental issues.

818 Make it attractive.

825 More jobs.

826 We always do better -- enhance industrial opportunities without giving away the focus.

830 There should be a commitment to bringing in new manufacturing jobs/companies similar to Topeka. Better pay for area people.

837 Stop it.

839 Location and ease of access.

840 Make improvements that draws industry to our community.

842 More green space and more trees.

846 Better access and some buildings.

852 Like the things happening in east Lawrence -- the new space reclaimed in old industrial buildings.

859 Minimize/eliminate those with dangerous/toxic byproducts (chemicals, nuclear energy, etc.).

867 Reduce environmental impact of new industry.

871 More work.

873 Use less concrete, asphalt and block-long buildings; make spaces more campus-like.

879 It should merge with the landscape. Look rural.

881 No new development.

884 Finish Chamber's tech training center and USD 497 "tech ed" center.

889 Move more north of the river.

893 Be cautious in spending money on new studies when the old ones are still current and can be used.

895 Use renewable energy, reduce carbon footprint.

897 We need more primary jobs in industry.

898 Employment.

899 Have architectural review to make sure buildings 'fit' into neighborhood.

902 More effective marketing.

903 Too much character, quality and agreement with existing structures compromised for development.

908 Better educated workforce.

910 Requiring better wages be paid -- offering incentives.

911 Would like to see enough of this type of development for well-paying, plentiful jobs that will be sustained into the future.

919 Limits.

922 Lawrence is a progressive community; keep industrial development clean.

923 Bring industry that uses responsible practices.

926 Same -- accessibility; many jobs do not pay well and students/lower income folks have to drive miles to get to work when everything is built on the edge of town. Hard to bike/walk to work.

928 Accessibility (training as well as location).

938 Certainly seek out and encourage, but don't provide so many perks it jeopardizes future taxes, etc., too much. Has to be fair.

939 Jobs.

941 City to encourage industrial development, instead of fighting.

943 New retail and restaurants to keep people in Lawrence, rather than traveling to Topeka and KC for them.

948 Offer moderate tax incentives to environmentally sustainable companies that offer career-oriented, living wage employment to Douglas County residents.

949 Less commercial development.

952 Maintain green space in projects.

954 We should not expand land space for industrial -- just reuse/recycle past industrial space.

955 Road development is adequate to travel to.

959 Industrial development is too scattered; too bad it wasn't planned to be in a central area.

960 Has there been industrial development?

961 Fair bid process.

962 Very carefully plan the impact on our natural resources, and consider recycling, etc., to improve the environment.

967 Improved communications network (fiber).

968 All of the new housing looks the same.

975 Emphasize efficiency and use of natural systems.

978 It's all on the east side; not sure about availability of public transportation to the east side.

984 Ecology, effect on surroundings and city area.

987 Centralization.

989 Environmentally friendly (low noise/pollution).

997 Less pollution.

1001 Get a new set of decision makers who are willing to be creative. Diversify your communities by race, income and background.

1003 One word: Cheese.

1006 Keep separated from other development and protect environment.

1011 Try to get some good paying industrial employment.

1012 Preserve areas with the best transportation access for industrial business parks, and then work with industrial development groups to get candidates to use the space. Provide long-term availability because developing these areas takes longer than other types of uses. Have patience.

1013 K-10 bypass.

1017 Which industrial development are you referring to? The development I know about is residential, commercial, recreational. The new district center was built way away from Lawrence.

1019 Better screening from public spaces.

1020 More clean industrial growth. More of this than retail.

1024 Develop good paying jobs!

1035 Bigger Lawrence city council commission meeting for all. Rate of growth in Lawrence and Douglas County.

1036 Be more aggressive in recruiting and providing incentive to new major employers.

1045 Environmentally friendly.

1049 Keep all industrial in northwest Lawrence.

1050 Good schools so families will move here.

1056 Greatly reduce all regulations for business.

1058 Bring in higher paying technology/research jobs.

1059 What new industrial development -- you mean there are some?

1060 Don't allow metal buildings of any kind.

1061 Environmentally friendly.

1062 Access to public transportation.

1069 Bring more businesses.

1071 Parks.

1072 More job opportunities.

1073 Create new good jobs.

1076 Create more strict environmental regulations for industry; this leads to healthy community.

1080 Not as boxy, but with character.

1081 Have pad ready sites!

1082 Toxins control.

1085 Make sure all environmental/safety regulations are met, and make industrial areas safe and nice for people who work there!

1093 Going after new industry. Identify areas where city and county can work with KU -- local jobs for KU graduates.

1106 Let the free market work its magic.

1107 Renewable energy.

1110 Taxes.

1112 Blend industrial with office development.

1117 Keep it on fringes of city.

1119 Match character of downtown Lawrence.

1123 Be sure it is actually job-producing and environmentally sound.

1124 Concentrated, rather than many sites.

1128 Work with businesses.

1129 City can't improve without a growing base of good jobs to provide revenue. Get realistic about industrial growth.

1132 Clean up old plant (fertilizer) on K-10 East.

1133 Let it happen.

1133 More and safer points of access.

1139 No more industrial blight -- industrial parks or tuck-aways, always with quality of the industry and blending in, not a sore thumb or detriment to the environment.

1141 Plan infrastructure better before developing more.

1148 Keep it in one tight cluster. Use less space -- build as vertically as possible.

1151 Attempt to choose a business that is interested in community support and involvement.

Varied timing of major construction projects in the same area (i.e. 23rd and Haskell
1154 closed at the same time).
1158 Need to blend in with community.
1159 Need to explore how to bring more industry to our area.
1160 Get some.
1162 Don't infringe on rural areas!
1165 Equal opportunity for employment.
1167 I guess we need more of it -- more jobs, more tax revenue.
1169 Attractive to the eye.
1176 Get some.
1179 It should stay on the edge of town.
1180 Environmental friendliness.
1182 Again, what development?
1190 The Farmland property needs to be developed = more jobs.
1193 Bring more jobs.
1194 More IT/high tech jobs!
1195 Industry recruitment -- focus on bio-tech industries.
1196 Make sure it is necessary.

1199 Continue to emphasize Farmland, and stay out of north of north Lawrence/NE sector.
1201 Access for trailer trucks and use of rail.
1202 Attract more industry to promote job opportunities.
1204 Encourage more business development.
1211 Maintaining as much of natural setting as possible.
1214 The city has to spend less on it.
1215 Provide public transportation to the area.
1216 Stick to the codes already present.
1219 Keep city integrity; don't lose the trees and nature.
1224 Get some industry in it. Preferably good paying employers offering good benefits.
1227 We need more employment; do what is necessary.
1231 Spread it around Lawrence, not all in one area.
1233 Green considerations.
1237 Be more reasonable in the process.
1242 Work aggressively to identify and develop industrial sites.
1243 Control the developers, and do not let the developers buy too much favor.
1245 Encourage more companies to locate here to provide jobs.
1247 Attract sectors with higher paying jobs.
1249 Getting some new industries to invest in Lawrence!
1252 Not sized to bring manufacturing, not logistics-friendly.
1253 Provide quality tech training.

Section 4
Household Types

Household Types

Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?					
City of Lawrence	78.9%	73.2%	81.2%	69.1%	75.7%
Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	21.1%	26.8%	18.8%	30.9%	24.3%
Q1a. Maintaining rural character					
Very important	28.3%	30.5%	23.9%	39.0%	30.6%
Somewhat important	40.1%	38.4%	43.6%	37.4%	40.2%
Not sure	19.3%	19.9%	18.2%	13.8%	17.2%
Not important	12.3%	11.3%	14.2%	9.8%	12.0%

Household Types

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q1b. Preserving historic buildings					
Very important	48.1%	51.6%	57.3%	50.9%	52.5%
Somewhat important	43.9%	40.5%	34.0%	38.6%	38.5%
Not sure	4.2%	5.2%	5.4%	5.1%	5.0%
Not important	3.8%	2.6%	3.3%	5.4%	4.0%
Q1c. Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods					
Very important	40.9%	38.2%	44.8%	38.4%	41.0%
Somewhat important	38.6%	50.7%	40.0%	42.3%	42.0%
Not sure	13.0%	6.6%	11.0%	14.8%	12.0%
Not important	7.4%	4.6%	4.2%	4.5%	5.0%

Household Types

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q1d. Development of the Clinton Lake Area					
Very important	20.5%	13.2%	21.0%	12.2%	17.0%
Somewhat important	34.9%	32.9%	32.6%	36.3%	34.2%
Not sure	20.5%	19.1%	26.0%	18.9%	21.5%
Not important	24.2%	34.9%	20.4%	32.6%	27.3%
Q1e. Quality housing for all income groups					
Very important	54.4%	53.9%	56.8%	50.8%	54.0%
Somewhat important	25.1%	28.9%	31.3%	32.9%	30.2%
Not sure	10.7%	9.2%	7.7%	8.8%	8.9%
Not important	9.8%	7.9%	4.2%	7.6%	6.9%

Household Types

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q1f. Walking and biking trails					
Very important	51.9%	52.3%	51.3%	33.0%	45.8%
Somewhat important	36.9%	38.6%	34.9%	43.0%	38.4%
Not sure	6.1%	4.6%	6.3%	10.6%	7.4%
Not important	5.1%	4.6%	7.5%	13.3%	8.4%
Q1g. Maintaining community identity.					
Very important	44.7%	46.4%	50.6%	45.6%	47.2%
Somewhat important	34.0%	35.9%	33.3%	33.1%	33.7%
Not sure	16.3%	13.7%	11.9%	17.9%	15.0%
Not important	5.1%	3.9%	4.2%	3.3%	4.1%

Household Types

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q1h. Downtown stability					
Very important	60.0%	68.0%	63.5%	55.0%	60.8%
Somewhat important	28.8%	20.9%	26.4%	31.3%	27.6%
Not sure	5.6%	5.2%	6.5%	7.0%	6.3%
Not important	5.6%	5.9%	3.6%	6.7%	5.3%
Q1i. Transportation alternatives to the car					
Very important	35.5%	40.5%	42.7%	37.8%	39.4%
Somewhat important	39.3%	30.7%	32.9%	33.2%	33.9%
Not sure	10.7%	15.7%	10.7%	13.0%	12.2%
Not important	14.5%	13.1%	13.6%	16.0%	14.5%

Household Types

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q1j. Availability of arts and cultural opportunities					
Very important	41.1%	42.5%	39.4%	33.8%	38.6%
Somewhat important	39.7%	38.6%	41.2%	43.8%	41.3%
Not sure	10.3%	11.8%	11.6%	10.6%	11.0%
Not important	8.9%	7.2%	7.8%	11.8%	9.2%
Q1k. Appearance of multi-family residential developments					
Very important	21.6%	34.0%	22.0%	26.9%	25.3%
Somewhat important	37.1%	33.3%	42.1%	45.2%	40.8%
Not sure	26.8%	19.0%	23.7%	16.1%	21.2%
Not important	14.6%	13.7%	12.2%	11.8%	12.7%

Household Types

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q1l. Incorporating natural areas into development projects					
Very important	45.1%	42.8%	41.8%	41.3%	42.5%
Somewhat important	32.6%	40.1%	28.8%	32.8%	32.6%
Not sure	13.0%	9.2%	16.9%	14.3%	14.1%
Not important	9.3%	7.9%	12.5%	11.6%	10.8%
Q1m. Creating employment opportunities					
Very important	72.0%	78.3%	73.8%	72.0%	73.6%
Somewhat important	22.9%	17.1%	20.8%	22.3%	21.1%
Not sure	2.8%	1.3%	3.0%	4.5%	3.2%
Not important	2.3%	3.3%	2.4%	1.2%	2.1%

Household Types

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q1n. Parks, recreation, open space					
Very important	63.3%	66.0%	57.1%	51.7%	58.0%
Somewhat important	31.6%	31.4%	36.0%	39.5%	35.5%
Not sure	4.2%	2.0%	4.5%	6.1%	4.6%
Not important	0.9%	0.7%	2.4%	2.7%	1.9%
Q1o. Protecting high value farmland					
Very important	41.1%	43.1%	41.5%	51.7%	45.0%
Somewhat important	30.8%	26.8%	31.5%	30.5%	30.3%
Not sure	19.6%	20.9%	18.4%	12.4%	17.1%
Not important	8.4%	9.2%	8.6%	5.4%	7.6%

Household Types

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q1p. Appearance of commercial areas					
Very important	26.5%	33.1%	28.6%	35.5%	31.1%
Somewhat important	52.1%	48.3%	51.8%	50.9%	51.1%
Not sure	14.9%	12.6%	14.0%	10.2%	12.7%
Not important	6.5%	6.0%	5.7%	3.3%	5.1%
Q1q. Managing future growth					
Very important	60.5%	58.2%	56.7%	58.9%	58.5%
Somewhat important	29.8%	31.4%	34.7%	30.8%	31.9%
Not sure	6.5%	8.5%	5.6%	6.9%	6.6%
Not important	3.3%	2.0%	3.0%	3.3%	3.0%

Household Types

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q1r. Activities and housing for the Retirement Community					
Very important	23.0%	25.0%	26.7%	37.5%	29.2%
Somewhat important	49.8%	50.7%	46.3%	45.7%	47.5%
Not sure	17.8%	17.8%	19.0%	11.3%	16.1%
Not important	9.4%	6.6%	8.0%	5.5%	7.3%
Q1s. Other					
Very important	89.5%	86.2%	81.8%	84.8%	85.4%
Somewhat important	7.9%	10.3%	2.3%	8.7%	7.0%
Not sure	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%	3.8%
Not important	2.6%	3.4%	2.3%	6.5%	3.8%

Household Types

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q2. Most Important					
Maintaining rural character	5.0%	3.9%	4.4%	6.9%	5.3%
Preserving historic buildings	2.8%	0.7%	6.5%	3.6%	3.9%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	2.3%	7.2%	2.9%	2.7%	3.3%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	1.4%	1.3%	1.5%	1.2%	1.3%
Quality housing for all income groups	15.1%	12.4%	13.5%	11.4%	13.0%
Walking and biking trails	3.2%	2.0%	5.0%	1.5%	3.1%
Maintaining community identity	5.5%	4.6%	6.8%	4.5%	5.4%
Downtown stability	6.9%	13.7%	10.6%	9.6%	9.9%
Transportation alternatives to the car	3.2%	1.3%	3.2%	2.1%	2.6%

Household Types

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)					
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	1.4%	2.0%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	0.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	1.8%	2.0%	1.5%	1.2%	1.5%
Creating employment opportunities	24.3%	24.8%	24.4%	23.7%	24.3%
Parks, recreation, open space	3.2%	2.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.7%
Protecting high value farmland	2.3%	2.6%	2.6%	5.7%	3.5%
Appearance of commercial areas	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Managing future growth	7.8%	7.8%	5.9%	6.9%	6.9%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	0.5%	0.7%	0.9%	3.3%	1.5%
Other	7.3%	6.5%	4.1%	3.0%	4.9%
None chosen	4.6%	3.3%	2.9%	9.6%	5.4%

Household Types

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q2. 3rd Important					
Maintaining rural character	1.8%	2.0%	2.1%	2.1%	2.0%
Preserving historic buildings	1.4%	3.3%	6.5%	2.4%	3.6%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	2.3%	4.6%	5.6%	5.1%	4.6%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	3.7%	1.3%	1.8%	1.8%	2.1%
Quality housing for all income groups	3.2%	9.8%	5.6%	5.7%	5.8%
Walking and biking trails	8.3%	6.5%	6.5%	4.5%	6.2%
Maintaining community identity	3.2%	3.9%	5.3%	2.4%	3.7%
Downtown stability	11.0%	10.5%	7.4%	10.5%	9.6%
Transportation alternatives to the car	8.3%	5.9%	6.2%	5.1%	6.2%

Household Types

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q2. 3rd Important (Cont.)					
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	4.1%	5.2%	5.9%	3.3%	4.6%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	1.4%	0.0%	1.2%	1.8%	1.2%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	5.5%	2.6%	4.1%	5.4%	4.6%
Creating employment opportunities	8.3%	8.5%	10.6%	10.8%	9.8%
Parks, recreation, open space	9.6%	6.5%	8.2%	6.0%	7.6%
Protecting high value farmland	3.7%	9.2%	5.9%	5.1%	5.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	5.5%	2.0%	3.2%	2.1%	3.2%
Managing future growth	9.2%	9.8%	8.2%	9.3%	9.0%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	0.9%	1.3%	1.8%	3.3%	2.0%
Other	0.9%	2.0%	0.3%	0.6%	0.8%
None chosen	7.8%	5.2%	3.8%	12.6%	7.6%

Household Types

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q2. 4th Important					
Maintaining rural character	3.7%	3.3%	1.8%	3.3%	2.9%
Preserving historic buildings	1.8%	3.9%	7.4%	4.2%	4.7%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	0.9%	7.8%	5.3%	5.4%	4.8%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	2.8%	2.6%	2.9%	2.1%	2.7%
Quality housing for all income groups	4.6%	3.3%	7.1%	4.5%	5.2%
Walking and biking trails	5.0%	5.9%	6.8%	1.8%	4.7%
Maintaining community identity	2.3%	7.2%	5.9%	4.5%	4.9%
Downtown stability	4.1%	5.9%	5.9%	6.0%	5.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	5.5%	6.5%	4.1%	3.0%	4.4%

Household Types

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q2. 4th Important (Cont.)					
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	6.9%	5.2%	6.2%	5.7%	6.1%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	1.8%	3.9%	2.6%	2.7%	2.7%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	6.0%	3.3%	6.2%	3.0%	4.7%
Creating employment opportunities	9.2%	7.2%	5.3%	8.4%	7.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	9.6%	7.8%	5.9%	6.9%	7.3%
Protecting high value farmland	6.0%	5.9%	3.5%	4.5%	4.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	2.3%	1.3%	2.9%	3.0%	2.6%
Managing future growth	10.6%	9.2%	11.8%	9.3%	10.3%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	4.1%	2.6%	2.6%	5.4%	3.8%
Other	2.8%	1.3%	1.5%	1.2%	1.6%
None chosen	10.1%	5.9%	4.4%	15.0%	9.2%

Household Types

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q2. Most Important					
Maintaining rural character	13.8%	13.1%	10.3%	17.4%	13.7%
Preserving historic buildings	10.1%	10.5%	23.8%	13.8%	15.8%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	12.8%	22.9%	17.6%	16.2%	16.9%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	11.5%	7.8%	9.7%	6.6%	8.9%
Quality housing for all income groups	30.3%	37.3%	37.1%	31.2%	33.8%
Walking and biking trails	22.0%	23.5%	24.1%	9.3%	18.8%
Maintaining community identity	13.8%	20.3%	22.6%	15.6%	18.2%
Downtown stability	35.3%	40.5%	41.2%	37.2%	38.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	19.3%	19.0%	19.7%	16.5%	18.6%

Household Types

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)					
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	15.1%	16.3%	16.5%	13.2%	15.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	6.9%	6.5%	5.0%	6.6%	6.1%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	15.6%	11.1%	12.9%	11.7%	12.8%
Creating employment opportunities	56.0%	55.6%	54.7%	55.6%	55.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	31.2%	21.6%	21.2%	18.0%	22.3%
Protecting high value farmland	16.1%	20.3%	17.1%	20.1%	18.4%
Appearance of commercial areas	9.2%	5.9%	7.4%	7.2%	7.5%
Managing future growth	34.4%	34.6%	31.2%	31.8%	32.5%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	6.0%	4.6%	7.4%	17.7%	9.9%
Other	12.8%	10.5%	6.5%	6.3%	8.4%
None chosen	4.6%	3.3%	2.9%	9.6%	5.4%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3a. A stronger community identity					
Strongly agree	17.1%	14.1%	17.8%	18.5%	17.5%
Agree	39.3%	42.3%	42.9%	43.2%	42.1%
Neutral	35.1%	38.9%	35.3%	33.3%	35.1%
Disagree	6.2%	4.7%	3.3%	3.4%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	2.4%	0.0%	0.6%	1.5%	1.2%
Q3b. More attractive City entrances					
Strongly agree	17.2%	13.9%	9.5%	9.5%	11.8%
Agree	28.8%	35.1%	37.8%	37.9%	35.6%
Neutral	40.0%	39.1%	38.4%	41.6%	39.8%
Disagree	11.2%	8.6%	12.2%	8.0%	10.1%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	3.3%	2.1%	3.1%	2.7%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3c. More parks and open space					
Strongly agree	24.4%	26.3%	23.9%	20.4%	23.3%
Agree	52.6%	42.8%	46.6%	41.7%	45.7%
Neutral	18.8%	28.9%	24.5%	29.9%	25.6%
Disagree	3.3%	1.3%	4.2%	4.9%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	3.1%	1.6%
Q3d. More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails					
Strongly agree	38.9%	36.7%	39.5%	25.6%	34.7%
Agree	40.7%	42.7%	34.7%	33.8%	36.8%
Neutral	12.0%	16.7%	20.5%	29.6%	21.0%
Disagree	5.6%	2.7%	4.5%	7.6%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	1.3%	0.9%	3.4%	2.1%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3e. More bicycle paths and routes					
Strongly agree	36.0%	32.9%	35.0%	22.5%	31.1%
Agree	29.4%	34.2%	30.6%	28.7%	30.2%
Neutral	20.6%	25.7%	25.8%	33.3%	27.0%
Disagree	9.8%	5.9%	5.6%	10.8%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	4.2%	1.3%	3.0%	4.6%	3.5%
Q3f. More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown					
Strongly agree	16.3%	15.9%	17.2%	7.6%	13.9%
Agree	36.3%	29.1%	34.7%	25.4%	31.3%
Neutral	31.6%	42.4%	31.5%	43.7%	36.9%
Disagree	12.1%	11.3%	12.8%	17.4%	13.9%
Strongly disagree	3.7%	1.3%	3.9%	5.8%	4.1%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3g. More housing in and around downtown					
Strongly agree	8.8%	11.2%	7.7%	8.0%	8.7%
Agree	19.4%	24.3%	25.5%	22.7%	23.1%
Neutral	48.1%	41.4%	45.1%	46.0%	45.4%
Disagree	19.4%	16.4%	17.2%	17.2%	17.5%
Strongly disagree	4.2%	6.6%	4.5%	6.1%	5.2%
Q3h. More affordable housing within the City					
Strongly agree	38.3%	31.8%	39.0%	30.7%	35.2%
Agree	28.0%	33.8%	34.8%	39.6%	34.8%
Neutral	24.3%	27.2%	21.4%	22.7%	23.2%
Disagree	6.5%	6.0%	3.3%	5.2%	5.0%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	1.3%	1.5%	1.8%	1.8%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3i. More employment opportunities					
Strongly agree	61.6%	62.5%	61.7%	60.8%	61.5%
Agree	29.2%	29.6%	28.8%	30.1%	29.4%
Neutral	6.9%	6.6%	8.3%	7.3%	7.4%
Disagree	1.4%	0.7%	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%
Strongly disagree	0.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.9%	0.7%
Q3j. Better protection of natural resources					
Strongly agree	37.5%	33.8%	41.1%	40.7%	39.3%
Agree	42.1%	37.7%	37.2%	37.0%	38.2%
Neutral	14.8%	23.8%	18.2%	17.9%	18.2%
Disagree	3.2%	3.3%	2.7%	2.8%	2.9%
Strongly disagree	2.3%	1.3%	0.9%	1.5%	1.5%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3k. Expanded public transportation					
Strongly agree	23.9%	26.8%	28.2%	21.7%	25.2%
Agree	31.0%	28.2%	29.7%	26.6%	28.7%
Neutral	29.6%	26.8%	26.4%	37.3%	30.5%
Disagree	6.6%	8.7%	10.4%	8.9%	8.9%
Strongly disagree	8.9%	9.4%	5.3%	5.5%	6.7%
Q3l. More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake					
Strongly agree	17.7%	9.9%	19.3%	8.0%	14.1%
Agree	32.6%	27.6%	29.5%	18.7%	26.5%
Neutral	35.3%	38.2%	34.5%	47.4%	39.2%
Disagree	9.8%	20.4%	11.6%	17.1%	14.2%
Strongly disagree	4.7%	3.9%	5.1%	8.9%	6.0%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3m. More activities for teenagers					
Strongly agree	24.2%	29.6%	15.4%	17.1%	19.9%
Agree	43.3%	42.1%	34.4%	37.5%	38.3%
Neutral	28.4%	28.3%	42.7%	38.7%	36.3%
Disagree	2.3%	0.0%	5.3%	4.9%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	1.9%	0.0%	2.1%	1.8%	1.7%
Q3n. More activities for seniors					
Strongly agree	11.2%	12.5%	10.1%	20.8%	14.2%
Agree	34.4%	41.4%	38.5%	37.3%	37.7%
Neutral	47.4%	41.4%	44.5%	37.6%	42.4%
Disagree	4.2%	4.6%	5.7%	3.1%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.4%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3o. Improved access to local foods					
Strongly agree	23.8%	20.4%	29.1%	19.0%	23.6%
Agree	38.8%	36.2%	35.9%	38.7%	37.4%
Neutral	27.6%	35.5%	28.8%	36.8%	32.0%
Disagree	5.6%	6.6%	4.2%	4.0%	4.8%
Strongly disagree	4.2%	1.3%	2.1%	1.5%	2.2%
Q3p. Better management of growth					
Strongly agree	34.0%	36.7%	36.0%	38.7%	36.7%
Agree	37.2%	30.7%	36.0%	34.5%	34.9%
Neutral	23.3%	25.3%	23.5%	19.8%	22.5%
Disagree	4.7%	6.0%	3.3%	4.6%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	0.9%	1.3%	1.2%	2.4%	1.6%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3q. Maintaining the rural character of the County					
Strongly agree	17.7%	21.1%	17.8%	31.0%	22.5%
Agree	35.8%	32.9%	37.1%	33.7%	35.2%
Neutral	35.8%	32.9%	34.1%	27.4%	32.1%
Disagree	7.9%	12.5%	9.5%	5.2%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	0.7%	1.5%	2.7%	2.0%
Q3r. New or expanded conference space					
Strongly agree	3.7%	5.3%	6.0%	4.9%	5.2%
Agree	19.6%	21.7%	17.9%	20.0%	19.4%
Neutral	50.5%	43.4%	47.3%	52.6%	49.0%
Disagree	20.1%	21.1%	22.3%	15.4%	19.4%
Strongly disagree	6.1%	8.6%	6.5%	7.1%	7.0%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3s. Multi-use neighborhoods					
Strongly agree	7.1%	9.9%	7.2%	7.1%	7.6%
Agree	31.8%	32.9%	29.3%	29.4%	30.3%
Neutral	46.4%	43.4%	48.5%	48.6%	47.4%
Disagree	10.9%	11.8%	12.6%	9.9%	11.3%
Strongly disagree	3.8%	2.0%	2.4%	5.0%	3.4%
Q3t. Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities					
Strongly agree	21.0%	22.7%	25.7%	14.3%	20.7%
Agree	39.3%	40.7%	39.7%	39.9%	39.7%
Neutral	30.8%	32.7%	26.0%	36.0%	31.2%
Disagree	5.6%	2.0%	6.9%	5.5%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	3.3%	2.0%	1.8%	4.3%	2.9%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3u. More arts and cultural opportunities					
Strongly agree	17.7%	19.7%	16.8%	12.8%	16.2%
Agree	36.7%	42.8%	41.0%	32.4%	37.7%
Neutral	32.1%	29.6%	31.1%	40.1%	33.9%
Disagree	7.9%	5.3%	8.7%	10.1%	8.4%
Strongly disagree	5.6%	2.6%	2.4%	4.6%	3.8%
Q3v. Development of the communications network (fiber)					
Strongly agree	38.8%	32.2%	40.3%	21.6%	32.9%
Agree	34.1%	32.2%	29.9%	33.3%	32.2%
Neutral	23.4%	28.9%	26.3%	36.4%	29.2%
Disagree	2.3%	5.9%	3.0%	5.6%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.7%	0.6%	3.1%	1.6%

Household Types

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q3w. Stronger retirement community					
Strongly agree	8.4%	11.2%	11.4%	22.6%	14.5%
Agree	28.0%	29.6%	32.1%	39.4%	33.2%
Neutral	50.0%	52.6%	49.8%	34.9%	45.4%
Disagree	11.7%	4.6%	4.8%	1.8%	5.3%
Strong disagree	1.9%	2.0%	1.8%	1.2%	1.7%
Q3x. Other					
Strongly agree	82.8%	83.3%	72.7%	59.4%	72.9%
Agree	0.0%	8.3%	3.0%	18.8%	7.5%
Neutral	10.3%	8.3%	21.2%	9.4%	13.1%
Disagree	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
Strongly disagree	3.4%	0.0%	3.0%	12.5%	5.6%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. Best Represent					
A stronger community identity	3.2%	2.0%	3.5%	4.5%	3.5%
More attractive City entrances	2.3%	0.7%	0.9%	1.2%	1.2%
More parks and open space	2.3%	3.9%	2.6%	2.4%	2.7%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	4.6%	5.9%	4.7%	3.0%	4.3%
More bicycle paths and routes	1.8%	0.7%	1.5%	1.2%	1.3%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	2.8%	4.6%	3.2%	1.5%	2.8%
More housing in and around downtown	1.4%	0.7%	2.1%	1.5%	1.5%
More affordable housing within the City	12.8%	11.8%	8.8%	7.2%	9.6%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)					
More employment opportunities	25.2%	29.4%	28.2%	29.7%	28.2%
Better protection of natural resources	4.1%	5.2%	4.1%	4.8%	4.6%
Expanded public transportation	2.3%	1.3%	2.1%	1.5%	1.8%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	1.8%	0.0%	2.1%	0.9%	1.3%
More activities for teenagers	1.8%	5.2%	1.2%	1.8%	2.1%
More activities for seniors	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.4%
Improved access to local foods	0.9%	0.7%	2.4%	0.6%	1.2%
Better management of growth	4.1%	8.5%	7.4%	10.5%	7.8%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	4.1%	3.3%	2.6%	5.1%	3.8%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)					
New or expanded conference space	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Multi-use neighborhoods	1.4%	0.7%	0.9%	0.3%	0.8%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	0.5%	1.3%	3.2%	0.0%	1.3%
More arts and cultural opportunities	0.9%	1.3%	1.2%	1.5%	1.2%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	6.9%	6.5%	4.7%	3.0%	4.9%
Stronger retirement community	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%	3.6%	1.6%
Other	7.3%	2.6%	5.6%	2.7%	4.6%
No response	6.9%	3.3%	5.9%	10.2%	7.2%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent					
A stronger community identity	1.8%	1.3%	1.8%	2.4%	1.9%
More attractive City entrances	1.8%	0.7%	1.2%	1.8%	1.4%
More parks and open space	3.7%	3.3%	2.9%	2.7%	3.1%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	7.3%	6.5%	5.3%	3.6%	5.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	5.0%	8.5%	5.9%	2.4%	5.0%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	4.1%	1.3%	2.9%	1.5%	2.5%
More housing in and around downtown	0.9%	5.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.9%
More affordable housing within the City	7.8%	7.8%	11.2%	11.4%	10.0%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)					
More employment opportunities	17.9%	14.4%	10.9%	12.0%	13.2%
Better protection of natural resources	4.6%	5.9%	6.8%	7.2%	6.3%
Expanded public transportation	4.1%	3.3%	5.9%	3.0%	4.3%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	4.1%	3.3%	5.0%	0.6%	3.2%
More activities for teenagers	3.2%	7.8%	3.2%	3.9%	4.1%
More activities for seniors	0.5%	0.0%	0.6%	4.8%	1.8%
Improved access to local foods	1.4%	1.3%	4.7%	2.1%	2.7%
Better management of growth	11.5%	9.8%	5.0%	8.1%	8.0%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	2.8%	4.6%	2.6%	6.3%	4.1%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)					
New or expanded conference space	0.5%	0.7%	1.2%	1.2%	1.0%
Multi-use neighborhoods	0.0%	0.7%	1.2%	0.6%	0.7%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	3.2%	3.9%	4.7%	3.0%	3.7%
More arts and cultural opportunities	1.8%	2.0%	0.6%	0.9%	1.1%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	3.2%	2.0%	7.1%	2.7%	4.1%
Stronger retirement community	0.5%	0.0%	0.9%	4.5%	1.8%
Other	0.0%	1.3%	0.3%	0.9%	0.6%
No response	8.3%	4.6%	6.8%	10.8%	8.1%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent					
A stronger community identity	1.8%	2.0%	2.1%	1.2%	1.7%
More attractive City entrances	2.3%	3.9%	2.1%	2.7%	2.6%
More parks and open space	5.5%	2.0%	1.8%	2.7%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	5.5%	5.9%	8.8%	4.8%	6.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	4.6%	3.9%	4.1%	2.4%	3.6%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	1.8%	3.3%	4.4%	1.2%	2.7%
More housing in and around downtown	0.9%	3.9%	1.5%	1.5%	1.7%
More affordable housing within the City	6.4%	1.3%	3.8%	4.8%	4.3%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)					
More employment opportunities	7.3%	6.5%	9.4%	9.6%	8.6%
Better protection of natural resources	5.5%	4.6%	4.7%	7.5%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	2.3%	6.5%	6.5%	2.7%	4.4%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	5.0%	1.3%	2.4%	2.1%	2.7%
More activities for teenagers	4.6%	9.8%	2.9%	3.6%	4.5%
More activities for seniors	1.4%	1.3%	3.5%	3.9%	2.9%
Improved access to local foods	4.6%	2.0%	2.6%	3.9%	3.3%
Better management of growth	7.3%	8.5%	7.9%	7.8%	7.9%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	1.8%	4.6%	1.5%	5.7%	3.3%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)					
New or expanded conference space	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%	2.4%	1.1%
Multi-use neighborhoods	3.2%	2.0%	2.4%	1.5%	2.2%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	4.6%	3.9%	6.2%	3.3%	4.6%
More arts and cultural opportunities	2.3%	5.2%	3.5%	1.5%	2.9%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	6.9%	9.2%	7.9%	3.9%	6.6%
Stronger retirement community	0.5%	0.7%	1.5%	4.8%	2.2%
Other	1.4%	0.7%	0.6%	0.3%	0.7%
No response	11.9%	6.5%	7.4%	14.1%	10.4%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. 4th Best Represent					
A stronger community identity	0.0%	1.3%	2.4%	1.8%	1.5%
More attractive City entrances	2.3%	4.6%	2.9%	2.1%	2.8%
More parks and open space	1.8%	3.3%	3.8%	2.4%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	4.6%	6.5%	5.6%	3.0%	4.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	6.0%	3.9%	5.3%	3.0%	4.5%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	4.6%	2.0%	2.1%	1.5%	2.4%
More housing in and around downtown	0.9%	1.3%	2.1%	0.6%	1.2%
More affordable housing within the City	5.5%	5.2%	5.6%	6.3%	5.7%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)					
More employment opportunities	2.8%	4.6%	3.5%	6.3%	4.5%
Better protection of natural resources	3.7%	3.3%	7.6%	6.3%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	4.6%	3.3%	3.8%	3.0%	3.6%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	3.7%	2.6%	2.9%	1.5%	2.6%
More activities for teenagers	5.5%	7.8%	3.5%	2.4%	4.2%
More activities for seniors	0.0%	0.7%	2.6%	3.0%	1.9%
Improved access to local foods	6.9%	5.9%	2.9%	2.4%	4.0%
Better management of growth	7.3%	5.2%	6.2%	6.6%	6.4%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.7%	3.3%	4.4%	3.3%	3.7%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)					
New or expanded conference space	1.4%	3.3%	2.6%	0.9%	1.9%
Multi-use neighborhoods	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	2.7%	1.3%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	5.5%	9.2%	7.1%	6.3%	6.8%
More arts and cultural opportunities	2.8%	4.6%	3.2%	3.9%	3.5%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	6.0%	3.9%	6.8%	4.2%	5.4%
Stronger retirement community	1.4%	2.0%	2.1%	6.0%	3.2%
Other	2.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.9%	1.1%
No response	15.6%	11.1%	10.0%	19.5%	14.4%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. Best Represent					
A stronger community identity	6.9%	6.5%	9.7%	9.9%	8.7%
More attractive City entrances	8.7%	9.8%	7.1%	7.8%	8.0%
More parks and open space	13.3%	12.4%	11.2%	10.2%	11.5%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	22.0%	24.8%	24.4%	14.4%	20.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	17.4%	17.0%	16.8%	9.0%	14.4%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	13.3%	11.1%	12.6%	5.7%	10.3%
More housing in and around downtown	4.1%	11.1%	7.1%	5.1%	6.4%
More affordable housing within the City	32.6%	26.1%	29.4%	29.7%	29.6%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)					
More employment opportunities	53.2%	54.9%	52.1%	57.7%	54.5%
Better protection of natural resources	17.9%	19.0%	23.2%	25.8%	22.4%
Expanded public transportation	13.3%	14.4%	18.2%	10.2%	14.1%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	14.7%	7.2%	12.4%	5.1%	9.8%
More activities for teenagers	15.1%	30.7%	10.9%	11.7%	14.9%
More activities for seniors	1.8%	2.0%	6.8%	12.9%	7.0%
Improved access to local foods	13.8%	9.8%	12.6%	9.0%	11.3%
Better management of growth	30.3%	32.0%	26.5%	33.0%	30.2%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	12.4%	15.7%	11.2%	20.4%	15.0%

Household Types

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)					
New or expanded conference space	2.3%	5.2%	4.4%	4.5%	4.1%
Multi-use neighborhoods	5.5%	3.9%	5.0%	5.1%	5.0%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	13.8%	18.3%	21.2%	12.6%	16.4%
More arts and cultural opportunities	7.8%	13.1%	8.5%	7.8%	8.8%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	22.9%	21.6%	26.5%	13.8%	20.9%
Stronger retirement community	2.8%	2.6%	5.6%	18.9%	8.8%
Other	11.5%	5.2%	6.8%	4.8%	6.9%
No response	6.9%	3.3%	5.9%	10.2%	7.2%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5a. Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities					
Major strength	34.7%	32.7%	36.6%	34.8%	35.0%
Strength	51.9%	48.0%	44.4%	42.5%	45.9%
Neutral	11.1%	16.7%	17.7%	19.7%	16.8%
Weakness	2.3%	2.0%	1.2%	2.8%	2.1%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%
Q5b. Availability of retail choices					
Major strength	4.6%	4.6%	8.5%	6.7%	6.5%
Strength	42.6%	36.4%	39.1%	37.3%	38.8%
Neutral	29.2%	29.8%	30.3%	28.7%	29.5%
Weakness	20.4%	22.5%	19.1%	21.4%	20.7%
Major weakness	3.2%	6.6%	3.0%	5.8%	4.5%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5c. Existing sidewalk network					
Major strength	6.0%	3.3%	3.9%	2.8%	3.9%
Strength	37.2%	32.0%	32.1%	26.6%	31.4%
Neutral	34.9%	38.7%	43.5%	48.0%	42.4%
Weakness	18.6%	23.3%	18.0%	19.3%	19.5%
Major weakness	3.3%	2.7%	2.4%	3.4%	2.9%
Q5d. Protection of natural resources					
Major strength	4.3%	2.7%	3.0%	4.0%	3.5%
Strength	28.4%	23.3%	24.9%	26.8%	26.0%
Neutral	55.5%	53.3%	56.8%	51.1%	54.1%
Weakness	10.0%	18.0%	13.5%	16.0%	14.4%
Major weakness	1.9%	2.7%	1.8%	2.2%	2.1%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5e. Public transportation					
Major strength	6.5%	4.7%	4.5%	4.3%	4.9%
Strength	29.2%	38.0%	33.7%	32.6%	33.0%
Neutral	46.8%	39.3%	40.7%	47.6%	44.0%
Weakness	16.2%	15.3%	17.8%	12.8%	15.5%
Major weakness	1.4%	2.7%	3.3%	2.7%	2.7%
Q5f. Character of neighborhoods					
Major strength	12.1%	7.9%	9.9%	7.1%	9.2%
Strength	46.7%	44.4%	45.5%	44.1%	45.1%
Neutral	31.3%	33.8%	34.1%	37.0%	34.4%
Weakness	8.9%	13.9%	9.6%	10.8%	10.5%
Major weakness	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5g. Availability of housing choices					
Major strength	6.9%	1.3%	4.8%	4.6%	4.7%
Strength	26.9%	24.8%	26.5%	26.4%	26.2%
Neutral	38.4%	45.6%	38.3%	41.7%	40.4%
Weakness	23.6%	25.5%	25.3%	22.1%	24.1%
Major weakness	4.2%	2.7%	5.1%	5.2%	4.6%
Q5h. Availability of parks and open space					
Major strength	18.7%	10.1%	12.7%	12.5%	13.5%
Strength	51.4%	62.4%	58.4%	53.2%	55.8%
Neutral	24.3%	19.5%	24.7%	24.3%	23.8%
Weakness	5.1%	6.7%	3.6%	9.4%	6.2%
Major weakness	0.5%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5i. Employment opportunities					
Major strength	3.3%	2.0%	3.9%	5.5%	4.0%
Strength	12.6%	6.7%	8.7%	9.7%	9.5%
Neutral	38.6%	33.3%	36.3%	34.7%	35.9%
Weakness	28.4%	37.3%	33.0%	34.3%	33.0%
Major weakness	17.2%	20.7%	18.0%	15.8%	17.6%
Q5j. Historic buildings and areas					
Major strength	13.9%	13.9%	15.6%	14.1%	14.5%
Strength	53.2%	49.0%	51.7%	47.7%	50.3%
Neutral	30.6%	32.5%	26.4%	34.9%	30.9%
Weakness	2.3%	4.0%	6.0%	3.1%	4.0%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5k. Rate of growth					
Major strength	5.1%	1.3%	2.4%	4.0%	3.3%
Strength	21.9%	22.1%	21.4%	24.1%	22.4%
Neutral	50.7%	43.0%	54.8%	48.8%	50.4%
Weakness	16.7%	24.2%	18.1%	17.3%	18.4%
Major weakness	5.6%	9.4%	3.3%	5.9%	5.5%
Q5l. Unique local identity					
Major strength	38.1%	35.8%	37.2%	25.7%	33.5%
Strength	43.3%	39.7%	39.3%	43.1%	41.4%
Neutral	16.3%	19.2%	21.6%	27.2%	22.0%
Weakness	1.9%	4.6%	1.8%	4.0%	2.9%
Major weakness	0.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5m. Opportunities for community involvement					
Major strength	24.7%	17.9%	18.0%	16.8%	19.0%
Strength	48.8%	54.3%	46.5%	41.6%	46.5%
Neutral	22.3%	23.8%	28.2%	33.0%	28.0%
Weakness	3.7%	3.3%	6.9%	7.0%	5.7%
Major weakness	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	1.5%	0.8%
Q5n. Attention to environmental issues					
Major strength	13.2%	10.0%	10.6%	8.9%	10.5%
Strength	39.2%	38.0%	36.1%	34.6%	36.4%
Neutral	35.8%	38.7%	38.8%	40.4%	38.7%
Weakness	10.4%	10.7%	13.0%	11.6%	11.8%
Major weakness	1.4%	2.7%	1.5%	4.6%	2.6%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5o. Downtown					
Major strength	50.9%	57.0%	50.8%	38.4%	47.7%
Strength	36.6%	27.8%	34.2%	38.4%	35.1%
Neutral	8.8%	9.9%	9.3%	15.9%	11.5%
Weakness	2.8%	3.3%	4.5%	6.1%	4.5%
Major weakness	0.9%	2.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%
Q5p. Population growth					
Major strength	6.5%	2.7%	2.7%	4.6%	4.1%
Strength	21.9%	26.0%	20.8%	23.8%	22.7%
Neutral	56.7%	53.4%	60.1%	55.7%	57.1%
Weakness	11.2%	13.0%	12.4%	11.8%	12.0%
Major weakness	3.7%	4.8%	3.9%	4.0%	4.0%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5q. Presence of family farms					
Major strength	8.8%	10.7%	10.2%	12.0%	10.5%
Strength	35.2%	36.7%	33.0%	31.6%	33.6%
Neutral	39.4%	39.3%	42.6%	36.8%	39.5%
Weakness	12.0%	10.0%	10.8%	15.6%	12.6%
Major weakness	4.6%	3.3%	3.3%	4.0%	3.8%
Q5r. Quality of life					
Major strength	27.9%	25.2%	29.0%	30.6%	28.7%
Strength	53.5%	60.9%	54.5%	48.3%	53.3%
Neutral	16.7%	9.3%	13.5%	16.5%	14.5%
Weakness	1.4%	4.0%	2.4%	3.1%	2.7%
Major weakness	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%	1.5%	0.9%

Household Types

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q5s. Existing roadway network					
Major strength	4.7%	3.3%	3.9%	9.8%	5.8%
Strength	26.5%	26.5%	29.6%	33.3%	29.6%
Neutral	37.2%	31.1%	29.9%	30.0%	31.6%
Weakness	23.7%	24.5%	26.3%	21.1%	24.0%
Major weakness	7.9%	14.6%	10.3%	5.8%	9.0%
Q5t. Other					
Major strength	19.2%	14.3%	10.0%	13.8%	14.0%
Strength	11.5%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	5.0%
Neutral	7.7%	0.0%	23.3%	6.9%	11.0%
Weakness	15.4%	28.6%	3.3%	20.7%	15.0%
Major weakness	46.2%	57.1%	60.0%	55.2%	55.0%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. Most Important					
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	8.3%	5.9%	9.4%	7.2%	7.9%
Availability of retail choices	1.4%	1.3%	1.8%	2.1%	1.7%
Existing sidewalk network	0.9%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%
Protection of natural resources	2.3%	3.3%	4.1%	3.3%	3.3%
Public transportation	1.8%	2.0%	2.4%	2.4%	2.2%
Character of neighborhoods	2.3%	1.3%	1.2%	2.1%	1.7%
Availability of housing choices	3.7%	3.3%	3.8%	2.4%	3.3%
Availability of parks and open space	2.8%	2.0%	2.6%	1.5%	2.2%
Employment opportunities	10.1%	13.7%	11.2%	8.4%	10.4%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)					
Historic buildings and areas	1.8%	1.3%	1.8%	0.9%	1.4%
Rate of growth	1.8%	1.3%	0.6%	1.2%	1.1%
Unique local identity	11.9%	11.1%	14.4%	10.5%	12.1%
Opportunities for community involvement	1.8%	2.0%	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%
Attention to environmental issues	1.4%	2.0%	0.9%	2.1%	1.5%
Downtown	12.8%	19.6%	14.4%	12.6%	14.2%
Population growth	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%
Presence of family farms	3.2%	0.0%	1.2%	3.0%	2.0%
Quality of life	13.3%	5.9%	8.8%	14.7%	11.2%
Existing roadway network	3.7%	7.2%	4.1%	3.9%	4.4%
Other	3.7%	0.7%	1.8%	1.8%	2.0%
No response	11.0%	15.0%	13.8%	17.1%	14.5%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. 2nd Important					
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	5.5%	8.5%	3.8%	6.9%	5.8%
Availability of retail choices	0.9%	3.3%	3.2%	3.0%	2.7%
Existing sidewalk network	3.2%	1.3%	1.8%	0.6%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	3.7%	0.7%	2.6%	2.1%	2.4%
Public transportation	0.5%	3.3%	3.5%	2.1%	2.5%
Character of neighborhoods	5.0%	2.6%	3.5%	2.7%	3.4%
Availability of housing choices	5.0%	3.3%	5.6%	3.0%	4.3%
Availability of parks and open space	4.6%	5.9%	3.2%	2.7%	3.7%
Employment opportunities	10.6%	4.6%	8.2%	8.1%	8.1%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. 2nd Important (Cont.)					
Historic buildings and areas	1.8%	3.3%	5.3%	3.0%	3.5%
Rate of growth	1.8%	3.3%	0.6%	1.2%	1.4%
Unique local identity	9.2%	7.2%	8.2%	7.5%	8.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	5.5%	3.3%	2.9%	3.3%	3.6%
Attention to environmental issues	1.4%	2.0%	2.4%	1.2%	1.7%
Downtown	15.6%	15.7%	15.3%	12.3%	14.4%
Population growth	0.5%	2.0%	0.3%	1.2%	0.9%
Presence of family farms	1.4%	2.6%	2.9%	3.0%	2.6%
Quality of life	6.9%	8.5%	10.0%	13.2%	10.1%
Existing roadway network	3.2%	0.7%	1.5%	2.4%	2.0%
Other	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.9%	0.5%
No response	13.8%	17.0%	15.0%	19.5%	16.5%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. 3rd Important					
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	11.5%	12.4%	9.4%	6.6%	9.4%
Availability of retail choices	4.1%	5.9%	2.9%	3.9%	3.9%
Existing sidewalk network	2.8%	3.3%	2.1%	0.3%	1.8%
Protection of natural resources	2.3%	2.0%	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%
Public transportation	1.8%	1.3%	3.2%	3.3%	2.7%
Character of neighborhoods	3.2%	0.7%	2.9%	2.4%	2.5%
Availability of housing choices	3.2%	3.9%	4.7%	2.1%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	6.0%	2.6%	3.8%	7.2%	5.2%
Employment opportunities	5.0%	2.0%	3.8%	3.6%	3.7%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. 3rd Important (Cont.)					
Historic buildings and areas	6.4%	4.6%	1.5%	3.3%	3.5%
Rate of growth	2.8%	3.3%	2.4%	1.5%	2.3%
Unique local identity	6.4%	5.9%	7.4%	7.5%	7.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	5.0%	2.6%	3.8%	3.3%	3.7%
Attention to environmental issues	2.3%	2.6%	3.8%	2.7%	3.0%
Downtown	8.7%	11.8%	10.3%	8.4%	9.6%
Population growth	0.5%	2.0%	1.2%	1.8%	1.3%
Presence of family farms	2.3%	4.6%	2.6%	3.6%	3.2%
Quality of life	8.7%	8.5%	11.8%	8.1%	9.6%
Existing roadway network	0.5%	1.3%	3.2%	4.5%	2.8%
Other	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%
No response	16.1%	18.3%	16.8%	23.1%	18.9%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. 4th Important					
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	7.8%	7.8%	7.4%	9.3%	8.2%
Availability of retail choices	2.8%	2.0%	4.1%	5.1%	3.8%
Existing sidewalk network	2.3%	2.6%	1.5%	0.9%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	1.8%	0.7%	2.6%	1.8%	1.9%
Public transportation	3.2%	3.3%	2.1%	1.5%	2.3%
Character of neighborhoods	0.9%	6.5%	2.9%	3.6%	3.3%
Availability of housing choices	1.4%	3.3%	3.5%	4.8%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	8.3%	4.6%	6.5%	3.9%	5.7%
Employment opportunities	2.8%	2.6%	2.1%	1.5%	2.1%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. 4th Important (Cont.)					
Historic buildings and areas	1.8%	2.0%	4.4%	4.8%	3.6%
Rate of growth	2.8%	2.6%	2.9%	1.8%	2.5%
Unique local identity	6.4%	6.5%	6.2%	3.9%	5.5%
Opportunities for community involvement	5.0%	2.6%	4.1%	4.2%	4.1%
Attention to environmental issues	3.7%	3.3%	3.2%	1.5%	2.8%
Downtown	10.1%	4.6%	5.9%	7.2%	7.0%
Population growth	2.3%	1.3%	0.9%	1.5%	1.4%
Presence of family farms	4.6%	6.5%	2.1%	2.4%	3.3%
Quality of life	11.5%	11.8%	13.5%	7.8%	11.0%
Existing roadway network	1.4%	2.0%	3.2%	3.0%	2.6%
Other	1.4%	0.7%	0.6%	0.9%	0.9%
No response	17.9%	22.9%	20.3%	28.5%	22.8%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. Most Important					
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	33.0%	34.6%	30.0%	30.0%	31.4%
Availability of retail choices	9.2%	12.4%	12.1%	14.1%	12.1%
Existing sidewalk network	9.2%	8.5%	5.9%	2.4%	5.8%
Protection of natural resources	10.1%	6.5%	11.5%	9.3%	9.8%
Public transportation	7.3%	9.8%	11.2%	9.3%	9.7%
Character of neighborhoods	11.5%	11.1%	10.6%	10.8%	10.9%
Availability of housing choices	13.3%	13.7%	17.6%	12.3%	14.5%
Availability of parks and open space	21.6%	15.0%	16.2%	15.3%	16.8%
Employment opportunities	28.4%	22.9%	25.3%	21.6%	24.4%

Household Types

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)					
Historic buildings and areas	11.9%	11.1%	12.9%	12.0%	12.1%
Rate of growth	9.2%	10.5%	6.5%	5.7%	7.4%
Unique local identity	33.9%	30.7%	36.2%	29.4%	32.7%
Opportunities for community involvement	17.4%	10.5%	12.1%	12.3%	13.0%
Attention to environmental issues	8.7%	9.8%	10.3%	7.5%	9.0%
Downtown	47.2%	51.6%	45.9%	40.5%	45.2%
Population growth	3.2%	5.2%	2.4%	5.1%	3.8%
Presence of family farms	11.5%	13.7%	8.8%	12.0%	11.1%
Quality of life	40.4%	34.6%	44.1%	43.8%	41.9%
Existing roadway network	8.7%	11.1%	12.1%	13.8%	11.8%
Other	5.5%	3.3%	2.6%	4.2%	3.8%
No response	11.0%	15.0%	13.8%	17.1%	14.5%

Household Types

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q7a. Ease of travel by car on highways					
Very satisfied	22.7%	22.2%	22.6%	22.5%	22.5%
Satisfied	55.1%	49.0%	55.4%	53.5%	53.9%
Neutral	12.0%	13.7%	9.3%	9.5%	10.6%
Dissatisfied	6.5%	9.8%	9.6%	9.8%	9.0%
Very dissatisfied	3.7%	5.2%	3.0%	4.6%	4.0%
Q7b. Ease of travel by car on major streets					
Very satisfied	11.1%	13.2%	9.0%	11.8%	10.9%
Satisfied	36.1%	28.9%	34.4%	39.7%	35.8%
Neutral	13.4%	15.8%	20.1%	19.1%	17.7%
Dissatisfied	26.9%	32.2%	27.2%	19.7%	25.4%
Very dissatisfied	12.5%	9.9%	9.3%	9.7%	10.2%

Household Types

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q7c. Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets					
Very satisfied	10.6%	12.5%	9.3%	9.4%	10.1%
Satisfied	50.9%	47.4%	49.4%	48.6%	49.3%
Neutral	23.1%	24.3%	22.5%	24.9%	23.6%
Dissatisfied	11.6%	13.2%	14.4%	12.2%	12.9%
Very dissatisfied	3.7%	2.6%	4.5%	4.9%	4.2%
Q7d. Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods					
Very satisfied	12.6%	12.6%	10.8%	10.7%	11.4%
Satisfied	45.6%	50.3%	45.3%	49.1%	47.4%
Neutral	24.2%	19.2%	28.2%	21.8%	24.0%
Dissatisfied	12.6%	14.6%	11.1%	12.0%	12.2%
Very dissatisfied	5.1%	3.3%	4.5%	6.4%	5.1%

Household Types

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q7e. Ease of walking in City of Lawrence					
Very satisfied	16.9%	13.6%	16.1%	13.4%	15.1%
Satisfied	49.8%	52.4%	46.9%	43.9%	47.4%
Neutral	15.5%	18.4%	25.5%	26.2%	22.5%
Dissatisfied	16.0%	12.9%	10.6%	12.8%	12.7%
Very dissatisfied	1.9%	2.7%	0.9%	3.6%	2.2%
Q7f. Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence					
Very satisfied	7.5%	7.4%	6.2%	6.8%	6.8%
Satisfied	33.9%	29.4%	29.1%	23.0%	28.4%
Neutral	29.0%	36.0%	35.3%	42.3%	36.2%
Dissatisfied	24.7%	20.6%	22.5%	20.4%	22.0%
Very dissatisfied	4.8%	6.6%	6.9%	7.5%	6.6%

Household Types

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q7g. Safety of walking in City of Lawrence					
Very satisfied	9.0%	11.8%	14.3%	9.3%	11.2%
Satisfied	46.4%	41.0%	40.1%	44.4%	42.9%
Neutral	23.2%	27.8%	25.5%	24.8%	25.1%
Dissatisfied	17.1%	16.7%	16.8%	15.9%	16.6%
Very dissatisfied	4.3%	2.8%	3.4%	5.6%	4.2%
Q7h. Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence					
Very satisfied	6.5%	6.6%	4.8%	5.2%	5.5%
Satisfied	21.6%	18.4%	18.8%	19.6%	19.6%
Neutral	33.5%	39.0%	34.1%	34.1%	34.8%
Dissatisfied	30.3%	27.9%	30.7%	30.0%	29.9%
Very dissatisfied	8.1%	8.1%	11.6%	11.1%	10.2%

Household Types

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q7i. Existing bicycle system throughout County					
Very satisfied	6.7%	6.2%	3.9%	6.0%	5.5%
Satisfied	23.6%	18.6%	15.8%	17.5%	18.5%
Neutral	35.4%	35.7%	46.6%	43.3%	41.5%
Dissatisfied	28.7%	29.5%	22.9%	21.4%	24.6%
Very dissatisfied	5.6%	10.1%	10.8%	11.9%	9.9%
Q7j. Existing walking and hiking system throughout County					
Very satisfied	7.3%	6.6%	5.6%	5.3%	6.0%
Satisfied	34.9%	32.4%	33.9%	27.7%	32.0%
Neutral	36.5%	36.8%	39.5%	42.4%	39.2%
Dissatisfied	17.2%	18.4%	17.1%	17.4%	17.5%
Very dissatisfied	4.2%	5.9%	3.8%	7.2%	5.2%

Household Types

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q7k. Existing road system in County					
Very satisfied	8.8%	7.0%	6.6%	7.2%	7.3%
Satisfied	43.6%	42.0%	40.1%	48.0%	43.5%
Neutral	40.2%	32.9%	40.1%	31.9%	36.6%
Dissatisfied	6.9%	15.4%	9.7%	9.5%	9.9%
Very dissatisfied	0.5%	2.8%	3.4%	3.3%	2.7%
Q7l. Quality of public transportation (bus service)					
Very satisfied	9.1%	8.8%	6.6%	5.2%	7.0%
Satisfied	28.0%	27.2%	29.8%	32.0%	29.8%
Neutral	46.9%	42.4%	42.6%	47.2%	45.0%
Dissatisfied	12.6%	14.4%	16.5%	8.6%	12.8%
Very dissatisfied	3.4%	7.2%	4.4%	7.1%	5.5%

Household Types

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q7m. Other					
Very satisfied	17.6%	12.5%	7.7%	0.0%	8.5%
Satisfied	11.8%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	4.2%
Neutral	0.0%	0.0%	19.2%	10.5%	9.9%
Dissatisfied	23.5%	12.5%	23.1%	5.3%	16.9%
Very dissatisfied	47.1%	75.0%	46.2%	84.2%	60.6%

Household Types

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q8. Most Important					
Ease of travel by car on highways	4.1%	11.1%	8.2%	9.0%	8.0%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	28.0%	29.4%	26.5%	24.3%	26.6%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	1.8%	3.9%	4.7%	3.6%	3.6%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	1.8%	2.0%	2.9%	2.4%	2.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	8.3%	4.6%	6.2%	5.1%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	8.7%	6.5%	5.9%	3.9%	5.9%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	6.4%	4.6%	4.7%	6.9%	5.7%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	7.3%	9.2%	7.9%	4.8%	7.0%

Household Types

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)					
Existing bicycle system throughout County	2.8%	0.0%	2.4%	3.0%	2.3%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	1.8%	2.6%	2.4%	2.7%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	2.8%	3.3%	3.8%	4.5%	3.7%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	9.2%	9.8%	10.0%	8.7%	9.4%
Other	1.4%	2.6%	2.9%	3.0%	2.6%
No response	15.6%	10.5%	11.5%	18.0%	14.3%

Household Types

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q8. 2nd Important					
Ease of travel by car on highways	6.4%	3.9%	4.7%	6.6%	5.5%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	8.3%	19.0%	13.8%	11.1%	12.5%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	6.9%	11.8%	7.9%	7.5%	8.2%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	6.0%	5.9%	4.4%	4.8%	5.1%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	6.9%	2.0%	8.2%	5.1%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	7.3%	9.2%	5.9%	6.3%	6.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	10.1%	12.4%	8.8%	10.5%	10.1%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	12.4%	9.2%	12.1%	10.2%	11.1%

Household Types

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q8. 2nd Important (Cont.)					
Existing bicycle system throughout County	1.8%	7.2%	4.4%	2.4%	3.6%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	4.6%	0.7%	2.1%	2.1%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	4.6%	0.7%	4.7%	4.5%	4.0%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	4.1%	2.6%	4.7%	4.5%	4.2%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.3%	0.6%
No response	19.7%	15.7%	17.4%	24.0%	19.8%

Household Types

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q8. 3rd Important					
Ease of travel by car on highways	3.7%	4.6%	2.1%	2.1%	2.8%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	5.5%	4.6%	5.3%	5.4%	5.3%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	8.3%	4.6%	7.4%	6.0%	6.7%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	7.8%	5.2%	7.1%	8.4%	7.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	8.7%	7.8%	6.2%	6.9%	7.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	3.7%	6.5%	7.9%	4.8%	5.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	6.9%	7.8%	7.4%	7.5%	7.4%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	8.3%	9.8%	8.8%	8.1%	8.6%

Household Types

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q8. 3rd Important (Cont.)					
Existing bicycle system throughout County	4.6%	5.2%	5.0%	5.1%	5.0%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	7.3%	9.2%	5.9%	5.1%	6.4%
Existing road system in County	4.6%	6.5%	5.0%	5.1%	5.2%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	8.3%	7.2%	7.9%	4.2%	6.8%
Other	0.5%	0.7%	0.9%	0.3%	0.6%
No response	22.0%	20.3%	23.2%	30.9%	25.0%

Household Types

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q8. Most Important					
Ease of travel by car on highways	14.2%	19.6%	15.0%	17.7%	16.3%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	41.7%	52.9%	45.6%	40.8%	44.4%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	17.0%	20.3%	20.0%	17.1%	18.5%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	15.6%	13.1%	14.4%	15.6%	14.8%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	23.9%	14.4%	20.6%	17.1%	19.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	19.7%	22.2%	19.7%	15.0%	18.5%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	23.4%	24.8%	20.9%	24.9%	23.2%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	28.0%	28.1%	28.8%	23.1%	26.7%

Household Types

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)					
Existing bicycle system throughout County	9.2%	12.4%	11.8%	10.5%	10.9%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	13.8%	12.4%	10.3%	9.9%	11.2%
Existing road system in County	11.9%	10.5%	13.5%	14.1%	12.9%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	21.6%	19.6%	22.6%	17.4%	20.4%
Other	2.8%	3.3%	4.7%	3.6%	3.7%
No response	15.6%	10.5%	11.5%	18.0%	14.3%

Household Types

Q9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q9. How satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?					
Very satisfied	5.5%	5.2%	4.1%	7.5%	5.6%
Satisfied	28.9%	28.1%	25.3%	22.5%	25.6%
Neutral	28.9%	25.5%	29.1%	32.4%	29.5%
Dissatisfied	12.4%	17.6%	11.5%	9.6%	12.0%
Very dissatisfied	5.5%	4.6%	5.0%	5.7%	5.3%
Don't know	18.8%	19.0%	25.0%	22.2%	21.9%

Household Types

Q11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q11. How satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?					
Very satisfied	2.8%	4.6%	3.2%	1.8%	2.9%
Satisfied	29.4%	28.1%	26.8%	31.8%	29.2%
Neutral	36.2%	36.6%	37.4%	31.5%	35.1%
Dissatisfied	15.1%	9.8%	13.5%	16.2%	14.2%
Very dissatisfied	2.8%	5.2%	4.4%	4.5%	4.2%
Don't know	13.8%	15.7%	14.7%	14.1%	14.4%

Household Types

Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?					
Very satisfied	2.3%	3.3%	1.5%	2.4%	2.2%
Satisfied	21.1%	20.3%	18.2%	18.9%	19.3%
Neutral	36.7%	32.0%	37.9%	42.6%	38.3%
Dissatisfied	2.8%	5.9%	7.6%	4.8%	5.5%
Very dissatisfied	2.3%	2.0%	0.6%	1.8%	1.5%
Don't know	34.9%	36.6%	34.1%	29.4%	33.1%

Household Types

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q15a. The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area.					
Strongly agree	38.0%	32.0%	28.4%	33.8%	32.7%
Agree	33.2%	33.3%	41.6%	32.0%	35.6%
Neutral	19.5%	16.0%	15.9%	20.1%	18.0%
Disagree	5.4%	14.0%	9.9%	10.7%	9.8%
Strongly disagree	3.9%	4.7%	4.2%	3.4%	3.9%
Q15b. Future retail development should primarily be located at the intersection of main streets.					
Strongly agree	9.8%	3.3%	4.8%	5.9%	6.0%
Agree	21.6%	26.7%	18.8%	21.0%	21.2%
Neutral	42.2%	38.7%	45.8%	42.9%	43.1%
Disagree	23.0%	30.7%	26.7%	25.6%	26.1%
Strongly disagree	3.4%	0.7%	3.9%	4.6%	3.6%

Household Types

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q15c. Future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods.					
Strongly agree	8.8%	7.2%	11.7%	8.3%	9.5%
Agree	44.1%	36.2%	33.1%	27.7%	34.0%
Neutral	26.5%	28.9%	34.0%	38.2%	33.1%
Disagree	14.7%	25.0%	16.0%	20.6%	18.5%
Strongly disagree	5.9%	2.6%	5.1%	5.2%	4.9%
Q15d. Available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings.					
Strongly agree	59.8%	54.2%	58.8%	50.5%	55.6%
Agree	23.0%	28.1%	23.1%	28.3%	25.6%
Neutral	9.8%	7.8%	9.8%	11.6%	10.0%
Disagree	4.9%	6.5%	6.8%	6.4%	6.2%
Strongly disagree	2.5%	3.3%	1.5%	3.3%	2.5%

Household Types

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q16a. I would like to see agricultural uses maintained in the County.					
Strongly agree	40.5%	38.2%	43.6%	49.5%	44.2%
Agree	41.0%	36.8%	37.3%	30.9%	35.8%
Neutral	15.6%	19.7%	15.8%	17.4%	16.8%
Disagree	2.4%	5.3%	2.4%	1.8%	2.6%
Strongly disagree	0.5%	0.0%	0.9%	0.3%	0.5%
Q16b. I would like to see major development directed inside the City limits.					
Strongly agree	20.8%	16.4%	21.7%	21.0%	20.6%
Agree	40.6%	36.2%	35.2%	37.0%	37.0%
Neutral	29.7%	36.2%	33.7%	28.1%	31.4%
Disagree	7.9%	9.9%	7.8%	10.8%	9.2%
Strongly disagree	1.0%	1.3%	1.5%	3.1%	1.9%

Household Types

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q16c. I would like to see more shopping opportunities in or near my neighborhood.					
Strongly agree	14.6%	14.5%	14.3%	7.0%	12.1%
Agree	31.7%	25.7%	28.3%	22.9%	26.9%
Neutral	34.6%	31.6%	33.3%	43.9%	36.7%
Disagree	13.7%	23.0%	19.0%	18.3%	18.3%
Strongly disagree	5.4%	5.3%	5.1%	7.9%	6.1%
Q16d. I would like to see more employment centers located near my home.					
Strongly agree	11.3%	17.8%	11.6%	8.2%	11.4%
Agree	28.4%	25.0%	22.1%	19.8%	23.0%
Neutral	39.7%	36.8%	45.4%	44.4%	42.7%
Disagree	15.7%	17.8%	15.5%	18.5%	16.8%
Strongly disagree	4.9%	2.6%	5.4%	9.1%	6.1%

Household Types

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q16e. I would like to see a modest increase in height of development if it means less expansion of the city out into the County.					
Strongly agree	18.9%	15.3%	16.4%	13.1%	15.8%
Agree	36.8%	35.3%	37.3%	37.3%	36.9%
Neutral	30.8%	28.0%	31.6%	30.9%	30.6%
Disagree	10.9%	16.0%	11.6%	12.8%	12.5%
Strongly disagree	2.5%	5.3%	3.0%	5.8%	4.1%
Q16f. I would like to see Downtown accommodate more development.					
Strongly agree	13.3%	18.4%	15.0%	11.2%	14.0%
Agree	34.0%	28.3%	36.0%	32.8%	33.4%
Neutral	32.5%	26.3%	30.0%	36.8%	32.2%
Disagree	17.7%	17.8%	13.5%	14.3%	15.2%
Strongly disagree	2.5%	9.2%	5.4%	4.9%	5.2%

Household Types

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q16g. I would like to see development that includes a better mix of uses in order to live, work, and play in close proximity.					
Strongly agree	31.2%	31.8%	31.8%	24.1%	29.3%
Agree	44.4%	41.1%	39.6%	45.7%	42.8%
Neutral	19.0%	20.5%	24.7%	24.4%	22.8%
Disagree	3.4%	5.3%	2.4%	3.0%	3.2%
Strongly disagree	2.0%	1.3%	1.5%	2.7%	2.0%

Household Types

Q17. From the following list, please check ALL the reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County. (Check all that apply)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q17a. The reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County.					
Not enough time	55.5%	62.1%	47.4%	26.4%	44.6%
Difficult to travel to meetings	9.6%	7.2%	6.8%	9.9%	8.5%
Not sure how to get involved	39.0%	40.5%	38.2%	28.5%	35.6%
Don't believe I can make a difference	29.4%	35.3%	35.0%	41.1%	35.8%
Don't have enough information	34.9%	43.8%	48.2%	35.4%	40.7%
Other	10.1%	11.1%	9.7%	16.2%	12.1%
None Chosen	7.3%	1.3%	2.9%	5.7%	4.5%

Household Types

Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?					
Very knowledgeable	2.3%	3.3%	1.8%	2.4%	2.3%
Somewhat knowledgeable	17.0%	24.2%	16.8%	25.8%	20.8%
Not sure	10.1%	9.2%	12.9%	16.2%	12.8%
Not knowledgeable	65.1%	62.7%	67.4%	54.1%	62.0%
Don't Know	5.5%	0.7%	1.2%	1.5%	2.1%

Household Types

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					
0 - 2 years	9.2%	4.6%	8.8%	4.2%	6.9%
3 - 5 years	6.3%	4.6%	11.2%	3.3%	6.7%
6 - 10 years	15.5%	11.8%	13.0%	5.1%	10.7%
11 - 20 years	35.7%	30.1%	26.8%	13.0%	24.6%
21 years or more	33.3%	49.0%	40.1%	74.4%	51.1%

Household Types

Q21. What is your age?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q21. What is your age?					
Under 35 years	28.6%	4.6%	29.7%	0.3%	16.3%
35 - 44 years	48.7%	21.7%	15.6%	0.6%	18.1%
45 - 54 years	17.6%	59.9%	36.5%	0.6%	24.6%
55 - 64 years	2.0%	7.9%	10.6%	45.5%	19.8%
65 - 74 years	2.0%	2.6%	4.7%	34.9%	13.7%
75+ years	1.0%	3.3%	2.9%	18.1%	7.5%

Household Types

Q22. Do you own or rent your home?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q22. Do you own or rent your home?					
Own	83.6%	86.9%	72.1%	92.1%	83.0%
Rent	16.4%	13.1%	27.9%	7.9%	17.0%

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?					
Single family	86.6%	88.2%	72.6%	88.8%	83.0%
Duplex/triplex	9.9%	5.2%	11.5%	5.4%	8.3%
Apartment/condo	3.5%	4.6%	14.7%	4.5%	7.7%
Mobile home	0.0%	2.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%

Household Types

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:					
Under 25,000	9.7%	2.1%	12.2%	7.2%	8.7%
$25,000 - $49,999	13.8%	10.3%	21.6%	19.9%	17.8%
$50,000 - $74,999	15.8%	18.6%	21.9%	17.0%	18.6%
$75,000 - $99,999	19.4%	20.7%	18.5%	21.6%	20.0%
$100,000 - $149,999	25.0%	22.8%	17.9%	22.2%	21.4%
$150,000 or more	16.3%	25.5%	7.8%	12.1%	13.5%

Q26. Your gender:

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q26. Your gender:					
Male	44.0%	48.0%	45.8%	54.2%	48.4%
Female	56.0%	52.0%	54.2%	45.8%	51.6%

Household Types

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?					
Yes	5.5%	5.9%	4.8%	2.4%	4.4%
No	94.5%	94.1%	95.2%	97.6%	95.6%

Q28. Which of the following best describes your race? (Without "Not Provided)

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q28. Which of the following best describes your race?					
African American (Non-Hispanic)	0.5%	3.3%	0.9%	1.2%	1.2%
White (Non-Hispanic)	91.3%	86.9%	89.4%	92.8%	90.4%
Native American	4.1%	2.6%	2.1%	1.5%	2.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.3%	2.6%	3.2%	0.0%	1.9%
Other	2.3%	3.3%	3.2%	3.0%	3.0%

Household Types

Q29. What is your current employment status?

N=1046	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q29. What is your current employment status?					
Full time employment	75.5%	78.9%	71.6%	36.7%	62.2%
Part time employment	14.4%	8.6%	10.1%	10.0%	10.8%
Full-time student	0.9%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	1.3%
Full-time homemaker	4.6%	4.6%	2.1%	1.8%	2.9%
Unemployed	0.9%	3.3%	5.1%	1.5%	2.8%
Retired	3.7%	4.6%	7.8%	50.0%	20.0%

Household Types

Q30. Where do you work?

N=756	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q30. Where do you work?					
City of Lawrence	60.8%	54.9%	63.9%	64.3%	61.6%
Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	6.2%	10.5%	6.6%	8.4%	7.5%
KC Metro area	11.3%	16.5%	12.8%	11.0%	12.7%
Topeka Metro area	14.4%	12.8%	11.7%	6.5%	11.5%
Other	14.4%	11.3%	9.5%	16.2%	12.4%

Household Types

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?					
Agriculture	2.1%	3.0%	2.2%	1.9%	2.2%
Administrative or Support	5.2%	7.5%	5.1%	7.1%	6.0%
Construction	4.1%	1.5%	2.2%	2.6%	2.6%
Manufacturing	2.1%	6.8%	4.0%	5.8%	4.4%
Wholesale Trade	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.3%
Food, Hospitality, Entertainment	3.1%	3.0%	5.1%	1.3%	3.4%
Retail	4.6%	3.8%	5.5%	7.1%	5.3%
Health Services	15.5%	12.0%	16.8%	8.4%	13.9%
Transportation and Warehousing	2.6%	1.5%	0.4%	1.9%	1.5%
Finance, Insurance, or Real Estate	8.8%	6.8%	4.7%	3.9%	6.0%
Professional Services	10.3%	13.5%	8.0%	11.7%	10.3%
Scientific or Technical Services	4.6%	8.3%	7.7%	8.4%	7.1%

Household Types

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Household Types				Total
	Households with Children Under Age 10	Households with Children Ages 10-19	Households with Adults Ages 20-54 and No Children	Household with Adults Ages 55+ and No Children	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do? (Cont.)					
Educational Services (Pre-school-12th grade)	8.8%	10.5%	9.5%	9.1%	9.4%
Educational Services (University/College)	13.9%	13.5%	12.4%	18.8%	14.4%
Government	5.2%	3.0%	8.4%	3.9%	5.7%
Armed Services	0.5%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.4%
Other	13.9%	7.5%	12.0%	14.9%	12.3%

Section 5
Household Income

Household Income

Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?							
City of Lawrence	84.5%	80.8%	73.9%	77.2%	72.5%	74.0%	75.7%
Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	15.5%	19.2%	26.1%	22.8%	27.5%	26.0%	24.3%
Q1a. Maintaining rural character							
Very important	32.5%	36.8%	29.9%	26.1%	30.7%	24.4%	30.6%
Somewhat important	42.5%	35.7%	41.4%	45.7%	37.6%	42.5%	40.2%
Not sure	16.3%	20.5%	15.5%	16.5%	18.0%	15.0%	17.2%
Not important	8.8%	7.0%	13.2%	11.7%	13.7%	18.1%	12.0%

Household Income

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q1b. Preserving historic buildings							
Very important	60.5%	57.3%	54.7%	47.9%	51.2%	48.1%	52.5%
Somewhat important	30.9%	32.2%	36.9%	44.3%	39.6%	45.0%	38.5%
Not sure	6.2%	5.8%	5.0%	4.2%	5.3%	4.7%	5.0%
Not important	2.5%	4.7%	3.4%	3.6%	3.9%	2.3%	4.0%
Q1c. Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods							
Very important	46.9%	42.7%	45.6%	44.5%	36.9%	34.6%	41.0%
Somewhat important	38.3%	39.2%	41.7%	36.6%	45.1%	52.3%	42.0%
Not sure	13.6%	15.2%	8.9%	13.1%	11.7%	7.7%	12.0%
Not important	1.2%	2.9%	3.9%	5.8%	6.3%	5.4%	5.0%

Household Income

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q1d. Development of the Clinton Lake Area							
Very important	31.3%	14.0%	16.9%	15.7%	18.0%	14.7%	17.0%
Somewhat important	26.3%	35.1%	36.2%	33.5%	37.4%	34.1%	34.2%
Not sure	18.8%	24.0%	23.2%	23.6%	19.4%	14.0%	21.5%
Not important	23.8%	26.9%	23.7%	27.2%	25.2%	37.2%	27.3%
Q1e. Quality housing for all income groups							
Very important	70.0%	66.7%	57.2%	57.8%	41.5%	37.2%	54.0%
Somewhat important	18.8%	23.4%	29.4%	29.2%	38.2%	40.3%	30.2%
Not sure	8.8%	7.0%	7.8%	6.3%	12.1%	10.1%	8.9%
Not important	2.5%	2.9%	5.6%	6.8%	8.2%	12.4%	6.9%

Household Income

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q1f. Walking and biking trails							
Very important	54.4%	44.2%	46.1%	42.6%	46.6%	52.3%	45.8%
Somewhat important	34.2%	36.0%	43.9%	38.4%	35.9%	37.7%	38.4%
Not sure	5.1%	10.5%	5.0%	6.8%	7.8%	6.2%	7.4%
Not important	6.3%	9.3%	5.0%	12.1%	9.7%	3.8%	8.4%
Q1g. Maintaining community identity.							
Very important	48.1%	46.8%	47.8%	51.3%	45.4%	51.5%	47.2%
Somewhat important	29.6%	31.6%	35.6%	30.2%	38.6%	31.5%	33.7%
Not sure	18.5%	19.3%	11.7%	13.8%	12.6%	13.1%	15.0%
Not important	3.7%	2.3%	5.0%	4.8%	3.4%	3.8%	4.1%

Household Income

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q1h. Downtown stability							
Very important	50.6%	57.9%	60.0%	62.5%	64.1%	67.4%	60.8%
Somewhat important	30.9%	28.1%	30.0%	25.5%	26.7%	24.8%	27.6%
Not sure	17.3%	8.8%	6.1%	5.2%	3.9%	3.1%	6.3%
Not important	1.2%	5.3%	3.9%	6.8%	5.3%	4.7%	5.3%
Q1i. Transportation alternatives to the car							
Very important	51.3%	48.8%	46.1%	35.6%	32.9%	30.0%	39.4%
Somewhat important	32.5%	32.0%	31.7%	36.1%	34.8%	37.7%	33.9%
Not sure	12.5%	12.2%	8.9%	13.6%	13.5%	12.3%	12.2%
Not important	3.8%	7.0%	13.3%	14.7%	18.8%	20.0%	14.5%

Household Income

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q1j. Availability of arts and cultural opportunities							
Very important	37.5%	36.6%	41.7%	40.7%	33.8%	42.3%	38.6%
Somewhat important	46.3%	38.4%	43.3%	39.7%	45.9%	41.5%	41.3%
Not sure	15.0%	13.4%	7.2%	6.9%	12.6%	7.7%	11.0%
Not important	1.3%	11.6%	7.8%	12.7%	7.7%	8.5%	9.2%
Q1k. Appearance of multi-family residential developments							
Very important	31.6%	18.6%	21.9%	30.7%	24.4%	25.2%	25.3%
Somewhat important	43.0%	43.0%	38.8%	40.1%	41.0%	40.9%	40.8%
Not sure	20.3%	25.6%	21.9%	18.2%	22.4%	18.9%	21.2%
Not important	5.1%	12.8%	17.4%	10.9%	12.2%	15.0%	12.7%

Household Income

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q1l. Incorporating natural areas into development projects							
Very important	47.5%	42.7%	41.7%	43.5%	38.2%	48.8%	42.5%
Somewhat important	23.8%	25.7%	29.4%	31.4%	42.0%	38.0%	32.6%
Not sure	11.3%	19.3%	15.6%	15.7%	11.1%	5.4%	14.1%
Not important	17.5%	12.3%	13.3%	9.4%	8.7%	7.8%	10.8%
Q1m. Creating employment opportunities							
Very important	70.4%	70.9%	69.1%	81.7%	72.9%	74.4%	73.6%
Somewhat important	21.0%	25.6%	25.3%	15.2%	21.7%	20.2%	21.1%
Not sure	7.4%	3.5%	2.8%	2.1%	2.4%	3.9%	3.2%
Not important	1.2%	0.0%	2.8%	1.0%	2.9%	1.6%	2.1%

Household Income

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q1n. Parks, recreation, open space							
Very important	68.8%	58.7%	54.7%	53.4%	58.1%	63.8%	58.0%
Somewhat important	23.8%	32.6%	41.9%	36.6%	36.0%	34.6%	35.5%
Not sure	6.3%	6.4%	2.8%	5.2%	4.9%	0.8%	4.6%
Not important	1.3%	2.3%	0.6%	4.7%	1.0%	0.8%	1.9%
Q1o. Protecting high value farmland							
Very important	51.9%	54.1%	43.0%	44.0%	40.6%	34.1%	45.0%
Somewhat important	27.2%	29.1%	31.8%	30.9%	33.8%	28.7%	30.3%
Not sure	16.0%	15.1%	17.9%	17.3%	17.4%	21.7%	17.1%
Not important	4.9%	1.7%	7.3%	7.9%	8.2%	15.5%	7.6%

Household Income

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q1p. Appearance of commercial areas							
Very important	28.8%	26.7%	25.1%	37.0%	29.1%	36.2%	31.1%
Somewhat important	48.8%	52.3%	51.4%	47.4%	55.3%	50.8%	51.1%
Not sure	20.0%	15.1%	15.1%	10.9%	11.7%	9.2%	12.7%
Not important	2.5%	5.8%	8.4%	4.7%	3.9%	3.8%	5.1%
Q1q. Managing future growth							
Very important	55.6%	55.2%	62.8%	58.9%	55.8%	60.0%	58.5%
Somewhat important	30.9%	34.3%	31.7%	32.8%	34.5%	27.7%	31.9%
Not sure	11.1%	8.7%	2.8%	5.7%	7.8%	6.9%	6.6%
Not important	2.5%	1.7%	2.8%	2.6%	1.9%	5.4%	3.0%

Household Income

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q1r. Activities and housing for the Retirement Community							
Very important	39.5%	33.5%	29.8%	28.3%	26.1%	17.7%	29.2%
Somewhat important	35.8%	50.6%	48.3%	47.1%	48.3%	54.6%	47.5%
Not sure	19.8%	12.9%	14.0%	15.7%	18.4%	20.8%	16.1%
Not important	4.9%	2.9%	7.9%	8.9%	7.2%	6.9%	7.3%
Q1s. Other							
Very important	82.4%	78.9%	84.6%	88.2%	86.2%	94.1%	85.4%
Somewhat important	0.0%	10.5%	11.5%	2.9%	6.9%	5.9%	7.0%
Not sure	17.6%	5.3%	3.8%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	3.8%
Not important	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	8.8%	3.4%	0.0%	3.8%

Household Income

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q2. Most Important							
Maintaining rural character	6.0%	4.1%	3.3%	4.7%	4.8%	8.4%	5.3%
Preserving historic buildings	4.8%	2.9%	5.6%	3.1%	3.4%	3.8%	3.9%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	2.4%	3.5%	3.9%	5.2%	3.4%	1.5%	3.3%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	2.4%	0.6%	1.1%	0.5%	1.9%	1.5%	1.3%
Quality housing for all income groups	20.2%	19.2%	16.7%	10.9%	7.7%	8.4%	13.0%
Walking and biking trails	4.8%	2.9%	3.9%	3.6%	2.4%	2.3%	3.1%
Maintaining community identity	2.4%	5.8%	3.3%	7.3%	7.7%	3.8%	5.4%
Downtown stability	3.6%	7.6%	9.4%	11.4%	11.1%	15.3%	9.9%
Transportation alternatives to the car	8.3%	4.1%	2.8%	0.0%	2.4%	2.3%	2.6%

Household Income

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)							
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	0.0%	0.6%	2.2%	2.6%	0.5%	1.5%	1.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	1.2%	0.6%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	1.5%	0.5%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	1.2%	2.9%	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.3%	1.5%
Creating employment opportunities	13.1%	22.1%	23.3%	26.9%	29.0%	29.0%	24.3%
Parks, recreation, open space	2.4%	1.2%	1.1%	2.1%	2.4%	1.5%	1.7%
Protecting high value farmland	4.8%	8.1%	1.7%	2.6%	3.4%	0.0%	3.5%
Appearance of commercial areas	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.6%	0.5%	0.8%	0.6%
Managing future growth	4.8%	3.5%	8.9%	4.1%	10.1%	8.4%	6.9%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	0.0%	2.3%	1.1%	2.1%	1.0%	1.5%	1.5%
Other	9.5%	1.7%	5.0%	4.7%	4.8%	4.6%	4.9%
None chosen	8.3%	6.4%	5.0%	5.7%	2.9%	1.5%	5.4%

Household Income

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q2. 3rd Important							
Maintaining rural character	2.4%	2.9%	2.8%	1.0%	2.4%	0.0%	2.0%
Preserving historic buildings	4.8%	4.1%	3.3%	3.1%	4.3%	3.1%	3.6%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	6.0%	2.9%	6.1%	4.7%	4.8%	4.6%	4.6%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	1.2%	2.3%	0.6%	2.1%	3.9%	1.5%	2.1%
Quality housing for all income groups	8.3%	6.4%	4.4%	4.1%	7.7%	4.6%	5.8%
Walking and biking trails	7.1%	7.6%	3.9%	5.7%	5.3%	9.9%	6.2%
Maintaining community identity	4.8%	2.3%	3.3%	3.6%	4.8%	5.3%	3.7%
Downtown stability	1.2%	11.0%	11.7%	12.4%	8.7%	11.5%	9.6%
Transportation alternatives to the car	7.1%	8.1%	8.3%	4.7%	4.8%	5.3%	6.2%

Household Income

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q2. 3rd Important (Cont.)							
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	1.2%	4.1%	5.0%	4.7%	4.3%	6.9%	4.6%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	2.4%	1.2%	0.6%	1.0%	1.4%	2.3%	1.2%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	7.1%	2.3%	6.7%	3.6%	5.8%	3.8%	4.6%
Creating employment opportunities	9.5%	12.2%	8.3%	9.3%	9.7%	9.2%	9.8%
Parks, recreation, open space	6.0%	5.8%	8.9%	6.2%	6.8%	9.9%	7.6%
Protecting high value farmland	8.3%	5.2%	4.4%	7.3%	5.8%	4.6%	5.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	1.2%	0.6%	2.2%	5.7%	2.9%	5.3%	3.2%
Managing future growth	6.0%	8.1%	10.0%	10.9%	10.6%	6.9%	9.0%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	3.6%	3.5%	2.2%	1.0%	1.0%	0.8%	2.0%
Other	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.6%	1.0%	0.0%	0.8%
None chosen	11.9%	8.1%	7.2%	7.3%	3.9%	4.6%	7.6%

Household Income

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q2. 4th Important							
Maintaining rural character	4.8%	2.3%	2.2%	4.1%	1.4%	3.1%	2.9%
Preserving historic buildings	3.6%	4.1%	7.8%	4.1%	3.9%	4.6%	4.7%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	4.8%	4.7%	7.2%	7.3%	3.4%	1.5%	4.8%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	2.4%	1.2%	2.8%	2.6%	4.3%	3.1%	2.7%
Quality housing for all income groups	7.1%	5.8%	5.0%	6.2%	2.9%	3.1%	5.2%
Walking and biking trails	6.0%	5.2%	6.1%	2.6%	5.3%	4.6%	4.7%
Maintaining community identity	4.8%	4.1%	5.6%	4.1%	7.2%	4.6%	4.9%
Downtown stability	4.8%	4.1%	2.2%	6.7%	7.7%	6.9%	5.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	2.4%	7.0%	4.4%	4.1%	4.8%	3.8%	4.4%

Household Income

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q2. 4th Important (Cont.)							
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	6.0%	8.7%	3.9%	5.2%	6.8%	9.2%	6.1%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	2.4%	1.7%	2.2%	3.1%	2.9%	3.1%	2.7%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	4.8%	4.7%	4.4%	4.1%	5.3%	5.3%	4.7%
Creating employment opportunities	3.6%	8.1%	7.2%	7.8%	10.1%	6.1%	7.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	6.0%	7.6%	7.8%	5.7%	8.7%	8.4%	7.3%
Protecting high value farmland	2.4%	3.5%	5.0%	6.2%	1.9%	6.1%	4.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	6.0%	2.3%	0.6%	2.1%	2.9%	4.6%	2.6%
Managing future growth	10.7%	9.3%	10.6%	10.4%	9.7%	10.7%	10.3%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	3.6%	5.8%	2.2%	3.6%	3.4%	4.6%	3.8%
Other	0.0%	1.7%	2.8%	1.0%	2.4%	1.5%	1.6%
None chosen	14.3%	8.1%	10.0%	8.8%	4.8%	5.3%	9.2%

Household Income

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q2. Most Important							
Maintaining rural character	14.3%	14.0%	12.8%	13.5%	12.6%	13.0%	13.7%
Preserving historic buildings	21.4%	16.9%	18.3%	13.0%	14.5%	15.3%	15.8%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	16.7%	15.7%	23.3%	20.7%	15.9%	11.5%	16.9%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	8.3%	6.4%	5.0%	8.8%	13.0%	10.7%	8.9%
Quality housing for all income groups	47.6%	45.9%	33.3%	36.3%	25.6%	22.1%	33.8%
Walking and biking trails	25.0%	20.9%	18.3%	15.0%	19.3%	21.4%	18.8%
Maintaining community identity	11.9%	15.7%	19.4%	18.7%	23.7%	20.6%	18.2%
Downtown stability	22.6%	31.4%	35.6%	45.1%	43.5%	48.1%	38.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	20.2%	26.7%	22.8%	12.4%	18.4%	16.0%	18.6%

Household Income

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)							
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	7.1%	15.7%	16.7%	16.6%	14.5%	19.8%	15.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	7.1%	6.4%	3.9%	5.7%	6.3%	9.2%	6.1%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	13.1%	11.0%	13.9%	9.8%	15.0%	15.3%	12.8%
Creating employment opportunities	48.8%	55.2%	50.6%	55.4%	62.3%	61.1%	55.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	20.2%	19.8%	24.4%	19.2%	23.7%	26.7%	22.3%
Protecting high value farmland	17.9%	21.5%	16.1%	20.7%	15.9%	13.7%	18.4%
Appearance of commercial areas	8.3%	3.5%	4.4%	9.3%	7.7%	13.7%	7.5%
Managing future growth	22.6%	25.0%	37.2%	34.2%	35.7%	32.8%	32.5%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	11.9%	14.0%	7.8%	8.3%	8.7%	6.9%	9.9%
Other	10.7%	5.2%	8.9%	9.3%	9.2%	7.6%	8.4%
None chosen	8.3%	6.4%	5.0%	5.7%	2.9%	1.5%	5.4%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3a. A stronger community identity							
Strongly agree	25.6%	16.6%	16.8%	16.4%	17.2%	19.2%	17.5%
Agree	37.2%	40.2%	49.2%	42.3%	41.9%	34.4%	42.1%
Neutral	34.6%	39.6%	28.5%	35.4%	36.5%	37.6%	35.1%
Disagree	2.6%	3.0%	3.9%	5.3%	3.4%	7.2%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.6%	1.7%	0.5%	1.0%	1.6%	1.2%
Q3b. More attractive City entrances							
Strongly agree	12.3%	6.4%	9.5%	14.2%	14.1%	19.2%	11.8%
Agree	32.1%	36.3%	29.6%	33.7%	43.7%	29.2%	35.6%
Neutral	45.7%	41.5%	49.2%	39.5%	32.0%	36.2%	39.8%
Disagree	8.6%	12.3%	9.5%	11.1%	7.8%	10.8%	10.1%
Strongly disagree	1.2%	3.5%	2.2%	1.6%	2.4%	4.6%	2.7%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3c. More parks and open space							
Strongly agree	26.3%	21.5%	23.6%	21.4%	26.0%	19.8%	23.3%
Agree	42.5%	44.8%	48.3%	44.4%	46.1%	51.1%	45.7%
Neutral	25.0%	28.5%	25.3%	26.7%	22.5%	24.4%	25.6%
Disagree	5.0%	4.1%	1.7%	5.9%	3.9%	3.1%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	1.6%	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%
Q3d. More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails							
Strongly agree	46.9%	31.0%	33.1%	32.3%	36.7%	32.8%	34.7%
Agree	29.6%	36.3%	42.7%	37.6%	34.8%	38.9%	36.8%
Neutral	18.5%	22.2%	19.1%	18.5%	22.7%	22.9%	21.0%
Disagree	4.9%	8.2%	3.9%	7.9%	4.3%	3.1%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	2.3%	1.1%	3.7%	1.4%	2.3%	2.1%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3e. More bicycle paths and routes							
Strongly agree	38.0%	30.6%	31.1%	29.6%	35.0%	26.2%	31.1%
Agree	29.1%	25.3%	37.8%	33.3%	26.2%	32.3%	30.2%
Neutral	25.3%	30.6%	22.2%	22.8%	27.2%	31.5%	27.0%
Disagree	5.1%	10.0%	6.7%	9.0%	8.7%	6.9%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	2.5%	3.5%	2.2%	5.3%	2.9%	3.1%	3.5%
Q3f. More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown							
Strongly agree	18.8%	11.8%	10.0%	12.2%	13.0%	23.1%	13.9%
Agree	25.0%	31.2%	33.9%	28.0%	37.2%	28.5%	31.3%
Neutral	40.0%	31.2%	45.6%	34.9%	34.8%	36.2%	36.9%
Disagree	13.8%	21.2%	8.3%	20.1%	10.6%	8.5%	13.9%
Strongly disagree	2.5%	4.7%	2.2%	4.8%	4.3%	3.8%	4.1%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3g. More housing in and around downtown							
Strongly agree	7.6%	8.1%	5.0%	10.6%	7.7%	13.7%	8.7%
Agree	27.8%	19.2%	20.7%	25.4%	24.2%	25.2%	23.1%
Neutral	40.5%	46.5%	52.5%	42.3%	44.9%	40.5%	45.4%
Disagree	16.5%	23.8%	16.2%	15.9%	17.4%	16.0%	17.5%
Strongly disagree	7.6%	2.3%	5.6%	5.8%	5.8%	4.6%	5.2%
Q3h. More affordable housing within the City							
Strongly agree	63.3%	43.3%	40.2%	35.3%	23.3%	24.0%	35.2%
Agree	24.1%	39.2%	35.8%	36.3%	39.3%	21.7%	34.8%
Neutral	11.4%	16.4%	21.2%	19.5%	27.2%	41.1%	23.2%
Disagree	0.0%	1.2%	1.7%	8.4%	5.3%	10.9%	5.0%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%	4.9%	2.3%	1.8%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3i. More employment opportunities							
Strongly agree	69.1%	64.3%	56.7%	63.2%	61.2%	63.4%	61.5%
Agree	22.2%	29.2%	36.1%	27.9%	29.6%	24.4%	29.4%
Neutral	8.6%	6.4%	5.0%	6.8%	7.8%	10.7%	7.4%
Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.6%	1.0%	1.5%	1.0%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.7%
Q3j. Better protection of natural resources							
Strongly agree	57.0%	48.2%	38.3%	31.9%	36.4%	30.8%	39.3%
Agree	30.4%	38.8%	36.1%	40.4%	39.3%	42.3%	38.2%
Neutral	10.1%	11.8%	22.2%	21.3%	19.9%	20.0%	18.2%
Disagree	1.3%	1.2%	2.2%	4.8%	3.4%	3.8%	2.9%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	0.0%	1.1%	1.6%	1.0%	3.1%	1.5%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3k. Expanded public transportation							
Strongly agree	44.3%	31.6%	29.4%	19.6%	19.1%	17.7%	25.2%
Agree	30.4%	27.5%	30.0%	31.2%	29.9%	24.6%	28.7%
Neutral	21.5%	30.4%	28.9%	30.2%	30.9%	35.4%	30.5%
Disagree	1.3%	8.2%	5.6%	10.6%	12.7%	11.5%	8.9%
Strongly disagree	2.5%	2.3%	6.1%	8.5%	7.4%	10.8%	6.7%
Q3l. More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake							
Strongly agree	15.2%	14.5%	14.4%	9.0%	18.0%	13.0%	14.1%
Agree	31.6%	21.5%	27.2%	31.2%	27.2%	22.9%	26.5%
Neutral	39.2%	39.0%	36.7%	40.7%	38.3%	39.7%	39.2%
Disagree	8.9%	16.3%	17.2%	13.8%	11.2%	16.8%	14.2%
Strongly disagree	5.1%	8.7%	4.4%	5.3%	5.3%	7.6%	6.0%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3m. More activities for teenagers							
Strongly agree	30.4%	23.8%	20.6%	18.4%	16.9%	13.7%	19.9%
Agree	32.9%	38.4%	36.7%	41.6%	39.1%	38.9%	38.3%
Neutral	32.9%	33.7%	36.1%	34.7%	37.7%	41.2%	36.3%
Disagree	2.5%	2.9%	3.9%	3.7%	4.8%	4.6%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	1.2%	2.8%	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%	1.7%
Q3n. More activities for seniors							
Strongly agree	26.3%	13.4%	16.8%	14.3%	11.7%	6.1%	14.2%
Agree	36.3%	43.6%	35.2%	36.0%	36.6%	39.7%	37.7%
Neutral	36.3%	41.3%	40.2%	41.8%	44.9%	48.1%	42.4%
Disagree	1.3%	1.2%	5.6%	6.3%	5.4%	5.3%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.6%	2.2%	1.6%	1.5%	0.8%	1.4%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3o. Improved access to local foods							
Strongly agree	47.5%	24.6%	24.0%	20.6%	19.8%	18.3%	23.6%
Agree	27.5%	42.1%	41.9%	38.1%	34.3%	35.1%	37.4%
Neutral	23.8%	30.4%	29.6%	32.3%	35.3%	35.9%	32.0%
Disagree	1.3%	2.3%	2.2%	4.2%	8.7%	8.4%	4.8%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.6%	2.2%	4.8%	1.9%	2.3%	2.2%
Q3p. Better management of growth							
Strongly agree	33.8%	33.7%	35.8%	34.4%	40.8%	36.9%	36.7%
Agree	37.5%	40.7%	34.6%	38.6%	33.0%	28.5%	34.9%
Neutral	27.5%	20.3%	24.0%	21.2%	20.4%	24.6%	22.5%
Disagree	0.0%	3.5%	4.5%	3.7%	4.9%	8.5%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	1.7%	1.1%	2.1%	1.0%	1.5%	1.6%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3q. Maintaining the rural character of the County							
Strongly agree	26.3%	30.2%	22.8%	15.8%	20.8%	18.3%	22.5%
Agree	31.3%	36.0%	36.7%	40.5%	34.8%	29.8%	35.2%
Neutral	36.3%	29.1%	30.6%	34.2%	32.4%	32.8%	32.1%
Disagree	5.0%	4.1%	7.8%	7.4%	9.7%	16.0%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	0.6%	2.2%	2.1%	2.4%	3.1%	2.0%
Q3r. New or expanded conference space							
Strongly agree	10.0%	2.4%	3.9%	7.4%	3.9%	7.7%	5.2%
Agree	18.8%	14.7%	14.4%	20.1%	24.9%	23.8%	19.4%
Neutral	45.0%	51.2%	55.6%	49.7%	42.4%	43.8%	49.0%
Disagree	18.8%	22.9%	19.4%	15.9%	22.4%	19.2%	19.4%
Strongly disagree	7.5%	8.8%	6.7%	6.9%	6.3%	5.4%	7.0%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3s. Multi-use neighborhoods							
Strongly agree	16.5%	8.3%	6.7%	7.0%	9.3%	3.8%	7.6%
Agree	27.8%	29.6%	33.3%	32.8%	30.2%	26.2%	30.3%
Neutral	46.8%	49.1%	43.3%	47.8%	43.9%	51.5%	47.4%
Disagree	8.9%	10.1%	12.2%	8.1%	12.2%	15.4%	11.3%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	3.0%	4.4%	4.3%	4.4%	3.1%	3.4%
Q3t. Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities							
Strongly agree	25.0%	21.6%	18.0%	21.8%	21.7%	22.3%	20.7%
Agree	36.3%	31.6%	43.8%	36.7%	47.8%	41.5%	39.7%
Neutral	36.3%	35.7%	30.9%	32.4%	24.2%	28.5%	31.2%
Disagree	2.5%	7.6%	5.6%	5.3%	2.9%	6.2%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	3.5%	1.7%	3.7%	3.4%	1.5%	2.9%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3u. More arts and cultural opportunities							
Strongly agree	22.5%	15.1%	13.9%	18.0%	14.6%	18.5%	16.2%
Agree	37.5%	34.9%	41.1%	33.3%	40.0%	40.8%	37.7%
Neutral	32.5%	36.0%	34.4%	34.4%	33.7%	31.5%	33.9%
Disagree	7.5%	9.9%	6.7%	9.5%	8.8%	4.6%	8.4%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	4.1%	3.9%	4.8%	2.9%	4.6%	3.8%
Q3v. Development of the communications network (fiber)							
Strongly agree	31.6%	30.0%	26.8%	30.0%	38.7%	37.7%	32.9%
Agree	29.1%	26.5%	39.1%	35.3%	31.4%	38.5%	32.2%
Neutral	34.2%	38.8%	29.1%	27.9%	24.5%	18.5%	29.2%
Disagree	3.8%	3.5%	3.9%	4.2%	4.4%	4.6%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	2.6%	1.0%	0.8%	1.6%

Household Income

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q3w. Stronger retirement community							
Strongly agree	20.0%	15.3%	18.0%	13.8%	12.1%	6.1%	14.5%
Agree	27.5%	37.6%	28.7%	32.4%	33.5%	36.6%	33.2%
Neutral	48.8%	43.5%	45.5%	45.7%	47.6%	48.1%	45.4%
Disagree	2.5%	3.5%	4.5%	5.9%	4.9%	8.4%	5.3%
Strong disagree	1.3%	0.0%	3.4%	2.1%	1.9%	0.8%	1.7%
Q3x. Other							
Strongly agree	64.3%	73.3%	81.3%	65.4%	73.7%	90.0%	72.9%
Agree	0.0%	6.7%	12.5%	11.5%	10.5%	0.0%	7.5%
Neutral	28.6%	13.3%	6.3%	7.7%	15.8%	10.0%	13.1%
Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
Strongly disagree	7.1%	6.7%	0.0%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	2.4%	3.5%	2.8%	4.1%	2.4%	3.8%	3.5%
More attractive City entrances	0.0%	0.6%	1.1%	3.1%	0.5%	2.3%	1.2%
More parks and open space	1.2%	4.1%	1.7%	3.1%	1.9%	1.5%	2.7%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	6.0%	4.1%	2.8%	1.6%	5.8%	6.1%	4.3%
More bicycle paths and routes	2.4%	1.7%	0.0%	2.1%	1.9%	0.8%	1.3%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	4.8%	0.6%	2.2%	0.5%	3.4%	7.6%	2.8%
More housing in and around downtown	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	1.6%	3.9%	0.0%	1.5%
More affordable housing within the City	14.3%	14.0%	13.3%	7.8%	6.3%	6.1%	9.6%
More employment opportunities	20.2%	25.0%	25.0%	33.7%	30.4%	38.2%	28.2%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	6.0%	5.8%	6.1%	5.2%	3.4%	0.8%	4.6%
Expanded public transportation	0.0%	1.7%	5.6%	2.1%	0.0%	0.8%	1.8%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	1.2%	1.7%	0.6%	1.0%	1.4%	2.3%	1.3%
More activities for teenagers	2.4%	2.9%	2.8%	1.0%	2.4%	1.5%	2.1%
More activities for seniors	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%
Improved access to local foods	3.6%	2.3%	0.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Better management of growth	1.2%	4.7%	7.8%	9.3%	11.6%	6.9%	7.8%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.6%	3.5%	5.6%	2.1%	3.4%	3.1%	3.8%
New or expanded conference space	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	2.4%	1.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.8%	0.8%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	0.0%	2.3%	1.7%	3.1%	0.5%	0.0%	1.3%
More arts and cultural opportunities	1.2%	0.6%	1.1%	2.6%	1.0%	1.5%	1.2%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	2.4%	6.4%	3.3%	2.6%	6.3%	8.4%	4.9%
Stronger retirement community	1.2%	2.9%	1.1%	0.5%	1.9%	0.8%	1.6%
Other	11.9%	3.5%	4.4%	2.6%	4.8%	3.1%	4.6%
No response	11.9%	7.0%	6.7%	6.7%	5.8%	3.8%	7.2%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	1.2%	0.6%	1.1%	2.6%	3.9%	2.3%	1.9%
More attractive City entrances	2.4%	1.7%	0.6%	1.6%	2.4%	0.8%	1.4%
More parks and open space	1.2%	3.5%	2.2%	3.1%	1.9%	5.3%	3.1%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	4.8%	8.1%	3.3%	6.7%	4.3%	6.1%	5.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	4.8%	7.6%	1.7%	2.6%	6.8%	6.1%	5.0%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	2.4%	0.6%	2.8%	2.6%	3.4%	3.8%	2.5%
More housing in and around downtown	2.4%	1.2%	0.6%	2.1%	2.4%	3.8%	1.9%
More affordable housing within the City	11.9%	12.2%	13.3%	15.0%	5.3%	4.6%	10.0%
More employment opportunities	13.1%	16.3%	16.7%	8.8%	12.1%	10.7%	13.2%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	4.8%	7.0%	6.7%	5.7%	6.8%	6.9%	6.3%
Expanded public transportation	11.9%	2.3%	5.0%	4.1%	3.4%	2.3%	4.3%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	1.2%	1.7%	3.9%	3.1%	4.8%	4.6%	3.2%
More activities for teenagers	2.4%	5.2%	3.3%	3.6%	5.8%	2.3%	4.1%
More activities for seniors	1.2%	2.9%	2.2%	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%	1.8%
Improved access to local foods	4.8%	2.3%	3.3%	3.1%	2.9%	0.8%	2.7%
Better management of growth	1.2%	5.2%	10.6%	9.3%	8.2%	12.2%	8.0%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	4.8%	3.5%	4.4%	2.1%	3.9%	6.1%	4.1%
New or expanded conference space	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.6%	0.5%	3.1%	1.0%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	1.2%	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	1.5%	0.7%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	6.0%	2.9%	1.1%	3.1%	4.3%	6.9%	3.7%
More arts and cultural opportunities	0.0%	0.6%	1.1%	1.6%	1.0%	1.5%	1.1%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	1.2%	4.7%	4.4%	5.2%	5.3%	2.3%	4.1%
Stronger retirement community	1.2%	0.6%	2.8%	1.6%	1.9%	0.0%	1.8%
Other	1.2%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.8%	0.6%
No response	13.1%	8.1%	7.8%	7.8%	6.3%	3.8%	8.1%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	2.4%	0.0%	2.8%	1.6%	0.5%	3.8%	1.7%
More attractive City entrances	7.1%	0.6%	1.7%	2.1%	3.4%	3.1%	2.6%
More parks and open space	0.0%	4.1%	1.7%	2.1%	5.8%	2.3%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	7.1%	5.2%	9.4%	5.7%	5.3%	5.3%	6.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	3.6%	4.1%	5.0%	3.6%	3.4%	3.8%	3.6%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	3.6%	4.7%	2.8%	1.0%	2.9%	2.3%	2.7%
More housing in and around downtown	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	3.1%	1.0%	2.3%	1.7%
More affordable housing within the City	2.4%	5.8%	3.3%	3.6%	6.3%	1.5%	4.3%
More employment opportunities	7.1%	6.4%	8.9%	13.0%	6.8%	7.6%	8.6%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	4.8%	8.1%	6.1%	4.7%	4.8%	4.6%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	6.0%	6.4%	3.3%	3.1%	2.9%	6.9%	4.4%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	3.6%	1.2%	1.1%	2.1%	4.3%	3.1%	2.7%
More activities for teenagers	9.5%	5.2%	3.9%	3.6%	2.4%	6.9%	4.5%
More activities for seniors	2.4%	4.1%	2.2%	3.1%	2.4%	0.8%	2.9%
Improved access to local foods	8.3%	2.3%	3.3%	3.1%	3.4%	2.3%	3.3%
Better management of growth	3.6%	9.3%	10.6%	4.7%	9.7%	9.9%	7.9%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	0.0%	5.2%	4.4%	4.7%	1.9%	3.1%	3.3%
New or expanded conference space	0.0%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	3.6%	1.2%	3.9%	1.6%	3.9%	0.0%	2.2%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	6.0%	2.3%	3.3%	4.1%	5.3%	9.9%	4.6%
More arts and cultural opportunities	1.2%	2.3%	1.1%	5.2%	2.9%	4.6%	2.9%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	3.6%	4.7%	5.6%	7.8%	8.7%	6.9%	6.6%
Stronger retirement community	1.2%	2.3%	2.2%	4.1%	1.0%	0.8%	2.2%
Other	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	1.0%	1.0%	0.8%	0.7%
No response	13.1%	11.0%	10.0%	10.4%	8.2%	6.1%	10.4%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. 4th Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	2.4%	2.3%	1.1%	1.6%	1.4%	0.8%	1.5%
More attractive City entrances	2.4%	0.6%	1.7%	4.1%	2.9%	6.1%	2.8%
More parks and open space	1.2%	2.3%	1.7%	1.6%	6.8%	2.3%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	3.6%	2.9%	5.6%	4.1%	4.8%	4.6%	4.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	3.6%	4.1%	7.8%	5.7%	3.4%	3.1%	4.5%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	3.6%	2.9%	5.3%	2.4%
More housing in and around downtown	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	2.1%	1.0%	1.5%	1.2%
More affordable housing within the City	10.7%	6.4%	6.7%	7.3%	2.9%	3.8%	5.7%
More employment opportunities	1.2%	6.4%	4.4%	3.6%	6.3%	3.1%	4.5%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	9.5%	5.2%	5.6%	4.1%	7.2%	3.8%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	4.8%	6.4%	4.4%	1.6%	3.9%	0.8%	3.6%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	1.2%	2.3%	3.3%	1.6%	2.9%	3.1%	2.6%
More activities for teenagers	7.1%	2.9%	4.4%	5.7%	1.9%	3.8%	4.2%
More activities for seniors	2.4%	0.6%	1.1%	4.1%	1.4%	0.8%	1.9%
Improved access to local foods	3.6%	5.2%	5.0%	2.6%	2.9%	6.9%	4.0%
Better management of growth	4.8%	8.1%	5.0%	7.3%	5.3%	6.1%	6.4%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.6%	6.4%	3.9%	3.6%	3.4%	0.8%	3.7%
New or expanded conference space	2.4%	0.6%	1.7%	1.6%	2.4%	3.8%	1.9%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	1.2%	1.7%	1.1%	0.5%	1.9%	2.3%	1.3%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	6.0%	5.8%	7.2%	6.7%	9.7%	6.1%	6.8%
More arts and cultural opportunities	2.4%	2.3%	4.4%	2.6%	3.4%	7.6%	3.5%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	3.6%	5.8%	6.7%	3.1%	4.3%	9.9%	5.4%
Stronger retirement community	3.6%	4.1%	2.8%	3.6%	3.4%	2.3%	3.2%
Other	0.0%	1.2%	0.6%	1.6%	0.5%	2.3%	1.1%
No response	17.9%	13.4%	13.3%	16.1%	13.0%	9.2%	14.4%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	8.3%	6.4%	7.8%	9.8%	8.2%	10.7%	8.7%
More attractive City entrances	11.9%	3.5%	5.0%	10.9%	9.2%	12.2%	8.0%
More parks and open space	3.6%	14.0%	7.2%	9.8%	16.4%	11.5%	11.5%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	21.4%	20.3%	21.1%	18.1%	20.3%	22.1%	20.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	14.3%	17.4%	14.4%	14.0%	15.5%	13.7%	14.4%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	11.9%	6.4%	8.3%	7.8%	12.6%	19.1%	10.3%
More housing in and around downtown	2.4%	5.2%	4.4%	8.8%	8.2%	7.6%	6.4%
More affordable housing within the City	39.3%	38.4%	36.7%	33.7%	20.8%	16.0%	29.6%
More employment opportunities	41.7%	54.1%	55.0%	59.1%	55.6%	59.5%	54.5%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	25.0%	26.2%	24.4%	19.7%	22.2%	16.0%	22.4%
Expanded public transportation	22.6%	16.9%	18.3%	10.9%	10.1%	10.7%	14.1%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	7.1%	7.0%	8.9%	7.8%	13.5%	13.0%	9.8%
More activities for teenagers	21.4%	16.3%	14.4%	14.0%	12.6%	14.5%	14.9%
More activities for seniors	6.0%	7.6%	7.2%	8.8%	5.8%	3.1%	7.0%
Improved access to local foods	20.2%	12.2%	12.2%	11.4%	9.2%	9.9%	11.3%
Better management of growth	10.7%	27.3%	33.9%	30.6%	34.8%	35.1%	30.2%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	11.9%	18.6%	18.3%	12.4%	12.6%	13.0%	15.0%
New or expanded conference space	2.4%	2.3%	2.8%	4.7%	4.8%	8.4%	4.1%

Household Income

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	8.3%	4.1%	6.1%	3.1%	6.8%	4.6%	5.0%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	17.9%	13.4%	13.3%	17.1%	19.8%	22.9%	16.4%
More arts and cultural opportunities	4.8%	5.8%	7.8%	11.9%	8.2%	15.3%	8.8%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	10.7%	21.5%	20.0%	18.7%	24.6%	27.5%	20.9%
Stronger retirement community	7.1%	9.9%	8.9%	9.8%	8.2%	3.8%	8.8%
Other	13.1%	5.8%	5.6%	6.2%	6.8%	6.9%	6.9%
No response	11.9%	7.0%	6.7%	6.7%	5.8%	3.8%	7.2%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5a. Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities							
Major strength	29.3%	27.8%	32.4%	37.7%	35.6%	45.3%	35.0%
Strength	40.2%	51.5%	44.9%	49.2%	49.8%	38.3%	45.9%
Neutral	25.6%	19.5%	19.9%	10.5%	12.7%	14.8%	16.8%
Weakness	4.9%	0.6%	2.3%	2.6%	2.0%	1.6%	2.1%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Q5b. Availability of retail choices							
Major strength	10.8%	8.4%	7.3%	4.2%	4.4%	4.6%	6.5%
Strength	37.3%	36.5%	43.8%	37.4%	41.9%	35.4%	38.8%
Neutral	31.3%	31.7%	29.2%	26.8%	33.0%	23.8%	29.5%
Weakness	13.3%	21.6%	15.7%	26.8%	16.3%	30.0%	20.7%
Major weakness	7.2%	1.8%	3.9%	4.7%	4.4%	6.2%	4.5%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5c. Existing sidewalk network							
Major strength	6.0%	4.1%	4.0%	3.7%	3.4%	4.6%	3.9%
Strength	34.9%	24.9%	31.6%	28.6%	40.0%	31.5%	31.4%
Neutral	30.1%	49.7%	43.5%	46.6%	32.2%	41.5%	42.4%
Weakness	24.1%	20.1%	19.8%	17.5%	20.0%	20.8%	19.5%
Major weakness	4.8%	1.2%	1.1%	3.7%	4.4%	1.5%	2.9%
Q5d. Protection of natural resources							
Major strength	6.0%	4.8%	3.4%	3.8%	2.4%	2.3%	3.5%
Strength	18.1%	22.8%	27.7%	24.2%	28.8%	32.3%	26.0%
Neutral	53.0%	55.1%	52.5%	54.3%	57.1%	52.3%	54.1%
Weakness	16.9%	14.4%	15.8%	16.7%	9.8%	11.5%	14.4%
Major weakness	6.0%	3.0%	0.6%	1.1%	2.0%	1.5%	2.1%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5e. Public transportation							
Major strength	14.5%	7.1%	2.8%	3.1%	4.4%	2.3%	4.9%
Strength	30.1%	39.1%	32.8%	39.8%	29.9%	26.2%	33.0%
Neutral	31.3%	37.3%	44.1%	39.8%	49.5%	54.6%	44.0%
Weakness	15.7%	14.2%	16.9%	15.7%	15.2%	15.4%	15.5%
Major weakness	8.4%	2.4%	3.4%	1.6%	1.0%	1.5%	2.7%
Q5f. Character of neighborhoods							
Major strength	13.3%	7.7%	9.0%	9.0%	8.3%	10.9%	9.2%
Strength	41.0%	47.9%	39.5%	50.8%	49.5%	43.0%	45.1%
Neutral	32.5%	33.7%	40.1%	29.1%	30.4%	33.6%	34.4%
Weakness	12.0%	10.1%	10.2%	11.1%	10.3%	12.5%	10.5%
Major weakness	1.2%	0.6%	1.1%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.8%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5g. Availability of housing choices							
Major strength	7.2%	3.0%	6.2%	3.7%	3.9%	3.1%	4.7%
Strength	19.3%	22.0%	18.0%	31.9%	31.2%	30.2%	26.2%
Neutral	36.1%	38.7%	43.8%	37.8%	39.5%	47.3%	40.4%
Weakness	25.3%	31.5%	27.5%	23.4%	22.4%	15.5%	24.1%
Major weakness	12.0%	4.8%	4.5%	3.2%	2.9%	3.9%	4.6%
Q5h. Availability of parks and open space							
Major strength	16.9%	11.3%	11.9%	15.2%	16.7%	12.3%	13.5%
Strength	44.6%	60.7%	55.7%	59.2%	54.9%	55.4%	55.8%
Neutral	21.7%	21.4%	26.1%	19.4%	24.0%	26.9%	23.8%
Weakness	16.9%	5.4%	5.1%	5.2%	4.4%	4.6%	6.2%
Major weakness	0.0%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5i. Employment opportunities							
Major strength	8.4%	4.1%	2.8%	2.6%	2.4%	3.8%	4.0%
Strength	8.4%	7.7%	11.8%	8.9%	9.3%	10.0%	9.5%
Neutral	39.8%	34.9%	39.9%	36.1%	35.1%	33.8%	35.9%
Weakness	26.5%	33.7%	30.9%	33.0%	35.1%	34.6%	33.0%
Major weakness	16.9%	19.5%	14.6%	19.4%	18.0%	17.7%	17.6%
Q5j. Historic buildings and areas							
Major strength	14.5%	9.5%	14.1%	18.8%	13.7%	16.9%	14.5%
Strength	54.2%	55.0%	48.6%	44.0%	52.9%	50.0%	50.3%
Neutral	22.9%	33.7%	31.6%	30.4%	31.4%	30.8%	30.9%
Weakness	6.0%	1.8%	5.6%	6.3%	2.0%	2.3%	4.0%
Major weakness	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5k. Rate of growth							
Major strength	4.8%	3.0%	2.2%	3.2%	2.9%	1.6%	3.3%
Strength	21.7%	17.6%	24.2%	21.1%	25.9%	22.5%	22.4%
Neutral	54.2%	60.6%	55.1%	46.3%	45.4%	42.6%	50.4%
Weakness	14.5%	16.4%	12.4%	25.3%	19.0%	23.3%	18.4%
Major weakness	4.8%	2.4%	6.2%	4.2%	6.8%	10.1%	5.5%
Q5l. Unique local identity							
Major strength	33.7%	26.6%	32.6%	36.8%	36.1%	40.3%	33.5%
Strength	34.9%	41.4%	44.9%	38.9%	40.5%	42.6%	41.4%
Neutral	28.9%	27.8%	20.2%	20.5%	20.0%	14.7%	22.0%
Weakness	2.4%	4.1%	2.2%	3.2%	3.4%	1.6%	2.9%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.8%	0.2%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5m. Opportunities for community involvement							
Major strength	18.1%	16.7%	11.2%	21.6%	23.4%	23.8%	19.0%
Strength	36.1%	48.2%	56.7%	45.8%	44.4%	43.8%	46.5%
Neutral	38.6%	26.2%	27.0%	26.3%	26.3%	28.5%	28.0%
Weakness	6.0%	7.1%	4.5%	6.3%	4.9%	3.1%	5.7%
Major weakness	1.2%	1.8%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%
Q5n. Attention to environmental issues							
Major strength	11.3%	9.5%	9.6%	13.2%	9.3%	10.9%	10.5%
Strength	31.3%	31.0%	46.3%	35.4%	34.8%	36.7%	36.4%
Neutral	35.0%	39.9%	28.8%	37.6%	46.1%	44.5%	38.7%
Weakness	15.0%	14.9%	14.1%	12.2%	7.8%	7.8%	11.8%
Major weakness	7.5%	4.8%	1.1%	1.6%	2.0%	0.0%	2.6%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5o. Downtown							
Major strength	34.9%	39.1%	51.7%	48.2%	53.4%	53.8%	47.7%
Strength	38.6%	39.1%	35.4%	37.2%	31.4%	36.9%	35.1%
Neutral	18.1%	12.4%	7.9%	11.0%	10.3%	7.7%	11.5%
Weakness	6.0%	7.1%	5.1%	1.6%	4.9%	0.8%	4.5%
Major weakness	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.8%	1.3%
Q5p. Population growth							
Major strength	7.4%	6.6%	3.4%	3.2%	2.5%	3.9%	4.1%
Strength	17.3%	19.8%	26.6%	20.1%	24.8%	22.7%	22.7%
Neutral	65.4%	59.3%	54.8%	59.8%	56.4%	52.3%	57.1%
Weakness	4.9%	11.4%	9.6%	14.8%	10.9%	18.0%	12.0%
Major weakness	4.9%	3.0%	5.6%	2.1%	5.4%	3.1%	4.0%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5q. Presence of family farms							
Major strength	15.7%	8.9%	7.9%	11.6%	12.3%	7.0%	10.5%
Strength	19.3%	28.4%	39.9%	36.8%	31.9%	37.2%	33.6%
Neutral	43.4%	40.8%	35.4%	34.2%	42.2%	45.0%	39.5%
Weakness	15.7%	16.6%	12.9%	13.2%	11.3%	8.5%	12.6%
Major weakness	6.0%	5.3%	3.9%	4.2%	2.5%	2.3%	3.8%
Q5r. Quality of life							
Major strength	17.1%	20.1%	29.2%	30.9%	33.0%	35.4%	28.7%
Strength	48.8%	56.2%	53.9%	57.6%	50.7%	52.3%	53.3%
Neutral	24.4%	17.8%	13.5%	9.9%	13.3%	11.5%	14.5%
Weakness	9.8%	3.0%	2.8%	1.6%	2.0%	0.0%	2.7%
Major weakness	0.0%	3.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.8%	0.9%

Household Income

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q5s. Existing roadway network							
Major strength	7.2%	4.2%	5.1%	7.4%	4.4%	5.4%	5.8%
Strength	26.5%	31.5%	29.8%	21.6%	32.5%	30.8%	29.6%
Neutral	30.1%	36.9%	34.8%	32.1%	27.1%	32.3%	31.6%
Weakness	27.7%	21.4%	19.1%	27.4%	27.1%	23.1%	24.0%
Major weakness	8.4%	6.0%	11.2%	11.6%	8.9%	8.5%	9.0%
Q5t. Other							
Major strength	36.4%	22.2%	15.8%	8.7%	9.1%	9.1%	14.0%
Strength	9.1%	11.1%	0.0%	4.3%	4.5%	9.1%	5.0%
Neutral	27.3%	11.1%	5.3%	4.3%	18.2%	9.1%	11.0%
Weakness	0.0%	11.1%	21.1%	26.1%	9.1%	18.2%	15.0%
Major weakness	27.3%	44.4%	57.9%	56.5%	59.1%	54.5%	55.0%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. Most Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	10.7%	4.7%	4.4%	8.3%	10.1%	9.2%	7.9%
Availability of retail choices	2.4%	1.2%	2.2%	2.1%	0.5%	0.8%	1.7%
Existing sidewalk network	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	1.0%	1.4%	0.8%	0.8%
Protection of natural resources	2.4%	5.8%	2.8%	3.1%	3.4%	2.3%	3.3%
Public transportation	9.5%	2.9%	1.1%	1.0%	1.4%	0.8%	2.2%
Character of neighborhoods	1.2%	1.7%	3.3%	1.0%	1.4%	1.5%	1.7%
Availability of housing choices	3.6%	5.8%	4.4%	2.6%	1.0%	3.8%	3.3%
Availability of parks and open space	3.6%	1.2%	3.3%	1.6%	1.9%	2.3%	2.2%
Employment opportunities	10.7%	8.7%	11.1%	15.5%	7.7%	9.2%	10.4%
Historic buildings and areas	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%	2.1%	0.5%	3.1%	1.4%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	0.0%	2.3%	0.6%	1.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.1%
Unique local identity	8.3%	10.5%	10.6%	14.5%	12.6%	15.3%	12.1%
Opportunities for community involvement	1.2%	2.3%	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%
Attention to environmental issues	4.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.0%	0.0%	2.3%	1.5%
Downtown	9.5%	12.2%	13.9%	14.0%	20.3%	15.3%	14.2%
Population growth	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Presence of family farms	2.4%	2.3%	1.7%	1.0%	3.9%	0.0%	2.0%
Quality of life	4.8%	9.9%	13.3%	9.3%	12.1%	14.5%	11.2%
Existing roadway network	2.4%	4.7%	2.8%	3.6%	6.8%	5.3%	4.4%
Other	3.6%	1.2%	2.2%	1.6%	3.9%	0.8%	2.0%
No response	17.9%	19.2%	16.1%	14.0%	7.7%	11.5%	14.5%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. 2nd Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	1.2%	5.8%	3.3%	9.3%	5.8%	4.6%	5.8%
Availability of retail choices	3.6%	2.3%	1.1%	3.1%	3.4%	2.3%	2.7%
Existing sidewalk network	2.4%	1.2%	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%	0.8%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	7.1%	2.9%	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%	3.1%	2.4%
Public transportation	4.8%	2.3%	1.1%	1.0%	3.4%	2.3%	2.5%
Character of neighborhoods	4.8%	2.9%	3.9%	4.1%	3.4%	3.1%	3.4%
Availability of housing choices	4.8%	7.0%	3.9%	5.2%	2.9%	0.8%	4.3%
Availability of parks and open space	2.4%	6.4%	2.2%	3.1%	4.3%	3.8%	3.7%
Employment opportunities	13.1%	9.3%	7.8%	10.4%	4.8%	6.1%	8.1%
Historic buildings and areas	6.0%	1.2%	4.4%	2.6%	4.8%	3.1%	3.5%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. 2nd Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	2.4%	1.2%	1.1%	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%
Unique local identity	7.1%	6.4%	8.3%	7.3%	8.7%	9.9%	8.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	2.4%	2.3%	3.9%	2.6%	5.3%	6.1%	3.6%
Attention to environmental issues	2.4%	2.3%	2.8%	1.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.7%
Downtown	8.3%	11.6%	15.6%	14.0%	15.0%	19.8%	14.4%
Population growth	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.6%	1.4%	0.8%	0.9%
Presence of family farms	3.6%	4.1%	3.3%	1.6%	1.4%	2.3%	2.6%
Quality of life	2.4%	9.3%	11.1%	8.3%	15.0%	13.0%	10.1%
Existing roadway network	0.0%	1.2%	2.2%	3.1%	2.9%	2.3%	2.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%
No response	21.4%	19.2%	20.0%	15.0%	10.1%	13.7%	16.5%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. 3rd Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	7.1%	5.8%	7.8%	7.8%	13.0%	14.5%	9.4%
Availability of retail choices	2.4%	2.3%	5.6%	4.1%	5.3%	3.8%	3.9%
Existing sidewalk network	2.4%	0.6%	1.7%	2.6%	2.4%	0.8%	1.8%
Protection of natural resources	1.2%	2.9%	2.2%	3.1%	1.4%	0.8%	2.1%
Public transportation	4.8%	5.2%	4.4%	2.1%	0.5%	1.5%	2.7%
Character of neighborhoods	3.6%	2.9%	1.7%	2.1%	2.9%	2.3%	2.5%
Availability of housing choices	7.1%	2.9%	2.8%	4.1%	3.4%	3.1%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	6.0%	6.4%	3.3%	6.7%	4.8%	3.1%	5.2%
Employment opportunities	6.0%	7.0%	3.3%	2.6%	2.9%	3.1%	3.7%
Historic buildings and areas	3.6%	3.5%	2.8%	3.6%	3.9%	3.8%	3.5%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. 3rd Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	1.2%	1.2%	2.2%	4.1%	2.9%	1.5%	2.3%
Unique local identity	7.1%	3.5%	10.0%	4.7%	8.7%	11.5%	7.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	1.2%	7.0%	3.3%	2.6%	3.9%	2.3%	3.7%
Attention to environmental issues	3.6%	2.3%	3.9%	2.6%	2.9%	0.8%	3.0%
Downtown	2.4%	8.7%	11.7%	7.3%	13.5%	11.5%	9.6%
Population growth	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.0%	1.9%	2.3%	1.3%
Presence of family farms	3.6%	3.5%	2.2%	3.6%	2.4%	3.1%	3.2%
Quality of life	6.0%	8.1%	7.2%	14.5%	8.7%	9.9%	9.6%
Existing roadway network	4.8%	3.5%	2.8%	2.1%	1.4%	3.8%	2.8%
Other	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%
No response	25.0%	20.9%	20.6%	17.6%	12.6%	16.8%	18.9%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. 4th Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	9.5%	7.0%	11.1%	7.3%	9.2%	6.9%	8.2%
Availability of retail choices	3.6%	4.7%	1.7%	5.2%	4.8%	3.8%	3.8%
Existing sidewalk network	1.2%	1.7%	1.1%	1.0%	3.4%	0.8%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	3.6%	1.2%	2.8%	0.5%	2.9%	0.8%	1.9%
Public transportation	2.4%	2.9%	1.1%	2.6%	3.4%	0.8%	2.3%
Character of neighborhoods	0.0%	2.9%	2.2%	4.1%	3.4%	5.3%	3.3%
Availability of housing choices	1.2%	2.3%	4.4%	3.1%	3.9%	6.1%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	1.2%	7.0%	5.0%	6.7%	6.3%	3.8%	5.7%
Employment opportunities	2.4%	1.7%	2.2%	3.1%	1.4%	2.3%	2.1%
Historic buildings and areas	2.4%	5.2%	3.3%	2.1%	4.8%	4.6%	3.6%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. 4th Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	4.8%	2.9%	1.7%	3.6%	2.4%	0.0%	2.5%
Unique local identity	4.8%	7.0%	3.9%	3.6%	8.7%	3.8%	5.5%
Opportunities for community involvement	3.6%	2.9%	3.9%	4.1%	5.8%	3.8%	4.1%
Attention to environmental issues	2.4%	3.5%	3.3%	3.1%	1.4%	3.1%	2.8%
Downtown	11.9%	4.7%	7.8%	7.8%	3.9%	9.2%	7.0%
Population growth	1.2%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.4%	3.8%	1.4%
Presence of family farms	4.8%	2.9%	5.6%	1.6%	4.8%	0.8%	3.3%
Quality of life	8.3%	10.5%	10.0%	11.4%	12.6%	16.0%	11.0%
Existing roadway network	1.2%	1.7%	2.8%	4.1%	0.0%	3.8%	2.6%
Other	0.0%	0.6%	1.1%	2.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.9%
No response	29.8%	25.0%	23.3%	22.8%	15.5%	19.8%	22.8%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. Most Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	28.6%	23.3%	26.7%	32.6%	38.2%	35.1%	31.4%
Availability of retail choices	11.9%	10.5%	10.6%	14.5%	14.0%	10.7%	12.1%
Existing sidewalk network	6.0%	4.1%	5.6%	6.7%	9.2%	3.1%	5.8%
Protection of natural resources	14.3%	12.8%	9.4%	8.3%	9.2%	6.9%	9.8%
Public transportation	21.4%	13.4%	7.8%	6.7%	8.7%	5.3%	9.7%
Character of neighborhoods	9.5%	10.5%	11.1%	11.4%	11.1%	12.2%	10.9%
Availability of housing choices	16.7%	18.0%	15.6%	15.0%	11.1%	13.7%	14.5%
Availability of parks and open space	13.1%	20.9%	13.9%	18.1%	17.4%	13.0%	16.8%
Employment opportunities	32.1%	26.7%	24.4%	31.6%	16.9%	20.6%	24.4%
Historic buildings and areas	13.1%	11.0%	11.7%	10.4%	14.0%	14.5%	12.1%

Household Income

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	8.3%	7.6%	5.6%	10.4%	8.7%	3.1%	7.4%
Unique local identity	27.4%	27.3%	32.8%	30.1%	38.6%	40.5%	32.7%
Opportunities for community involvement	8.3%	14.5%	12.8%	10.9%	16.4%	13.7%	13.0%
Attention to environmental issues	13.1%	9.9%	11.7%	7.8%	6.3%	6.1%	9.0%
Downtown	32.1%	37.2%	48.9%	43.0%	52.7%	55.7%	45.2%
Population growth	2.4%	4.1%	2.8%	2.6%	4.8%	6.9%	3.8%
Presence of family farms	14.3%	12.8%	12.8%	7.8%	12.6%	6.1%	11.1%
Quality of life	21.4%	37.8%	41.7%	43.5%	48.3%	53.4%	41.9%
Existing roadway network	8.3%	11.0%	10.6%	13.0%	11.1%	15.3%	11.8%
Other	3.6%	2.3%	3.9%	6.2%	4.8%	2.3%	3.8%
No response	17.9%	19.2%	16.1%	14.0%	7.7%	11.5%	14.5%

Household Income

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q7a. Ease of travel by car on highways							
Very satisfied	21.0%	22.0%	21.8%	22.0%	21.5%	27.5%	22.5%
Satisfied	46.9%	57.1%	62.0%	49.2%	55.1%	47.3%	53.9%
Neutral	21.0%	11.9%	5.0%	12.6%	7.8%	12.2%	10.6%
Dissatisfied	7.4%	6.5%	9.5%	9.4%	10.7%	9.2%	9.0%
Very dissatisfied	3.7%	2.4%	1.7%	6.8%	4.9%	3.8%	4.0%
Q7b. Ease of travel by car on major streets							
Very satisfied	13.6%	11.2%	9.6%	9.4%	11.2%	16.0%	10.9%
Satisfied	37.0%	33.5%	36.0%	35.4%	35.6%	32.1%	35.8%
Neutral	24.7%	16.5%	21.9%	19.3%	13.2%	16.8%	17.7%
Dissatisfied	14.8%	27.1%	23.6%	24.0%	29.8%	28.2%	25.4%
Very dissatisfied	9.9%	11.8%	9.0%	12.0%	10.2%	6.9%	10.2%

Household Income

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q7c. Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets							
Very satisfied	7.4%	11.2%	8.4%	7.9%	12.7%	14.5%	10.1%
Satisfied	43.2%	45.9%	50.6%	50.8%	47.8%	55.7%	49.3%
Neutral	29.6%	21.8%	26.4%	22.0%	26.8%	19.1%	23.6%
Dissatisfied	14.8%	15.3%	11.2%	13.1%	9.8%	9.9%	12.9%
Very dissatisfied	4.9%	5.9%	3.4%	6.3%	2.9%	0.8%	4.2%
Q7d. Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods							
Very satisfied	12.2%	12.4%	9.6%	7.9%	14.2%	14.7%	11.4%
Satisfied	40.2%	40.8%	50.8%	49.7%	47.1%	55.8%	47.4%
Neutral	30.5%	23.1%	23.7%	22.5%	24.5%	19.4%	24.0%
Dissatisfied	17.1%	14.8%	11.9%	12.0%	10.3%	7.8%	12.2%
Very dissatisfied	0.0%	8.9%	4.0%	7.9%	3.9%	2.3%	5.1%

Household Income

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q7e. Ease of walking in City of Lawrence							
Very satisfied	16.3%	15.4%	12.7%	16.1%	16.3%	15.0%	15.1%
Satisfied	42.5%	46.9%	60.1%	44.4%	41.8%	48.8%	47.4%
Neutral	23.8%	22.2%	13.9%	23.3%	28.6%	22.0%	22.5%
Dissatisfied	15.0%	13.6%	12.7%	12.8%	9.7%	13.4%	12.7%
Very dissatisfied	2.5%	1.9%	0.6%	3.3%	3.6%	0.8%	2.2%
Q7f. Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence							
Very satisfied	8.8%	6.9%	4.4%	9.4%	6.5%	5.3%	6.8%
Satisfied	33.8%	22.9%	29.6%	25.6%	29.2%	36.0%	28.4%
Neutral	32.4%	40.3%	39.6%	38.8%	32.7%	28.1%	36.2%
Dissatisfied	20.6%	23.6%	22.0%	21.3%	22.0%	22.8%	22.0%
Very dissatisfied	4.4%	6.3%	4.4%	5.0%	9.5%	7.9%	6.6%

Household Income

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q7g. Safety of walking in City of Lawrence							
Very satisfied	13.0%	8.7%	9.2%	13.7%	10.3%	15.3%	11.2%
Satisfied	36.4%	41.6%	48.6%	37.9%	44.6%	46.8%	42.9%
Neutral	26.0%	31.1%	28.3%	22.5%	23.1%	20.2%	25.1%
Dissatisfied	20.8%	13.7%	13.3%	20.9%	16.9%	15.3%	16.6%
Very dissatisfied	3.9%	5.0%	0.6%	4.9%	5.1%	2.4%	4.2%
Q7h. Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence							
Very satisfied	7.5%	2.1%	3.7%	8.6%	5.9%	6.2%	5.5%
Satisfied	19.4%	18.8%	22.8%	17.8%	20.0%	20.4%	19.6%
Neutral	32.8%	38.2%	35.2%	31.3%	35.9%	35.4%	34.8%
Dissatisfied	32.8%	28.5%	32.1%	34.4%	25.9%	27.4%	29.9%
Very dissatisfied	7.5%	12.5%	6.2%	8.0%	12.4%	10.6%	10.2%

Household Income

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q7i. Existing bicycle system throughout County							
Very satisfied	6.2%	3.5%	3.3%	6.7%	6.2%	8.1%	5.5%
Satisfied	20.0%	16.3%	19.0%	17.3%	18.0%	23.4%	18.5%
Neutral	46.2%	44.0%	43.1%	44.0%	37.3%	35.1%	41.5%
Dissatisfied	18.5%	27.0%	25.5%	25.3%	25.5%	23.4%	24.6%
Very dissatisfied	9.2%	9.2%	9.2%	6.7%	13.0%	9.9%	9.9%
Q7j. Existing walking and hiking system throughout County							
Very satisfied	9.4%	4.2%	6.4%	6.3%	6.8%	6.0%	6.0%
Satisfied	29.7%	31.9%	32.5%	34.4%	29.9%	35.3%	32.0%
Neutral	39.1%	45.1%	34.4%	41.9%	39.0%	33.6%	39.2%
Dissatisfied	15.6%	17.4%	20.4%	13.8%	17.5%	19.0%	17.5%
Very dissatisfied	6.3%	1.4%	6.4%	3.8%	6.8%	6.0%	5.2%

Household Income

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q7k. Existing road system in County							
Very satisfied	8.0%	8.1%	7.2%	5.6%	9.7%	5.5%	7.3%
Satisfied	40.0%	43.5%	45.2%	46.4%	38.3%	43.3%	43.5%
Neutral	40.0%	39.1%	38.6%	34.6%	34.2%	38.6%	36.6%
Dissatisfied	9.3%	8.1%	7.2%	10.1%	13.8%	8.7%	9.9%
Very dissatisfied	2.7%	1.2%	1.8%	3.4%	4.1%	3.9%	2.7%
Q7l. Quality of public transportation (bus service)							
Very satisfied	11.0%	5.6%	4.1%	8.9%	7.5%	7.1%	7.0%
Satisfied	34.2%	32.2%	34.5%	27.4%	28.9%	21.2%	29.8%
Neutral	35.6%	44.8%	41.4%	43.9%	49.7%	50.5%	45.0%
Dissatisfied	13.7%	12.6%	16.6%	12.7%	10.1%	14.1%	12.8%
Very dissatisfied	5.5%	4.9%	3.4%	7.0%	3.8%	7.1%	5.5%

Household Income

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q7m. Other							
Very satisfied	22.2%	25.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%
Satisfied	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
Neutral	33.3%	16.7%	7.1%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	9.9%
Dissatisfied	11.1%	16.7%	28.6%	16.7%	20.0%	0.0%	16.9%
Very dissatisfied	33.3%	41.7%	42.9%	83.3%	70.0%	100.0%	60.6%

Household Income

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q8. Most Important							
Ease of travel by car on highways	7.1%	4.7%	9.4%	9.3%	7.2%	7.6%	8.0%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	14.3%	27.3%	23.9%	26.4%	32.9%	30.5%	26.6%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	1.2%	5.8%	3.9%	5.7%	1.0%	3.8%	3.6%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	3.6%	1.2%	3.3%	2.6%	1.9%	2.3%	2.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	10.7%	6.4%	5.6%	5.7%	5.3%	6.9%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	6.0%	8.1%	6.7%	4.7%	4.8%	5.3%	5.9%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	8.3%	2.9%	5.0%	8.3%	7.7%	3.8%	5.7%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	4.8%	8.1%	7.2%	7.8%	6.8%	4.6%	7.0%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	0.0%	1.7%	2.2%	1.6%	2.9%	3.8%	2.3%

Household Income

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)							
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	2.4%	2.3%	3.9%	0.5%	1.4%	3.8%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	2.4%	4.1%	2.8%	4.1%	4.8%	3.8%	3.7%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	15.5%	11.0%	11.1%	9.3%	7.2%	6.9%	9.4%
Other	6.0%	2.3%	1.1%	1.6%	2.9%	3.1%	2.6%
No response	17.9%	14.0%	13.9%	12.4%	13.0%	13.7%	14.3%

Household Income

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q8. 2nd Important							
Ease of travel by car on highways	3.6%	4.1%	3.3%	6.2%	8.7%	6.9%	5.5%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	6.0%	8.7%	15.0%	17.1%	12.1%	9.9%	12.5%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	10.7%	8.1%	8.3%	7.8%	6.8%	7.6%	8.2%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	2.4%	7.6%	4.4%	6.7%	5.3%	3.8%	5.1%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	9.5%	4.1%	6.1%	5.7%	7.7%	4.6%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	4.8%	5.8%	7.2%	6.2%	7.7%	9.2%	6.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	14.3%	8.7%	11.1%	11.4%	10.6%	6.1%	10.1%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	9.5%	19.2%	8.3%	8.8%	9.2%	15.3%	11.1%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	2.4%	2.3%	6.7%	3.1%	2.9%	3.8%	3.6%

Household Income

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q8. 2nd Important (Cont.)							
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	1.2%	2.3%	2.2%	2.1%	2.4%	3.1%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	2.4%	4.1%	3.9%	3.6%	4.8%	4.6%	4.0%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	7.1%	4.7%	4.4%	3.6%	3.9%	4.6%	4.2%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.4%	0.0%	0.6%
No response	26.2%	20.3%	18.9%	16.1%	16.4%	20.6%	19.8%

Household Income

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q8. 3rd Important							
Ease of travel by car on highways	3.6%	4.1%	0.6%	2.6%	4.3%	3.1%	2.8%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	7.1%	5.2%	2.2%	6.7%	5.3%	4.6%	5.3%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	9.5%	7.0%	6.1%	6.2%	6.3%	5.3%	6.7%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	7.1%	8.7%	6.7%	6.2%	7.7%	7.6%	7.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	4.8%	6.4%	9.4%	6.7%	6.8%	9.2%	7.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	6.0%	6.4%	7.2%	5.2%	6.8%	4.6%	5.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	6.0%	7.6%	7.8%	8.8%	7.7%	6.1%	7.4%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	10.7%	7.0%	8.9%	8.3%	7.7%	10.7%	8.6%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	1.2%	7.0%	3.3%	5.2%	5.3%	6.9%	5.0%

Household Income

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q8. 3rd Important (Cont.)							
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	3.6%	6.4%	8.9%	5.2%	6.3%	7.6%	6.4%
Existing road system in County	2.4%	3.5%	7.8%	6.2%	5.8%	2.3%	5.2%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	7.1%	7.6%	4.4%	8.3%	7.2%	7.6%	6.8%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
No response	31.0%	23.3%	25.0%	23.3%	22.7%	24.4%	25.0%

Household Income

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q8. Most Important							
Ease of travel by car on highways	14.3%	12.8%	13.3%	18.1%	20.3%	17.6%	16.3%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	27.4%	41.3%	41.1%	50.3%	50.2%	45.0%	44.4%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	21.4%	20.9%	18.3%	19.7%	14.0%	16.8%	18.5%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	13.1%	17.4%	14.4%	15.5%	15.0%	13.7%	14.8%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	25.0%	16.9%	21.1%	18.1%	19.8%	20.6%	19.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	16.7%	20.3%	21.1%	16.1%	19.3%	19.1%	18.5%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	28.6%	19.2%	23.9%	28.5%	26.1%	16.0%	23.2%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	25.0%	34.3%	24.4%	24.9%	23.7%	30.5%	26.7%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	3.6%	11.0%	12.2%	9.8%	11.1%	14.5%	10.9%

Household Income

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)							
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	7.1%	11.0%	15.0%	7.8%	10.1%	14.5%	11.2%
Existing road system in County	7.1%	11.6%	14.4%	14.0%	15.5%	10.7%	12.9%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	29.8%	23.3%	20.0%	21.2%	18.4%	19.1%	20.4%
Other	6.0%	2.3%	2.8%	4.1%	4.3%	3.1%	3.7%
No response	17.9%	14.0%	13.9%	12.4%	13.0%	13.7%	14.3%

Household Income

Q9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q9. How satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?							
Very satisfied	8.3%	1.7%	6.1%	4.1%	7.2%	7.6%	5.6%
Satisfied	23.8%	22.7%	22.8%	28.5%	30.0%	27.5%	25.6%
Neutral	22.6%	26.7%	30.0%	30.1%	32.9%	29.8%	29.5%
Dissatisfied	10.7%	12.8%	12.8%	13.0%	7.2%	15.3%	12.0%
Very dissatisfied	7.1%	7.6%	4.4%	3.1%	5.8%	5.3%	5.3%
Don't know	27.4%	28.5%	23.9%	21.2%	16.9%	14.5%	21.9%

Household Income

Q11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q11. How satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?							
Very satisfied	4.8%	1.7%	2.2%	2.1%	2.9%	5.3%	2.9%
Satisfied	27.4%	25.6%	26.1%	33.2%	32.9%	33.6%	29.2%
Neutral	29.8%	36.0%	40.0%	31.1%	37.2%	31.3%	35.1%
Dissatisfied	11.9%	12.8%	10.6%	16.1%	14.5%	16.8%	14.2%
Very dissatisfied	8.3%	5.2%	2.2%	4.7%	2.4%	5.3%	4.2%
Don't know	17.9%	18.6%	18.9%	13.0%	10.1%	7.6%	14.4%

Household Income

Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?							
Very satisfied	1.2%	1.7%	2.2%	2.1%	2.9%	2.3%	2.2%
Satisfied	16.7%	18.0%	15.6%	25.4%	22.7%	17.6%	19.3%
Neutral	35.7%	36.0%	42.8%	35.2%	41.1%	42.7%	38.3%
Dissatisfied	9.5%	4.7%	5.0%	6.2%	4.3%	3.8%	5.5%
Very dissatisfied	2.4%	1.2%	0.0%	1.6%	1.4%	3.1%	1.5%
Don't know	34.5%	38.4%	34.4%	29.5%	27.5%	30.5%	33.1%

Household Income

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q15a. The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area.							
Strongly agree	21.4%	24.3%	28.8%	35.4%	40.1%	40.3%	32.7%
Agree	28.6%	45.0%	37.3%	36.5%	31.7%	34.1%	35.6%
Neutral	31.0%	16.6%	22.0%	16.1%	15.8%	11.6%	18.0%
Disagree	13.1%	10.7%	7.3%	7.8%	9.9%	10.1%	9.8%
Strongly disagree	6.0%	3.6%	4.5%	4.2%	2.5%	3.9%	3.9%
Q15b. Future retail development should primarily be located at the intersection of main streets.							
Strongly agree	3.7%	3.0%	2.3%	8.9%	10.3%	6.2%	6.0%
Agree	22.0%	21.1%	19.5%	22.0%	19.7%	24.6%	21.2%
Neutral	37.8%	47.0%	46.0%	39.8%	44.3%	39.2%	43.1%
Disagree	28.0%	25.3%	29.9%	23.6%	22.2%	29.2%	26.1%
Strongly disagree	8.5%	3.6%	2.3%	5.8%	3.4%	0.8%	3.6%

Household Income

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q15c. Future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods.							
Strongly agree	13.3%	8.3%	6.2%	9.4%	12.4%	8.5%	9.5%
Agree	33.7%	36.3%	40.1%	30.9%	32.2%	33.1%	34.0%
Neutral	30.1%	33.9%	35.0%	31.9%	33.2%	31.5%	33.1%
Disagree	16.9%	16.7%	15.3%	22.0%	16.3%	23.1%	18.5%
Strongly disagree	6.0%	4.8%	3.4%	5.8%	5.9%	3.8%	4.9%
Q15d. Available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings.							
Strongly agree	56.0%	60.8%	59.3%	60.2%	48.5%	47.3%	55.6%
Agree	20.2%	26.9%	26.6%	19.9%	30.9%	26.7%	25.6%
Neutral	20.2%	6.4%	7.3%	12.0%	9.8%	8.4%	10.0%
Disagree	2.4%	3.5%	4.5%	6.3%	8.3%	11.5%	6.2%
Strongly disagree	1.2%	2.3%	2.3%	1.6%	2.5%	6.1%	2.5%

Household Income

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q16a. I would like to see agricultural uses maintained in the County.							
Strongly agree	52.4%	51.5%	49.4%	40.8%	38.8%	34.6%	44.2%
Agree	26.8%	32.0%	33.7%	38.2%	40.3%	38.5%	35.8%
Neutral	17.1%	14.8%	15.2%	18.3%	16.0%	20.8%	16.8%
Disagree	3.7%	0.6%	1.1%	2.6%	3.9%	6.2%	2.6%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	1.2%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Q16b. I would like to see major development directed inside the City limits.							
Strongly agree	22.5%	22.8%	17.6%	22.6%	16.7%	28.5%	20.6%
Agree	37.5%	38.3%	37.5%	34.2%	43.1%	31.5%	37.0%
Neutral	32.5%	29.3%	31.8%	31.1%	31.9%	26.9%	31.4%
Disagree	6.3%	8.4%	9.1%	10.5%	7.4%	11.5%	9.2%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	1.2%	4.0%	1.6%	1.0%	1.5%	1.9%

Household Income

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q16c. I would like to see more shopping opportunities in or near my neighborhood.							
Strongly agree	20.5%	11.2%	10.7%	12.0%	10.7%	12.2%	12.1%
Agree	25.3%	27.6%	24.2%	25.1%	33.2%	23.7%	26.9%
Neutral	36.1%	35.3%	44.4%	36.1%	31.7%	32.8%	36.7%
Disagree	15.7%	20.6%	16.3%	19.4%	15.1%	24.4%	18.3%
Strongly disagree	2.4%	5.3%	4.5%	7.3%	9.3%	6.9%	6.1%
Q16d. I would like to see more employment centers located near my home.							
Strongly agree	22.9%	12.9%	7.3%	7.3%	10.6%	15.4%	11.4%
Agree	28.9%	22.9%	22.6%	25.1%	23.7%	15.4%	23.0%
Neutral	30.1%	43.5%	48.6%	42.9%	44.0%	36.9%	42.7%
Disagree	12.0%	14.7%	16.9%	18.3%	13.5%	26.9%	16.8%
Strongly disagree	6.0%	5.9%	4.5%	6.3%	8.2%	5.4%	6.1%

Household Income

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q16e. I would like to see a modest increase in height of development if it means less expansion of the city out into the County.							
Strongly agree	18.5%	15.0%	11.8%	16.4%	17.4%	21.5%	15.8%
Agree	27.2%	47.3%	44.9%	33.3%	35.3%	31.5%	36.9%
Neutral	37.0%	26.9%	24.7%	33.9%	31.4%	28.5%	30.6%
Disagree	9.9%	7.2%	15.2%	12.7%	14.0%	11.5%	12.5%
Strongly disagree	7.4%	3.6%	3.4%	3.7%	1.9%	6.9%	4.1%
Q16f. I would like to see Downtown accommodate more development.							
Strongly agree	13.3%	12.9%	11.2%	12.7%	15.0%	23.1%	14.0%
Agree	22.9%	28.2%	34.3%	35.4%	41.5%	35.4%	33.4%
Neutral	36.1%	39.4%	28.7%	33.9%	28.5%	23.1%	32.2%
Disagree	21.7%	15.3%	19.1%	12.7%	11.6%	10.8%	15.2%
Strongly disagree	6.0%	4.1%	6.7%	5.3%	3.4%	7.7%	5.2%

Household Income

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q16g. I would like to see development that includes a better mix of uses in order to live, work, and play in close proximity.							
Strongly agree	34.5%	33.7%	26.4%	27.2%	31.4%	28.7%	29.3%
Agree	40.5%	41.4%	44.9%	41.9%	40.6%	45.0%	42.8%
Neutral	23.8%	19.5%	20.8%	26.2%	22.2%	22.5%	22.8%
Disagree	1.2%	3.0%	4.5%	3.7%	3.4%	2.3%	3.2%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	2.4%	3.4%	1.0%	2.4%	1.6%	2.0%

Household Income

Q17. From the following list, please check ALL the reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County. (Check all that apply)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q17a. The reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County.							
Not enough time	40.5%	39.5%	43.3%	39.9%	53.1%	56.5%	44.6%
Difficult to travel to meetings	19.0%	8.7%	6.1%	7.8%	5.8%	9.2%	8.5%
Not sure how to get involved	40.5%	33.7%	43.9%	37.3%	34.8%	35.9%	35.6%
Don't believe I can make a difference	29.8%	37.8%	35.6%	39.4%	33.8%	33.6%	35.8%
Don't have enough information	52.4%	48.3%	47.2%	42.0%	28.0%	38.2%	40.7%
Other	13.1%	11.6%	15.6%	15.0%	7.7%	10.7%	12.1%
None Chosen	0.0%	4.1%	2.8%	4.1%	4.3%	3.1%	4.5%

Household Income

Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?							
Very knowledgeable	1.2%	0.0%	1.7%	2.6%	2.9%	5.3%	2.3%
Somewhat knowledgeable	10.7%	15.7%	17.2%	21.2%	31.4%	22.9%	20.8%
Not sure	13.1%	16.3%	13.3%	11.4%	10.1%	13.7%	12.8%
Not knowledgeable	75.0%	67.4%	66.7%	62.7%	55.1%	58.0%	62.0%
Don't Know	0.0%	0.6%	1.1%	2.1%	0.5%	0.0%	2.1%

Household Income

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?							
0 - 2 years	15.5%	8.8%	7.8%	4.1%	5.3%	5.3%	6.9%
3 - 5 years	9.5%	12.9%	5.0%	5.2%	3.9%	6.1%	6.7%
6 - 10 years	13.1%	7.0%	10.0%	10.4%	11.7%	13.7%	10.7%
11 - 20 years	15.5%	19.3%	23.9%	23.8%	30.6%	32.1%	24.6%
21 years or more	46.4%	52.0%	53.3%	56.5%	48.5%	42.7%	51.1%

Household Income

Q21. What is your age?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q21. What is your age?							
Under 35 years	42.9%	26.7%	15.7%	13.0%	12.6%	3.1%	16.3%
35 - 44 years	11.9%	11.0%	20.8%	16.1%	21.7%	24.4%	18.1%
45 - 54 years	11.9%	18.0%	27.0%	25.5%	26.6%	35.1%	24.6%
55 - 64 years	8.3%	20.9%	15.2%	19.3%	25.1%	22.1%	19.8%
65 - 74 years	6.0%	11.6%	15.7%	15.6%	11.1%	14.5%	13.7%
75+ years	19.0%	11.6%	5.6%	10.4%	2.9%	0.8%	7.5%

Household Income

Q22. Do you own or rent your home?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q22. Do you own or rent your home?							
Own	37.8%	63.7%	81.1%	91.7%	96.1%	98.5%	83.0%
Rent	62.2%	36.3%	18.9%	8.3%	3.9%	1.5%	17.0%

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?							
Single family	42.2%	66.9%	83.9%	88.0%	95.7%	98.5%	83.0%
Duplex/triplex	19.3%	13.4%	10.0%	7.8%	3.9%	1.5%	8.3%
Apartment/condo	31.3%	18.6%	5.6%	4.2%	0.5%	0.0%	7.7%
Mobile home	7.2%	1.2%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%

Household Income

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:							
Under 25,000	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%
$25,000 - $49,999	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.8%
$50,000 - $74,999	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.6%
$75,000 - $99,999	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
$100,000 - $149,999	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	21.4%
$150,000 or more	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	13.5%

Q26. Your gender:

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q26. Your gender:							
Male	33.7%	41.1%	46.9%	51.6%	50.7%	64.3%	48.4%
Female	66.3%	58.9%	53.1%	48.4%	49.3%	35.7%	51.6%

Household Income

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?							
Yes	8.5%	4.1%	6.2%	2.6%	3.9%	4.7%	4.4%
No	91.5%	95.9%	93.8%	97.4%	96.1%	95.3%	95.6%

Q28. Which of the following best describes your race? (Without "Not Provided)

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q28. Which of the following best describes your race?							
African American (Non-Hispanic)	1.2%	2.3%	0.6%	1.6%	0.5%	1.5%	1.2%
White (Non-Hispanic)	89.3%	89.5%	92.8%	89.1%	95.2%	90.8%	90.4%
Native American	6.0%	3.5%	2.2%	3.6%	0.0%	1.5%	2.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.0%	1.7%	0.6%	2.1%	1.0%	2.3%	1.9%
Other	2.4%	4.1%	2.8%	4.1%	2.4%	3.1%	3.0%

Household Income

Q29. What is your current employment status?

N=1046	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q29. What is your current employment status?							
Full time employment	20.2%	55.6%	68.0%	64.4%	75.4%	76.3%	62.2%
Part time employment	28.6%	11.1%	10.7%	6.8%	7.2%	6.9%	10.8%
Full-time student	7.1%	2.9%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Full-time homemaker	2.4%	1.2%	2.2%	2.6%	3.4%	5.3%	2.9%
Unemployed	15.5%	1.8%	1.1%	1.6%	1.9%	0.8%	2.8%
Retired	26.2%	27.5%	17.4%	24.6%	12.1%	10.7%	20.0%

Household Income

Q30. Where do you work?

N=756	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q30. Where do you work?							
City of Lawrence	82.9%	68.4%	62.9%	61.8%	52.6%	56.9%	61.6%
Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	4.9%	3.5%	14.3%	6.6%	7.0%	6.4%	7.5%
KC Metro area	4.9%	5.3%	8.6%	14.7%	17.0%	17.4%	12.7%
Topeka Metro area	4.9%	5.3%	8.6%	9.6%	19.9%	14.7%	11.5%
Other	7.3%	20.2%	10.7%	11.8%	8.8%	17.4%	12.4%

Household Income

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?							
Agriculture	2.4%	2.6%	3.6%	0.7%	2.9%	0.9%	2.2%
Administrative or Support	4.9%	7.0%	8.6%	5.9%	5.3%	2.8%	6.0%
Construction	2.4%	4.4%	4.3%	1.5%	0.6%	2.8%	2.6%
Manufacturing	4.9%	2.6%	5.0%	6.6%	1.8%	6.4%	4.4%
Wholesale Trade	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Food, Hospitality, Entertainment	19.5%	7.9%	0.7%	3.7%	0.6%	1.8%	3.4%
Retail	12.2%	8.8%	5.0%	3.7%	3.5%	3.7%	5.3%
Health Services	22.0%	13.2%	8.6%	11.8%	15.2%	20.2%	13.9%
Transportation and Warehousing	4.9%	3.5%	1.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Finance, Insurance, or Real Estate	2.4%	1.8%	4.3%	8.1%	8.8%	9.2%	6.0%
Professional Services	2.4%	3.5%	10.0%	10.3%	12.9%	17.4%	10.3%
Scientific or Technical Services	0.0%	8.8%	8.6%	4.4%	8.8%	7.3%	7.1%

Household Income

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						Total
	Under 25,000	$25,000 - $49,999	$50,000 - $74,999	$75,000 - $99,999	$100,000 - $149,999	$150,000 or more	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do? (Cont.)							
Educational Services (Pre-school-12th grade)	7.3%	11.4%	14.3%	12.5%	7.0%	0.9%	9.4%
Educational Services (University/College)	14.6%	11.4%	12.9%	12.5%	17.5%	13.8%	14.4%
Government	0.0%	2.6%	10.7%	5.1%	7.6%	1.8%	5.7%
Armed Services	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.4%
Other	7.3%	19.3%	7.1%	12.5%	12.3%	13.8%	12.3%

Section 6

Whether Respondents Reside Within the City of Lawrence or Douglas County

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1a. Maintaining rural character			
Very important	19.9%	63.1%	30.6%
Somewhat important	44.5%	27.0%	40.2%
Not sure	20.7%	6.7%	17.2%
Not important	15.0%	3.2%	12.0%
Q1b. Preserving historic buildings			
Very important	55.0%	44.6%	52.5%
Somewhat important	36.4%	45.0%	38.5%
Not sure	4.9%	5.6%	5.0%
Not important	3.7%	4.8%	4.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1c. Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods			
Very important	45.4%	27.2%	41.0%
Somewhat important	41.3%	44.4%	42.0%
Not sure	9.4%	20.0%	12.0%
Not important	3.9%	8.4%	5.0%
Q1d. Development of the Clinton Lake Area			
Very important	17.4%	15.5%	17.0%
Somewhat important	35.4%	30.7%	34.2%
Not sure	20.9%	23.5%	21.5%
Not important	26.3%	30.3%	27.3%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1e. Quality housing for all income groups			
Very important	57.2%	43.8%	54.0%
Somewhat important	29.9%	31.1%	30.2%
Not sure	7.8%	12.4%	8.9%
Not important	5.1%	12.7%	6.9%
Q1f. Walking and biking trails			
Very important	50.1%	32.4%	45.8%
Somewhat important	37.8%	40.4%	38.4%
Not sure	5.7%	12.4%	7.4%
Not important	6.4%	14.8%	8.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1g. Maintaining community identity.			
Very important	51.8%	32.9%	47.2%
Somewhat important	32.7%	36.9%	33.7%
Not sure	12.8%	21.7%	15.0%
Not important	2.7%	8.4%	4.1%
Q1h. Downtown stability			
Very important	66.5%	43.0%	60.8%
Somewhat important	25.5%	34.3%	27.6%
Not sure	4.7%	11.2%	6.3%
Not important	3.3%	11.6%	5.3%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1i. Transportation alternatives to the car			
Very important	42.7%	29.1%	39.4%
Somewhat important	35.2%	29.9%	33.9%
Not sure	10.2%	18.3%	12.2%
Not important	11.8%	22.7%	14.5%
Q1j. Availability of arts and cultural opportunities			
Very important	43.8%	22.0%	38.6%
Somewhat important	40.5%	43.6%	41.3%
Not sure	9.0%	17.2%	11.0%
Not important	6.6%	17.2%	9.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1k. Appearance of multi-family residential developments			
Very important	25.4%	24.9%	25.3%
Somewhat important	42.0%	36.9%	40.8%
Not sure	20.5%	23.3%	21.2%
Not important	12.1%	14.9%	12.7%
Q1l. Incorporating natural areas into development projects			
Very important	43.9%	38.0%	42.5%
Somewhat important	32.5%	32.8%	32.6%
Not sure	13.0%	17.6%	14.1%
Not important	10.6%	11.6%	10.8%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1m. Creating employment opportunities			
Very important	74.9%	69.4%	73.6%
Somewhat important	19.4%	26.6%	21.1%
Not sure	4.0%	0.8%	3.2%
Not important	1.8%	3.2%	2.1%
Q1n. Parks, recreation, open space			
Very important	61.7%	46.4%	58.0%
Somewhat important	32.5%	44.8%	35.5%
Not sure	4.5%	4.8%	4.6%
Not important	1.3%	4.0%	1.9%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1o. Protecting high value farmland			
Very important	39.4%	62.5%	45.0%
Somewhat important	32.8%	22.5%	30.3%
Not sure	19.8%	8.7%	17.1%
Not important	8.0%	6.3%	7.6%
Q1p. Appearance of commercial areas			
Very important	31.3%	30.3%	31.1%
Somewhat important	51.1%	51.0%	51.1%
Not sure	12.9%	12.4%	12.7%
Not important	4.7%	6.4%	5.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1q. Managing future growth			
Very important	60.4%	52.6%	58.5%
Somewhat important	30.7%	35.5%	31.9%
Not sure	6.4%	7.6%	6.6%
Not important	2.5%	4.4%	3.0%
Q1r. Activities and housing for the Retirement Community			
Very important	29.2%	28.9%	29.2%
Somewhat important	47.1%	48.6%	47.5%
Not sure	16.5%	14.9%	16.1%
Not important	7.2%	7.6%	7.3%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q1s. Other			
Very important	87.1%	80.5%	85.4%
Somewhat important	5.2%	12.2%	7.0%
Not sure	4.3%	2.4%	3.8%
Not important	3.4%	4.9%	3.8%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q2. Most Important			
Maintaining rural character	1.0%	18.5%	5.3%
Preserving historic buildings	4.8%	1.2%	3.9%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	3.9%	1.6%	3.3%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	1.6%	0.4%	1.3%
Quality housing for all income groups	14.5%	8.3%	13.0%
Walking and biking trails	3.4%	2.0%	3.1%
Maintaining community identity	6.2%	3.1%	5.4%
Downtown stability	11.9%	3.9%	9.9%
Transportation alternatives to the car	3.2%	0.8%	2.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)			
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	1.4%	2.0%	1.5%
Creating employment opportunities	24.1%	24.8%	24.3%
Parks, recreation, open space	2.0%	0.8%	1.7%
Protecting high value farmland	1.5%	9.8%	3.5%
Appearance of commercial areas	0.8%	0.0%	0.6%
Managing future growth	6.9%	6.7%	6.9%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	1.5%	1.6%	1.5%
Other	4.8%	5.1%	4.9%
None chosen	4.7%	7.9%	5.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q2. 3rd Important			
Maintaining rural character	0.8%	5.9%	2.0%
Preserving historic buildings	3.5%	3.9%	3.6%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	4.9%	3.5%	4.6%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	1.8%	3.1%	2.1%
Quality housing for all income groups	6.1%	5.1%	5.8%
Walking and biking trails	7.1%	3.5%	6.2%
Maintaining community identity	4.4%	1.6%	3.7%
Downtown stability	9.8%	8.7%	9.6%
Transportation alternatives to the car	6.3%	5.9%	6.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q2. 3rd Important (Cont.)			
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	5.4%	2.0%	4.6%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	1.4%	0.8%	1.2%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	5.1%	3.1%	4.6%
Creating employment opportunities	9.6%	10.6%	9.8%
Parks, recreation, open space	8.0%	6.3%	7.6%
Protecting high value farmland	4.4%	9.8%	5.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	3.3%	2.8%	3.2%
Managing future growth	9.0%	9.1%	9.0%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	1.6%	3.1%	2.0%
Other	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
None chosen	6.8%	10.2%	7.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q2. 4th Important			
Maintaining rural character	1.1%	8.3%	2.9%
Preserving historic buildings	4.7%	4.7%	4.7%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	5.1%	3.9%	4.8%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	2.9%	2.0%	2.7%
Quality housing for all income groups	5.6%	3.9%	5.2%
Walking and biking trails	5.1%	3.5%	4.7%
Maintaining community identity	5.3%	3.5%	4.9%
Downtown stability	6.4%	2.8%	5.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	4.5%	3.9%	4.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q2. 4th Important (Cont.)			
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	7.1%	3.1%	6.1%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	2.9%	2.0%	2.7%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	5.2%	3.1%	4.7%
Creating employment opportunities	6.7%	9.4%	7.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	7.6%	6.3%	7.3%
Protecting high value farmland	3.7%	7.9%	4.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	2.5%	2.8%	2.6%
Managing future growth	9.8%	11.8%	10.3%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	3.8%	3.9%	3.8%
Other	1.4%	2.4%	1.6%
None chosen	8.7%	10.6%	9.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q2. Most Important			
Maintaining rural character	4.7%	41.7%	13.7%
Preserving historic buildings	16.2%	14.6%	15.8%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	18.9%	10.6%	16.9%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	8.6%	9.8%	8.9%
Quality housing for all income groups	37.0%	24.0%	33.8%
Walking and biking trails	21.1%	11.8%	18.8%
Maintaining community identity	20.5%	11.0%	18.2%
Downtown stability	43.1%	24.4%	38.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	19.6%	15.7%	18.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)			
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	17.7%	7.5%	15.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	6.2%	5.9%	6.1%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	13.3%	11.4%	12.8%
Creating employment opportunities	54.3%	58.7%	55.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	23.6%	18.1%	22.3%
Protecting high value farmland	12.2%	37.4%	18.4%
Appearance of commercial areas	8.0%	5.9%	7.5%
Managing future growth	32.3%	33.1%	32.5%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	9.1%	12.6%	9.9%
Other	8.3%	8.7%	8.4%
None chosen	4.7%	7.9%	5.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3a. A stronger community identity			
Strongly agree	18.1%	15.6%	17.5%
Agree	43.6%	37.3%	42.1%
Neutral	34.2%	38.1%	35.1%
Disagree	3.1%	7.4%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	1.0%	1.6%	1.2%
Q3b. More attractive City entrances			
Strongly agree	12.1%	10.9%	11.8%
Agree	35.5%	35.9%	35.6%
Neutral	39.6%	40.3%	39.8%
Disagree	11.0%	7.3%	10.1%
Strongly disagree	1.8%	5.6%	2.7%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3c. More parks and open space			
Strongly agree	25.5%	16.3%	23.3%
Agree	46.9%	41.9%	45.7%
Neutral	23.2%	33.3%	25.6%
Disagree	3.3%	5.3%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	1.0%	3.3%	1.6%
Q3d. More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails			
Strongly agree	39.0%	20.9%	34.7%
Agree	37.0%	36.1%	36.8%
Neutral	18.1%	30.1%	21.0%
Disagree	4.5%	8.4%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	4.4%	2.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3e. More bicycle paths and routes			
Strongly agree	35.1%	18.5%	31.1%
Agree	30.8%	28.5%	30.2%
Neutral	24.6%	34.5%	27.0%
Disagree	7.1%	11.6%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	2.4%	6.8%	3.5%
Q3f. More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown			
Strongly agree	16.1%	6.8%	13.9%
Agree	31.7%	30.0%	31.3%
Neutral	37.1%	36.4%	36.9%
Disagree	12.0%	19.6%	13.9%
Strongly disagree	3.1%	7.2%	4.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3g. More housing in and around downtown			
Strongly agree	10.0%	4.8%	8.7%
Agree	24.9%	17.6%	23.1%
Neutral	44.6%	48.0%	45.4%
Disagree	16.2%	21.6%	17.5%
Strongly disagree	4.3%	8.0%	5.2%
Q3h. More affordable housing within the City			
Strongly agree	39.1%	22.9%	35.2%
Agree	32.4%	42.2%	34.8%
Neutral	22.1%	26.9%	23.2%
Disagree	4.6%	6.0%	5.0%
Strongly disagree	1.8%	2.0%	1.8%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3i. More employment opportunities			
Strongly agree	62.4%	58.6%	61.5%
Agree	28.2%	33.5%	29.4%
Neutral	7.5%	7.2%	7.4%
Disagree	1.1%	0.4%	1.0%
Strongly disagree	0.8%	0.4%	0.7%
Q3j. Better protection of natural resources			
Strongly agree	39.1%	39.9%	39.3%
Agree	38.3%	37.9%	38.2%
Neutral	18.4%	17.3%	18.2%
Disagree	2.7%	3.6%	2.9%
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1.2%	1.5%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3k. Expanded public transportation			
Strongly agree	28.1%	15.9%	25.2%
Agree	29.4%	26.4%	28.7%
Neutral	28.3%	37.8%	30.5%
Disagree	7.9%	11.8%	8.9%
Strongly disagree	6.3%	8.1%	6.7%
Q3l. More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake			
Strongly agree	14.8%	11.6%	14.1%
Agree	26.6%	26.1%	26.5%
Neutral	40.0%	36.9%	39.2%
Disagree	13.0%	18.1%	14.2%
Strongly disagree	5.6%	7.2%	6.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3m. More activities for teenagers			
Strongly agree	20.9%	16.9%	19.9%
Agree	37.6%	40.6%	38.3%
Neutral	36.3%	36.1%	36.3%
Disagree	3.6%	4.4%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	1.7%	2.0%	1.7%
Q3n. More activities for seniors			
Strongly agree	13.1%	17.4%	14.2%
Agree	37.1%	39.7%	37.7%
Neutral	44.3%	36.4%	42.4%
Disagree	4.3%	4.5%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	1.1%	2.0%	1.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3o. Improved access to local foods			
Strongly agree	24.5%	20.6%	23.6%
Agree	38.0%	35.6%	37.4%
Neutral	31.1%	34.8%	32.0%
Disagree	4.6%	5.3%	4.8%
Strongly disagree	1.8%	3.6%	2.2%
Q3p. Better management of growth			
Strongly agree	36.9%	36.0%	36.7%
Agree	34.2%	37.2%	34.9%
Neutral	23.4%	19.6%	22.5%
Disagree	4.1%	5.2%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	2.0%	1.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3q. Maintaining the rural character of the County			
Strongly agree	14.6%	47.2%	22.5%
Agree	36.2%	32.0%	35.2%
Neutral	36.7%	17.6%	32.1%
Disagree	10.1%	2.4%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	2.4%	0.8%	2.0%
Q3r. New or expanded conference space			
Strongly agree	5.1%	5.2%	5.2%
Agree	20.1%	17.3%	19.4%
Neutral	48.5%	50.4%	49.0%
Disagree	19.6%	19.0%	19.4%
Strongly disagree	6.7%	8.1%	7.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3s. Multi-use neighborhoods			
Strongly agree	8.9%	3.6%	7.6%
Agree	32.3%	24.3%	30.3%
Neutral	44.9%	55.1%	47.4%
Disagree	11.6%	10.1%	11.3%
Strongly disagree	2.3%	6.9%	3.4%
Q3t. Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities			
Strongly agree	22.8%	14.1%	20.7%
Agree	40.8%	36.5%	39.7%
Neutral	29.0%	38.2%	31.2%
Disagree	4.4%	8.8%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	3.1%	2.4%	2.9%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3u. More arts and cultural opportunities			
Strongly agree	19.0%	7.6%	16.2%
Agree	39.4%	32.1%	37.7%
Neutral	31.9%	40.2%	33.9%
Disagree	7.4%	11.6%	8.4%
Strongly disagree	2.3%	8.4%	3.8%
Q3v. Development of the communications network (fiber)			
Strongly agree	34.1%	29.1%	32.9%
Agree	31.7%	34.0%	32.2%
Neutral	28.6%	31.2%	29.2%
Disagree	4.2%	3.6%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	2.0%	1.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q3w. Stronger retirement community			
Strongly agree	14.1%	15.7%	14.5%
Agree	31.5%	38.6%	33.2%
Neutral	47.0%	40.6%	45.4%
Disagree	5.8%	3.6%	5.3%
Strong disagree	1.7%	1.6%	1.7%
Q3x. Other			
Strongly agree	74.1%	69.2%	72.9%
Agree	8.6%	3.8%	7.5%
Neutral	12.3%	15.4%	13.1%
Disagree	1.2%	0.0%	0.9%
Strongly disagree	3.7%	11.5%	5.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. Best Represent			
A stronger community identity	3.7%	3.1%	3.5%
More attractive City entrances	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%
More parks and open space	3.0%	1.6%	2.7%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	5.2%	1.6%	4.3%
More bicycle paths and routes	1.3%	1.6%	1.3%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%
More housing in and around downtown	1.5%	1.6%	1.5%
More affordable housing within the City	11.2%	4.3%	9.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)			
More employment opportunities	28.2%	28.3%	28.2%
Better protection of natural resources	3.8%	7.1%	4.6%
Expanded public transportation	2.0%	1.2%	1.8%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%
More activities for teenagers	2.4%	1.2%	2.1%
More activities for seniors	0.3%	0.8%	0.4%
Improved access to local foods	1.6%	0.0%	1.2%
Better management of growth	8.0%	7.5%	7.8%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	1.1%	12.2%	3.8%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)			
New or expanded conference space	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Multi-use neighborhoods	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	1.5%	0.8%	1.3%
More arts and cultural opportunities	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	5.6%	2.8%	4.9%
Stronger retirement community	1.1%	3.1%	1.6%
Other	4.9%	3.5%	4.6%
No response	6.1%	10.6%	7.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent			
A stronger community identity	1.6%	2.8%	1.9%
More attractive City entrances	1.6%	0.8%	1.4%
More parks and open space	3.3%	2.4%	3.1%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	5.7%	4.3%	5.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	5.8%	2.4%	5.0%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	2.9%	1.2%	2.5%
More housing in and around downtown	2.1%	1.2%	1.9%
More affordable housing within the City	11.1%	6.7%	10.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)			
More employment opportunities	13.5%	12.2%	13.2%
Better protection of natural resources	5.6%	8.7%	6.3%
Expanded public transportation	5.2%	1.6%	4.3%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	2.8%	4.3%	3.2%
More activities for teenagers	4.3%	3.5%	4.1%
More activities for seniors	1.3%	3.5%	1.8%
Improved access to local foods	2.8%	2.4%	2.7%
Better management of growth	7.4%	9.8%	8.0%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	1.8%	11.4%	4.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)			
New or expanded conference space	1.0%	0.8%	1.0%
Multi-use neighborhoods	0.8%	0.4%	0.7%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	4.3%	2.0%	3.7%
More arts and cultural opportunities	1.3%	0.8%	1.1%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	4.4%	3.1%	4.1%
Stronger retirement community	1.8%	2.0%	1.8%
Other	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%
No response	7.1%	11.4%	8.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent			
A stronger community identity	1.9%	1.2%	1.7%
More attractive City entrances	2.4%	3.1%	2.6%
More parks and open space	3.3%	1.6%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	8.0%	1.6%	6.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	3.9%	2.8%	3.6%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	3.0%	1.6%	2.7%
More housing in and around downtown	2.1%	0.4%	1.7%
More affordable housing within the City	4.3%	4.3%	4.3%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)			
More employment opportunities	7.6%	11.8%	8.6%
Better protection of natural resources	5.4%	6.7%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	4.8%	3.1%	4.4%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	2.4%	3.5%	2.7%
More activities for teenagers	4.3%	5.1%	4.5%
More activities for seniors	3.0%	2.4%	2.9%
Improved access to local foods	3.5%	2.8%	3.3%
Better management of growth	7.3%	9.8%	7.9%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	1.5%	9.1%	3.3%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)			
New or expanded conference space	1.4%	0.4%	1.1%
Multi-use neighborhoods	2.5%	1.2%	2.2%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	5.2%	2.8%	4.6%
More arts and cultural opportunities	3.4%	1.2%	2.9%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	6.7%	6.3%	6.6%
Stronger retirement community	1.9%	3.1%	2.2%
Other	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%
No response	9.5%	13.4%	10.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. 4th Best Represent			
A stronger community identity	1.5%	1.6%	1.5%
More attractive City entrances	2.5%	3.5%	2.8%
More parks and open space	3.2%	2.0%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	5.4%	2.4%	4.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	5.3%	2.0%	4.5%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	2.9%	0.8%	2.4%
More housing in and around downtown	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%
More affordable housing within the City	6.1%	4.7%	5.7%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)			
More employment opportunities	4.0%	5.9%	4.5%
Better protection of natural resources	5.8%	5.5%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	3.8%	3.1%	3.6%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	3.0%	1.2%	2.6%
More activities for teenagers	4.4%	3.5%	4.2%
More activities for seniors	1.6%	2.8%	1.9%
Improved access to local foods	3.9%	4.3%	4.0%
Better management of growth	6.2%	7.1%	6.4%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	2.8%	6.7%	3.7%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)			
New or expanded conference space	1.9%	2.0%	1.9%
Multi-use neighborhoods	1.5%	0.8%	1.3%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	6.3%	8.3%	6.8%
More arts and cultural opportunities	3.9%	2.4%	3.5%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	5.1%	6.3%	5.4%
Stronger retirement community	3.2%	3.1%	3.2%
Other	1.0%	1.2%	1.1%
No response	13.4%	17.7%	14.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. Best Represent			
A stronger community identity	8.7%	8.7%	8.7%
More attractive City entrances	7.8%	8.7%	8.0%
More parks and open space	12.8%	7.5%	11.5%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	24.2%	9.8%	20.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	16.3%	8.7%	14.4%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	11.6%	6.3%	10.3%
More housing in and around downtown	7.1%	4.3%	6.4%
More affordable housing within the City	32.7%	20.1%	29.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)			
More employment opportunities	53.3%	58.3%	54.5%
Better protection of natural resources	20.6%	28.0%	22.4%
Expanded public transportation	15.8%	9.1%	14.1%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	9.6%	10.2%	9.8%
More activities for teenagers	15.4%	13.4%	14.9%
More activities for seniors	6.2%	9.4%	7.0%
Improved access to local foods	11.9%	9.4%	11.3%
Better management of growth	28.9%	34.3%	30.2%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	7.2%	39.4%	15.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)			
New or expanded conference space	4.4%	3.1%	4.1%
Multi-use neighborhoods	5.6%	3.1%	5.0%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	17.3%	13.8%	16.4%
More arts and cultural opportunities	9.8%	5.5%	8.8%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	21.7%	18.5%	20.9%
Stronger retirement community	8.0%	11.4%	8.8%
Other	7.2%	5.9%	6.9%
No response	6.1%	10.6%	7.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5a. Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities			
Major strength	39.2%	21.8%	35.0%
Strength	46.3%	44.8%	45.9%
Neutral	12.9%	29.0%	16.8%
Weakness	1.5%	4.0%	2.1%
Major weakness	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%
Q5b. Availability of retail choices			
Major strength	7.1%	4.8%	6.5%
Strength	38.7%	39.0%	38.8%
Neutral	30.1%	27.7%	29.5%
Weakness	19.6%	24.1%	20.7%
Major weakness	4.5%	4.4%	4.5%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5c. Existing sidewalk network			
Major strength	4.4%	2.4%	3.9%
Strength	31.1%	32.1%	31.4%
Neutral	39.8%	50.4%	42.4%
Weakness	21.5%	13.0%	19.5%
Major weakness	3.2%	2.0%	2.9%
Q5d. Protection of natural resources			
Major strength	3.4%	4.1%	3.5%
Strength	25.4%	27.8%	26.0%
Neutral	56.1%	47.8%	54.1%
Weakness	13.3%	18.0%	14.4%
Major weakness	1.9%	2.4%	2.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5e. Public transportation			
Major strength	5.4%	3.2%	4.9%
Strength	33.8%	30.4%	33.0%
Neutral	42.8%	47.8%	44.0%
Weakness	15.7%	14.6%	15.5%
Major weakness	2.3%	4.0%	2.7%
Q5f. Character of neighborhoods			
Major strength	10.4%	5.2%	9.2%
Strength	48.0%	35.9%	45.1%
Neutral	30.5%	46.8%	34.4%
Weakness	10.4%	10.9%	10.5%
Major weakness	0.6%	1.2%	0.8%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5g. Availability of housing choices			
Major strength	5.5%	2.0%	4.7%
Strength	26.8%	24.4%	26.2%
Neutral	38.5%	46.3%	40.4%
Weakness	24.4%	23.2%	24.1%
Major weakness	4.7%	4.1%	4.6%
Q5h. Availability of parks and open space			
Major strength	14.7%	10.1%	13.5%
Strength	58.1%	48.4%	55.8%
Neutral	21.1%	32.3%	23.8%
Weakness	5.4%	8.9%	6.2%
Major weakness	0.8%	0.4%	0.7%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5i. Employment opportunities			
Major strength	3.6%	5.2%	4.0%
Strength	8.5%	12.9%	9.5%
Neutral	37.4%	30.9%	35.9%
Weakness	32.6%	34.5%	33.0%
Major weakness	17.9%	16.5%	17.6%
Q5j. Historic buildings and areas			
Major strength	15.6%	10.8%	14.5%
Strength	51.9%	45.4%	50.3%
Neutral	28.7%	37.8%	30.9%
Weakness	3.6%	5.2%	4.0%
Major weakness	0.1%	0.8%	0.3%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5k. Rate of growth			
Major strength	3.5%	2.8%	3.3%
Strength	22.0%	23.6%	22.4%
Neutral	51.5%	46.7%	50.4%
Weakness	18.0%	19.5%	18.4%
Major weakness	4.9%	7.3%	5.5%
Q5l. Unique local identity			
Major strength	38.1%	18.7%	33.5%
Strength	40.4%	44.7%	41.4%
Neutral	18.7%	32.5%	22.0%
Weakness	2.7%	3.7%	2.9%
Major weakness	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5m. Opportunities for community involvement			
Major strength	21.5%	10.9%	19.0%
Strength	48.1%	41.3%	46.5%
Neutral	25.0%	37.7%	28.0%
Weakness	4.7%	8.9%	5.7%
Major weakness	0.6%	1.2%	0.8%
Q5n. Attention to environmental issues			
Major strength	10.7%	9.7%	10.5%
Strength	38.8%	29.1%	36.4%
Neutral	37.3%	42.9%	38.7%
Weakness	11.0%	14.2%	11.8%
Major weakness	2.2%	4.0%	2.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5o. Downtown			
Major strength	52.9%	31.3%	47.7%
Strength	34.3%	37.8%	35.1%
Neutral	9.2%	18.5%	11.5%
Weakness	3.1%	8.8%	4.5%
Major weakness	0.5%	3.6%	1.3%
Q5p. Population growth			
Major strength	4.5%	2.8%	4.1%
Strength	21.6%	26.4%	22.7%
Neutral	58.2%	53.7%	57.1%
Weakness	12.1%	11.8%	12.0%
Major weakness	3.6%	5.3%	4.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5q. Presence of family farms			
Major strength	8.2%	17.7%	10.5%
Strength	34.1%	32.1%	33.6%
Neutral	43.7%	26.5%	39.5%
Weakness	10.9%	17.7%	12.6%
Major weakness	3.1%	6.0%	3.8%
Q5r. Quality of life			
Major strength	31.2%	20.9%	28.7%
Strength	53.3%	53.0%	53.3%
Neutral	12.2%	21.7%	14.5%
Weakness	2.4%	3.6%	2.7%
Major weakness	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q5s. Existing roadway network			
Major strength	4.6%	9.7%	5.8%
Strength	28.7%	32.7%	29.6%
Neutral	34.2%	23.4%	31.6%
Weakness	23.8%	24.6%	24.0%
Major weakness	8.7%	9.7%	9.0%
Q5t. Other			
Major strength	18.2%	0.0%	14.0%
Strength	6.5%	0.0%	5.0%
Neutral	9.1%	17.4%	11.0%
Weakness	16.9%	8.7%	15.0%
Major weakness	49.4%	73.9%	55.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. Most Important			
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	7.8%	8.3%	7.9%
Availability of retail choices	1.6%	2.0%	1.7%
Existing sidewalk network	1.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Protection of natural resources	3.7%	2.4%	3.3%
Public transportation	2.4%	1.6%	2.2%
Character of neighborhoods	1.9%	1.2%	1.7%
Availability of housing choices	4.2%	0.8%	3.3%
Availability of parks and open space	2.1%	2.4%	2.2%
Employment opportunities	10.0%	11.8%	10.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)			
Historic buildings and areas	1.3%	2.0%	1.4%
Rate of growth	1.0%	1.6%	1.1%
Unique local identity	13.3%	8.7%	12.1%
Opportunities for community involvement	1.5%	1.6%	1.5%
Attention to environmental issues	1.8%	0.8%	1.5%
Downtown	15.4%	10.6%	14.2%
Population growth	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%
Presence of family farms	0.9%	5.5%	2.0%
Quality of life	10.7%	12.6%	11.2%
Existing roadway network	4.2%	5.1%	4.4%
Other	2.1%	1.6%	2.0%
No response	13.0%	19.3%	14.5%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. 2nd Important			
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	6.2%	4.7%	5.8%
Availability of retail choices	2.4%	3.5%	2.7%
Existing sidewalk network	1.8%	1.2%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	2.3%	2.8%	2.4%
Public transportation	2.9%	1.2%	2.5%
Character of neighborhoods	3.8%	2.4%	3.4%
Availability of housing choices	4.8%	2.8%	4.3%
Availability of parks and open space	3.5%	4.3%	3.7%
Employment opportunities	8.6%	6.7%	8.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. 2nd Important (Cont.)			
Historic buildings and areas	3.8%	2.8%	3.5%
Rate of growth	1.6%	0.8%	1.4%
Unique local identity	7.8%	8.7%	8.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.3%	1.6%	3.6%
Attention to environmental issues	1.3%	3.1%	1.7%
Downtown	14.9%	13.0%	14.4%
Population growth	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%
Presence of family farms	1.1%	7.1%	2.6%
Quality of life	10.7%	8.3%	10.1%
Existing roadway network	1.6%	3.1%	2.0%
Other	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%
No response	15.2%	20.9%	16.5%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. 3rd Important			
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	10.4%	6.3%	9.4%
Availability of retail choices	3.3%	5.9%	3.9%
Existing sidewalk network	1.8%	2.0%	1.8%
Protection of natural resources	2.0%	2.4%	2.1%
Public transportation	3.0%	1.6%	2.7%
Character of neighborhoods	2.4%	2.8%	2.5%
Availability of housing choices	3.7%	2.8%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	5.6%	3.9%	5.2%
Employment opportunities	3.5%	4.3%	3.7%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. 3rd Important (Cont.)			
Historic buildings and areas	3.3%	4.3%	3.5%
Rate of growth	2.5%	1.6%	2.3%
Unique local identity	7.3%	5.9%	7.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.0%	2.8%	3.7%
Attention to environmental issues	2.7%	3.9%	3.0%
Downtown	10.2%	7.5%	9.6%
Population growth	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%
Presence of family farms	1.9%	7.1%	3.2%
Quality of life	10.7%	5.9%	9.6%
Existing roadway network	2.4%	3.9%	2.8%
Other	0.6%	0.0%	0.5%
No response	17.3%	24.0%	18.9%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. 4th Important			
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	8.7%	6.7%	8.2%
Availability of retail choices	3.9%	3.5%	3.8%
Existing sidewalk network	1.8%	1.2%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	1.8%	2.4%	1.9%
Public transportation	1.9%	3.5%	2.3%
Character of neighborhoods	3.5%	2.4%	3.3%
Availability of housing choices	3.4%	3.5%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	6.1%	4.7%	5.7%
Employment opportunities	2.1%	2.0%	2.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. 4th Important (Cont.)			
Historic buildings and areas	4.3%	1.6%	3.6%
Rate of growth	2.7%	2.0%	2.5%
Unique local identity	5.6%	5.5%	5.5%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.3%	3.5%	4.1%
Attention to environmental issues	2.5%	3.5%	2.8%
Downtown	7.8%	4.3%	7.0%
Population growth	1.5%	1.2%	1.4%
Presence of family farms	2.7%	5.5%	3.3%
Quality of life	11.4%	9.8%	11.0%
Existing roadway network	2.1%	3.9%	2.6%
Other	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%
No response	21.1%	28.3%	22.8%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. Most Important			
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	33.1%	26.0%	31.4%
Availability of retail choices	11.2%	15.0%	12.1%
Existing sidewalk network	6.3%	4.3%	5.8%
Protection of natural resources	9.7%	9.8%	9.8%
Public transportation	10.2%	7.9%	9.7%
Character of neighborhoods	11.6%	8.7%	10.9%
Availability of housing choices	16.0%	9.8%	14.5%
Availability of parks and open space	17.3%	15.4%	16.8%
Employment opportunities	24.2%	24.8%	24.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)			
Historic buildings and areas	12.6%	10.6%	12.1%
Rate of growth	7.8%	5.9%	7.4%
Unique local identity	34.0%	28.7%	32.7%
Opportunities for community involvement	14.1%	9.4%	13.0%
Attention to environmental issues	8.2%	11.4%	9.0%
Downtown	48.4%	35.4%	45.2%
Population growth	3.9%	3.5%	3.8%
Presence of family farms	6.6%	25.2%	11.1%
Quality of life	43.6%	36.6%	41.9%
Existing roadway network	10.4%	16.1%	11.8%
Other	4.2%	2.8%	3.8%
No response	13.0%	19.3%	14.5%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q7a. Ease of travel by car on highways			
Very satisfied	23.3%	19.8%	22.5%
Satisfied	54.3%	52.8%	53.9%
Neutral	10.8%	9.9%	10.6%
Dissatisfied	8.5%	10.7%	9.0%
Very dissatisfied	3.1%	6.7%	4.0%
Q7b. Ease of travel by car on major streets			
Very satisfied	11.3%	9.9%	10.9%
Satisfied	37.2%	31.3%	35.8%
Neutral	17.6%	17.9%	17.7%
Dissatisfied	24.6%	28.2%	25.4%
Very dissatisfied	9.3%	12.7%	10.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q7c. Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets			
Very satisfied	10.6%	8.4%	10.1%
Satisfied	53.5%	36.3%	49.3%
Neutral	20.1%	34.7%	23.6%
Dissatisfied	12.5%	13.9%	12.9%
Very dissatisfied	3.3%	6.8%	4.2%
Q7d. Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods			
Very satisfied	12.5%	7.7%	11.4%
Satisfied	51.7%	33.7%	47.4%
Neutral	20.9%	33.7%	24.0%
Dissatisfied	10.2%	18.3%	12.2%
Very dissatisfied	4.6%	6.5%	5.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q7e. Ease of walking in City of Lawrence			
Very satisfied	15.1%	15.1%	15.1%
Satisfied	48.6%	43.4%	47.4%
Neutral	20.5%	29.7%	22.5%
Dissatisfied	13.6%	9.6%	12.7%
Very dissatisfied	2.2%	2.3%	2.2%
Q7f. Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence			
Very satisfied	6.4%	8.4%	6.8%
Satisfied	29.1%	25.8%	28.4%
Neutral	34.2%	43.7%	36.2%
Dissatisfied	23.5%	16.3%	22.0%
Very dissatisfied	6.8%	5.8%	6.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q7g. Safety of walking in City of Lawrence			
Very satisfied	11.1%	11.5%	11.2%
Satisfied	44.8%	36.4%	42.9%
Neutral	22.4%	34.6%	25.1%
Dissatisfied	17.1%	14.7%	16.6%
Very dissatisfied	4.6%	2.8%	4.2%
Q7h. Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence			
Very satisfied	5.4%	6.1%	5.5%
Satisfied	20.3%	17.2%	19.6%
Neutral	32.7%	41.9%	34.8%
Dissatisfied	31.0%	26.3%	29.9%
Very dissatisfied	10.6%	8.6%	10.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q7i. Existing bicycle system throughout County			
Very satisfied	5.0%	7.0%	5.5%
Satisfied	19.5%	15.0%	18.5%
Neutral	43.0%	37.0%	41.5%
Dissatisfied	24.1%	26.5%	24.6%
Very dissatisfied	8.4%	14.5%	9.9%
Q7j. Existing walking and hiking system throughout County			
Very satisfied	6.5%	4.4%	6.0%
Satisfied	33.5%	26.8%	32.0%
Neutral	39.9%	37.1%	39.2%
Dissatisfied	15.9%	22.9%	17.5%
Very dissatisfied	4.2%	8.8%	5.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q7k. Existing road system in County			
Very satisfied	6.1%	10.9%	7.3%
Satisfied	42.3%	47.0%	43.5%
Neutral	41.2%	23.1%	36.6%
Dissatisfied	9.2%	11.7%	9.9%
Very dissatisfied	1.1%	7.3%	2.7%
Q7l. Quality of public transportation (bus service)			
Very satisfied	7.8%	4.3%	7.0%
Satisfied	32.3%	20.9%	29.8%
Neutral	41.8%	56.1%	45.0%
Dissatisfied	12.8%	12.8%	12.8%
Very dissatisfied	5.3%	5.9%	5.5%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q7m. Other			
Very satisfied	11.5%	0.0%	8.5%
Satisfied	3.8%	5.3%	4.2%
Neutral	9.6%	10.5%	9.9%
Dissatisfied	17.3%	15.8%	16.9%
Very dissatisfied	57.7%	68.4%	60.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q8. Most Important			
Ease of travel by car on highways	7.7%	9.1%	8.0%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	26.4%	27.2%	26.6%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	3.8%	3.1%	3.6%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	2.7%	1.6%	2.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	7.3%	2.0%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	7.1%	2.4%	5.9%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	6.4%	3.5%	5.7%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	7.4%	5.5%	7.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)			
Existing bicycle system throughout County	1.4%	5.1%	2.3%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	1.5%	10.6%	3.7%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	10.4%	6.3%	9.4%
Other	2.8%	2.0%	2.6%
No response	12.8%	19.3%	14.3%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q8. 2nd Important			
Ease of travel by car on highways	4.3%	9.4%	5.5%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	12.8%	11.8%	12.5%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	8.8%	6.3%	8.2%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	4.7%	6.3%	5.1%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	6.6%	4.3%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	7.4%	4.7%	6.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	11.0%	7.5%	10.1%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	13.1%	4.7%	11.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q8. 2nd Important (Cont.)			
Existing bicycle system throughout County	3.7%	3.5%	3.6%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	1.8%	4.3%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	2.7%	8.3%	4.0%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	4.5%	3.1%	4.2%
Other	0.4%	1.2%	0.6%
No response	18.3%	24.4%	19.8%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q8. 3rd Important			
Ease of travel by car on highways	2.3%	4.3%	2.8%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	4.7%	7.1%	5.3%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	6.9%	5.9%	6.7%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	7.3%	7.5%	7.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	8.3%	3.5%	7.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	6.6%	3.5%	5.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	8.6%	3.5%	7.4%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	9.6%	5.5%	8.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q8. 3rd Important (Cont.)			
Existing bicycle system throughout County	4.9%	5.1%	5.0%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	6.7%	5.5%	6.4%
Existing road system in County	3.4%	10.6%	5.2%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	6.9%	6.3%	6.8%
Other	0.5%	0.8%	0.6%
No response	23.2%	30.7%	25.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q8. Most Important			
Ease of travel by car on highways	14.3%	22.8%	16.3%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	43.8%	46.1%	44.4%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	19.6%	15.4%	18.5%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	14.6%	15.4%	14.8%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	22.2%	9.8%	19.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	21.1%	10.6%	18.5%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	26.0%	14.6%	23.2%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	30.2%	15.7%	26.7%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)			
Existing bicycle system throughout County	10.0%	13.8%	10.9%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	10.9%	12.2%	11.2%
Existing road system in County	7.6%	29.5%	12.9%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	21.8%	15.7%	20.4%
Other	3.7%	3.9%	3.7%
No response	12.8%	19.3%	14.3%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q9. How satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?			
Very satisfied	6.1%	4.3%	5.6%
Satisfied	27.9%	18.5%	25.6%
Neutral	28.7%	32.3%	29.5%
Dissatisfied	12.9%	9.4%	12.0%
Very dissatisfied	5.1%	5.9%	5.3%
Don't know	19.4%	29.5%	21.9%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q11. How satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?			
Very satisfied	2.9%	2.8%	2.9%
Satisfied	30.1%	26.4%	29.2%
Neutral	36.5%	30.7%	35.1%
Dissatisfied	13.8%	15.7%	14.2%
Very dissatisfied	3.8%	5.5%	4.2%
Don't know	13.0%	18.9%	14.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?			
Very satisfied	2.5%	1.2%	2.2%
Satisfied	19.3%	19.3%	19.3%
Neutral	38.4%	38.2%	38.3%
Dissatisfied	5.3%	6.3%	5.5%
Very dissatisfied	1.0%	3.1%	1.5%
Don't know	33.5%	31.9%	33.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q15a. The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area.			
Strongly agree	34.5%	26.8%	32.7%
Agree	36.6%	32.5%	35.6%
Neutral	17.2%	20.3%	18.0%
Disagree	7.9%	15.9%	9.8%
Strongly disagree	3.8%	4.5%	3.9%
Q15b. Future retail development should primarily be located at the intersection of main streets.			
Strongly agree	6.5%	4.6%	6.0%
Agree	19.8%	25.7%	21.2%
Neutral	45.4%	35.7%	43.1%
Disagree	24.7%	30.7%	26.1%
Strongly disagree	3.6%	3.3%	3.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q15c. Future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods.			
Strongly agree	10.4%	6.6%	9.5%
Agree	34.4%	32.8%	34.0%
Neutral	34.2%	29.5%	33.1%
Disagree	16.5%	25.0%	18.5%
Strongly disagree	4.5%	6.1%	4.9%
Q15d. Available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings.			
Strongly agree	57.2%	50.6%	55.6%
Agree	24.6%	28.7%	25.6%
Neutral	9.3%	12.6%	10.0%
Disagree	6.2%	6.5%	6.2%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	1.6%	2.5%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q16a. I would like to see agricultural uses maintained in the County.			
Strongly agree	38.8%	61.0%	44.2%
Agree	37.8%	29.7%	35.8%
Neutral	20.1%	6.5%	16.8%
Disagree	2.8%	2.0%	2.6%
Strongly disagree	0.4%	0.8%	0.5%
Q16b. I would like to see major development directed inside the City limits.			
Strongly agree	19.3%	24.6%	20.6%
Agree	35.7%	41.0%	37.0%
Neutral	33.7%	24.2%	31.4%
Disagree	9.4%	8.6%	9.2%
Strongly disagree	2.0%	1.6%	1.9%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q16c. I would like to see more shopping opportunities in or near my neighborhood.			
Strongly agree	13.4%	8.2%	12.1%
Agree	28.4%	22.0%	26.9%
Neutral	35.1%	41.6%	36.7%
Disagree	18.5%	17.6%	18.3%
Strongly disagree	4.6%	10.6%	6.1%
Q16d. I would like to see more employment centers located near my home.			
Strongly agree	12.3%	8.9%	11.4%
Agree	23.9%	20.2%	23.0%
Neutral	42.5%	43.3%	42.7%
Disagree	16.9%	16.6%	16.8%
Strongly disagree	4.5%	10.9%	6.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q16e. I would like to see a modest increase in height of development if it means less expansion of the city out into the County.			
Strongly agree	15.2%	17.6%	15.8%
Agree	35.3%	42.0%	36.9%
Neutral	31.8%	26.9%	30.6%
Disagree	13.5%	9.4%	12.5%
Strongly disagree	4.2%	4.1%	4.1%
Q16f. I would like to see Downtown accommodate more development.			
Strongly agree	15.7%	8.9%	14.0%
Agree	33.1%	34.1%	33.4%
Neutral	31.7%	33.7%	32.2%
Disagree	15.0%	15.9%	15.2%
Strongly disagree	4.5%	7.3%	5.2%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q16g. I would like to see development that includes a better mix of uses in order to live, work, and play in close proximity.			
Strongly agree	32.0%	20.4%	29.3%
Agree	43.1%	41.6%	42.8%
Neutral	20.2%	31.0%	22.8%
Disagree	3.0%	4.1%	3.2%
Strongly disagree	1.7%	2.9%	2.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q17. From the following list, please check ALL the reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County. (Check all that apply)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q17a. The reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County.			
Not enough time	47.5%	35.8%	44.6%
Difficult to travel to meetings	8.6%	8.3%	8.5%
Not sure how to get involved	37.0%	31.1%	35.6%
Don't believe I can make a difference	34.6%	39.4%	35.8%
Don't have enough information	39.9%	43.3%	40.7%
Other	12.2%	11.8%	12.1%
None Chosen	4.3%	5.1%	4.5%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?			
Very knowledgeable	2.5%	1.6%	2.3%
Somewhat knowledgeable	21.3%	19.3%	20.8%
Not sure	12.8%	13.0%	12.8%
Not knowledgeable	61.9%	62.2%	62.0%
Don't Know	1.5%	3.9%	2.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?			
0 - 2 years	8.3%	2.4%	6.9%
3 - 5 years	7.3%	4.8%	6.7%
6 - 10 years	10.8%	10.4%	10.7%
11 - 20 years	27.2%	16.5%	24.6%
21 years or more	46.4%	65.9%	51.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q21. What is your age?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q21. What is your age?			
Under 35 years	20.0%	4.5%	16.3%
35 - 44 years	19.4%	13.9%	18.1%
45 - 54 years	24.4%	25.4%	24.6%
55 - 64 years	17.3%	27.9%	19.8%
65 - 74 years	11.3%	21.3%	13.7%
75+ years	7.7%	7.0%	7.5%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q22. Do you own or rent your home?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q22. Do you own or rent your home?			
Own	78.4%	97.6%	83.0%
Rent	21.6%	2.4%	17.0%

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?			
Single family	78.5%	97.2%	83.0%
Duplex/triplex	10.5%	1.2%	8.3%
Apartment/condo	10.0%	0.4%	7.7%
Mobile home	1.0%	1.2%	1.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:			
Under 25,000	9.6%	5.7%	8.7%
$25,000 - $49,999	18.8%	14.5%	17.8%
$50,000 - $74,999	18.0%	20.6%	18.6%
$75,000 - $99,999	20.2%	19.3%	20.0%
$100,000 - $149,999	20.3%	25.0%	21.4%
$150,000 or more	13.1%	14.9%	13.5%

Q26. Your gender:

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q26. Your gender:			
Male	47.3%	51.9%	48.4%
Female	52.7%	48.1%	51.6%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?			
Yes	4.7%	3.7%	4.4%
No	95.3%	96.3%	95.6%

Q28. Which of the following best describes your race? (Without "Not Provided)

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q28. Which of the following best describes your race?			
African American (Non-Hispanic)	1.6%	0.0%	1.2%
White (Non-Hispanic)	89.9%	92.1%	90.4%
Native American	2.7%	1.6%	2.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.3%	0.8%	1.9%
Other	3.4%	1.6%	3.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q29. What is your current employment status?

N=1046	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q29. What is your current employment status?			
Full time employment	62.8%	60.5%	62.2%
Part time employment	11.4%	8.9%	10.8%
Full-time student	1.7%	0.0%	1.3%
Full-time homemaker	2.3%	4.8%	2.9%
Unemployed	3.0%	2.0%	2.8%
Retired	18.8%	23.8%	20.0%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q30. Where do you work?

N=756	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q30. Where do you work?			
City of Lawrence	66.6%	44.8%	61.6%
Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	3.4%	21.5%	7.5%
KC Metro area	12.3%	14.0%	12.7%
Topeka Metro area	11.8%	10.5%	11.5%
Other	10.4%	19.2%	12.4%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?			
Agriculture	0.9%	7.0%	2.2%
Administrative or Support	6.0%	5.8%	6.0%
Construction	1.7%	5.8%	2.6%
Manufacturing	3.8%	6.4%	4.4%
Wholesale Trade	0.2%	0.6%	0.3%
Food, Hospitality, Entertainment	4.5%	0.0%	3.4%
Retail	5.3%	5.2%	5.3%
Health Services	13.5%	15.1%	13.9%
Transportation and Warehousing	1.0%	2.9%	1.5%
Finance, Insurance, or Real Estate	6.8%	2.9%	6.0%
Professional Services	10.1%	11.0%	10.3%
Scientific or Technical Services	6.5%	9.3%	7.1%

By City Residents and Residents Outside the City

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?		Total
	City of Lawrence	Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do? (Cont.)			
Educational Services (Pre-school-12th grade)	9.8%	8.1%	9.4%
Educational Services (University/College)	16.1%	8.7%	14.4%
Government	5.8%	5.2%	5.7%
Armed Services	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%
Other	11.8%	14.0%	12.3%

Section 7
Employment Status

Respondent Employment

Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?							
City of Lawrence	76.7%	80.4%	100.0%	60.0%	82.8%	71.5%	75.7%
Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	23.3%	19.6%	0.0%	40.0%	17.2%	28.5%	24.3%
Q1a. Maintaining rural character							
Very important	27.1%	36.4%	7.7%	41.4%	28.6%	36.3%	30.6%
Somewhat important	41.1%	42.7%	30.8%	34.5%	39.3%	39.2%	40.2%
Not sure	17.8%	10.9%	30.8%	24.1%	21.4%	16.2%	17.2%
Not important	14.0%	10.0%	30.8%	0.0%	10.7%	8.3%	12.0%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q1b. Preserving historic buildings							
Very important	52.0%	67.6%	46.2%	51.7%	51.7%	46.4%	52.5%
Somewhat important	38.9%	28.8%	38.5%	44.8%	37.9%	41.5%	38.5%
Not sure	5.8%	2.7%	7.7%	3.4%	6.9%	3.9%	5.0%
Not important	3.3%	0.9%	7.7%	0.0%	3.4%	8.2%	4.0%
Q1c. Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods							
Very important	43.3%	48.2%	23.1%	41.4%	31.0%	33.0%	41.0%
Somewhat important	39.0%	43.6%	76.9%	48.3%	44.8%	47.6%	42.0%
Not sure	12.5%	6.4%	0.0%	10.3%	13.8%	13.1%	12.0%
Not important	5.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	6.3%	5.0%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q1d. Development of the Clinton Lake Area							
Very important	18.1%	24.3%	23.1%	3.4%	10.3%	12.7%	17.0%
Somewhat important	32.9%	32.4%	46.2%	27.6%	37.9%	38.2%	34.2%
Not sure	22.2%	18.9%	7.7%	34.5%	10.3%	21.1%	21.5%
Not important	26.8%	24.3%	23.1%	34.5%	41.4%	27.9%	27.3%
Q1e. Quality housing for all income groups							
Very important	53.4%	63.1%	76.9%	55.2%	41.4%	52.7%	54.0%
Somewhat important	29.7%	27.9%	23.1%	27.6%	37.9%	31.7%	30.2%
Not sure	9.1%	4.5%	0.0%	13.8%	17.2%	8.8%	8.9%
Not important	7.8%	4.5%	0.0%	3.4%	3.4%	6.8%	6.9%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q1f. Walking and biking trails							
Very important	48.3%	60.9%	84.6%	48.3%	44.8%	28.8%	45.8%
Somewhat important	37.5%	34.5%	15.4%	34.5%	34.5%	45.4%	38.4%
Not sure	6.7%	1.8%	0.0%	10.3%	6.9%	11.7%	7.4%
Not important	7.5%	2.7%	0.0%	6.9%	13.8%	14.1%	8.4%
Q1g. Maintaining community identity.							
Very important	46.9%	56.8%	61.5%	41.4%	32.1%	45.9%	47.2%
Somewhat important	34.9%	27.9%	30.8%	31.0%	35.7%	33.7%	33.7%
Not sure	13.9%	13.5%	7.7%	20.7%	25.0%	16.1%	15.0%
Not important	4.2%	1.8%	0.0%	6.9%	7.1%	4.4%	4.1%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q1h. Downtown stability							
Very important	63.1%	64.5%	84.6%	55.2%	41.4%	54.9%	60.8%
Somewhat important	25.7%	26.4%	15.4%	34.5%	34.5%	32.0%	27.6%
Not sure	6.3%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	13.8%	6.3%	6.3%
Not important	5.0%	2.7%	0.0%	10.3%	10.3%	6.8%	5.3%
Q1i. Transportation alternatives to the car							
Very important	38.1%	47.7%	61.5%	34.5%	37.9%	39.0%	39.4%
Somewhat important	33.4%	31.5%	30.8%	44.8%	24.1%	36.1%	33.9%
Not sure	11.9%	9.9%	0.0%	10.3%	17.2%	14.6%	12.2%
Not important	16.6%	10.8%	7.7%	10.3%	20.7%	10.2%	14.5%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q1j. Availability of arts and cultural opportunities							
Very important	39.1%	48.6%	61.5%	37.9%	31.0%	32.2%	38.6%
Somewhat important	41.5%	36.0%	30.8%	41.4%	41.4%	44.4%	41.3%
Not sure	10.3%	9.9%	0.0%	17.2%	27.6%	10.2%	11.0%
Not important	9.1%	5.4%	7.7%	3.4%	0.0%	13.2%	9.2%
Q1k. Appearance of multi-family residential developments							
Very important	24.1%	27.5%	23.1%	6.9%	17.2%	31.0%	25.3%
Somewhat important	38.3%	41.3%	53.8%	51.7%	44.8%	45.8%	40.8%
Not sure	23.0%	21.1%	7.7%	24.1%	34.5%	13.8%	21.2%
Not important	14.6%	10.1%	15.4%	17.2%	3.4%	9.4%	12.7%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q1l. Incorporating natural areas into development projects							
Very important	41.8%	54.1%	38.5%	55.2%	37.9%	37.7%	42.5%
Somewhat important	34.1%	26.1%	30.8%	17.2%	31.0%	33.8%	32.6%
Not sure	14.2%	9.9%	0.0%	20.7%	13.8%	16.2%	14.1%
Not important	9.9%	9.9%	30.8%	6.9%	17.2%	12.3%	10.8%
Q1m. Creating employment opportunities							
Very important	74.1%	75.7%	53.8%	80.0%	69.0%	72.9%	73.6%
Somewhat important	21.5%	19.8%	38.5%	16.7%	13.8%	19.8%	21.1%
Not sure	2.0%	2.7%	7.7%	3.3%	10.3%	5.8%	3.2%
Not important	2.4%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	1.4%	2.1%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q1n. Parks, recreation, open space							
Very important	57.6%	68.5%	84.6%	58.6%	57.1%	52.5%	58.0%
Somewhat important	36.7%	27.9%	7.7%	37.9%	35.7%	36.3%	35.5%
Not sure	4.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	7.8%	4.6%
Not important	1.6%	0.9%	7.7%	3.4%	0.0%	3.4%	1.9%
Q1o. Protecting high value farmland							
Very important	41.9%	50.5%	23.1%	60.0%	37.9%	51.2%	45.0%
Somewhat important	31.6%	28.8%	38.5%	13.3%	41.4%	27.1%	30.3%
Not sure	18.1%	14.4%	23.1%	23.3%	17.2%	15.0%	17.1%
Not important	8.5%	6.3%	15.4%	3.3%	3.4%	6.8%	7.6%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q1p. Appearance of commercial areas							
Very important	28.4%	30.6%	30.8%	27.6%	21.4%	42.0%	31.1%
Somewhat important	51.9%	52.3%	69.2%	48.3%	46.4%	47.3%	51.1%
Not sure	14.3%	9.9%	0.0%	17.2%	25.0%	7.7%	12.7%
Not important	5.5%	7.2%	0.0%	6.9%	7.1%	2.9%	5.1%
Q1q. Managing future growth							
Very important	57.9%	57.7%	76.9%	79.3%	41.4%	58.5%	58.5%
Somewhat important	33.0%	33.3%	23.1%	17.2%	34.5%	30.0%	31.9%
Not sure	6.6%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	17.2%	7.7%	6.6%
Not important	2.5%	3.6%	0.0%	3.4%	6.9%	3.9%	3.0%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q1r. Activities and housing for the Retirement Community							
Very important	24.9%	38.7%	23.1%	13.8%	13.8%	42.4%	29.2%
Somewhat important	47.7%	45.0%	46.2%	65.5%	48.3%	45.4%	47.5%
Not sure	19.4%	10.8%	23.1%	17.2%	20.7%	7.8%	16.1%
Not important	8.0%	5.4%	7.7%	3.4%	17.2%	4.4%	7.3%
Q1s. Other							
Very important	88.5%	83.3%	0.0%	100.0%	42.9%	89.7%	85.4%
Somewhat important	6.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	3.4%	7.0%
Not sure	3.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	3.8%
Not important	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	6.9%	3.8%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q2. Most Important							
Maintaining rural character	4.7%	0.9%	7.7%	6.7%	3.4%	7.7%	5.3%
Preserving historic buildings	3.4%	4.5%	7.7%	0.0%	13.8%	3.9%	3.9%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	3.7%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	2.9%	3.3%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	1.4%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.3%
Quality housing for all income groups	12.9%	19.6%	23.1%	6.7%	10.3%	10.1%	13.0%
Walking and biking trails	3.4%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.4%	3.1%
Maintaining community identity	7.0%	5.4%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	5.4%
Downtown stability	10.7%	10.7%	0.0%	13.3%	3.4%	8.7%	9.9%
Transportation alternatives to the car	1.9%	1.8%	30.8%	3.3%	13.8%	1.9%	2.6%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)							
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	1.0%	1.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	1.4%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.0%	1.5%
Creating employment opportunities	26.7%	17.0%	7.7%	30.0%	24.1%	22.2%	24.3%
Parks, recreation, open space	2.0%	1.8%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	0.5%	1.7%
Protecting high value farmland	3.0%	3.6%	0.0%	13.3%	6.9%	3.9%	3.5%
Appearance of commercial areas	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.6%
Managing future growth	6.2%	7.1%	7.7%	6.7%	0.0%	9.7%	6.9%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	3.4%	1.5%
Other	5.0%	5.4%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	5.3%	4.9%
None chosen	3.1%	8.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	12.1%	5.4%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q2. 3rd Important							
Maintaining rural character	2.0%	1.8%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	1.4%	2.0%
Preserving historic buildings	3.9%	0.9%	7.7%	3.3%	10.3%	3.4%	3.6%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	5.1%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	3.9%	4.6%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	2.5%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	2.1%
Quality housing for all income groups	5.7%	5.4%	7.7%	13.3%	3.4%	5.8%	5.8%
Walking and biking trails	6.7%	7.1%	30.8%	10.0%	10.3%	1.9%	6.2%
Maintaining community identity	4.0%	3.6%	7.7%	6.7%	6.9%	1.9%	3.7%
Downtown stability	11.2%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	11.1%	9.6%
Transportation alternatives to the car	5.9%	7.1%	7.7%	3.3%	10.3%	6.3%	6.2%

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q2. 3rd Important (Cont.)							
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	5.6%	1.8%	15.4%	0.0%	3.4%	3.4%	4.6%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.2%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	4.2%	5.4%	0.0%	6.7%	3.4%	5.8%	4.6%
Creating employment opportunities	9.6%	10.7%	7.7%	13.3%	13.8%	9.2%	9.8%
Parks, recreation, open space	7.0%	15.2%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	5.3%	7.6%
Protecting high value farmland	5.7%	6.3%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	6.8%	5.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	3.9%	0.9%	7.7%	0.0%	3.4%	2.4%	3.2%
Managing future growth	8.7%	10.7%	0.0%	13.3%	10.3%	7.7%	9.0%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	1.1%	4.5%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	3.9%	2.0%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
None chosen	5.0%	8.9%	0.0%	10.0%	6.9%	15.5%	7.6%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q2. 4th Important							
Maintaining rural character	3.4%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	1.9%	2.9%
Preserving historic buildings	5.3%	5.4%	7.7%	10.0%	0.0%	1.4%	4.7%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	5.1%	4.5%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	3.9%	4.8%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	3.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.0%	2.7%
Quality housing for all income groups	5.6%	4.5%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	4.3%	5.2%
Walking and biking trails	4.2%	5.4%	15.4%	6.7%	17.2%	3.4%	4.7%
Maintaining community identity	5.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	4.9%
Downtown stability	5.0%	6.3%	7.7%	6.7%	3.4%	5.8%	5.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	5.6%	3.6%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	2.4%	4.4%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q2. 4th Important (Cont.)							
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	6.2%	6.3%	15.4%	10.0%	10.3%	4.3%	6.1%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	2.2%	3.6%	7.7%	0.0%	6.9%	3.4%	2.7%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	4.8%	6.3%	0.0%	10.0%	6.9%	2.4%	4.7%
Creating employment opportunities	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	9.2%	7.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	7.8%	8.9%	23.1%	3.3%	3.4%	5.3%	7.3%
Protecting high value farmland	5.0%	5.4%	7.7%	3.3%	0.0%	3.9%	4.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	2.0%	2.7%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	3.9%	2.6%
Managing future growth	11.5%	6.3%	7.7%	13.3%	13.8%	8.7%	10.3%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	3.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	3.8%
Other	1.7%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	1.0%	1.6%
None chosen	5.9%	10.7%	0.0%	10.0%	10.3%	18.8%	9.2%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q2. Most Important							
Maintaining rural character	12.9%	8.9%	7.7%	20.0%	13.8%	16.4%	13.7%
Preserving historic buildings	16.0%	15.2%	23.1%	16.7%	31.0%	12.1%	15.8%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	18.6%	17.0%	0.0%	13.3%	10.3%	14.0%	16.9%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	10.4%	9.8%	7.7%	0.0%	6.9%	5.3%	8.9%
Quality housing for all income groups	34.2%	36.6%	53.8%	40.0%	27.6%	30.9%	33.8%
Walking and biking trails	20.3%	22.3%	53.8%	16.7%	31.0%	9.2%	18.8%
Maintaining community identity	20.0%	14.3%	23.1%	10.0%	6.9%	17.9%	18.2%
Downtown stability	41.9%	32.1%	38.5%	40.0%	20.7%	33.3%	38.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	19.6%	17.0%	46.2%	20.0%	24.1%	14.5%	18.6%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)							
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	16.9%	9.8%	38.5%	13.3%	20.7%	11.6%	15.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	6.1%	4.5%	7.7%	0.0%	6.9%	7.2%	6.1%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	12.4%	15.2%	0.0%	20.0%	17.2%	11.6%	12.8%
Creating employment opportunities	56.7%	52.7%	23.1%	63.3%	72.4%	52.2%	55.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	22.8%	29.5%	38.5%	16.7%	27.6%	15.9%	22.3%
Protecting high value farmland	18.0%	21.4%	7.7%	26.7%	13.8%	17.4%	18.4%
Appearance of commercial areas	7.6%	4.5%	15.4%	3.3%	6.9%	9.2%	7.5%
Managing future growth	32.9%	30.4%	15.4%	33.3%	31.0%	32.9%	32.5%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	6.4%	12.5%	0.0%	6.7%	3.4%	21.7%	9.9%
Other	8.4%	10.7%	0.0%	13.3%	3.4%	7.7%	8.4%
None chosen	3.1%	8.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	12.1%	5.4%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3a. A stronger community identity							
Strongly agree	18.2%	17.0%	30.8%	3.6%	17.9%	17.1%	17.5%
Agree	40.8%	49.1%	30.8%	42.9%	35.7%	44.2%	42.1%
Neutral	35.4%	30.2%	30.8%	46.4%	46.4%	33.2%	35.1%
Disagree	4.6%	3.8%	7.7%	7.1%	0.0%	3.0%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	1.2%
Q3b. More attractive City entrances							
Strongly agree	11.0%	15.3%	23.1%	10.7%	10.7%	12.4%	11.8%
Agree	33.2%	31.5%	53.8%	39.3%	39.3%	43.1%	35.6%
Neutral	41.0%	43.2%	7.7%	35.7%	39.3%	36.1%	39.8%
Disagree	11.9%	8.1%	7.7%	14.3%	7.1%	5.9%	10.1%
Strongly disagree	3.0%	1.8%	7.7%	0.0%	3.6%	2.5%	2.7%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3c. More parks and open space							
Strongly agree	23.6%	29.4%	30.8%	20.7%	25.9%	18.3%	23.3%
Agree	47.5%	46.8%	61.5%	44.8%	44.4%	39.1%	45.7%
Neutral	24.7%	21.1%	7.7%	27.6%	22.2%	32.2%	25.6%
Disagree	3.5%	2.8%	0.0%	6.9%	7.4%	5.0%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	1.6%
Q3d. More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails							
Strongly agree	34.8%	49.1%	53.8%	39.3%	32.1%	24.5%	34.7%
Agree	37.8%	36.4%	46.2%	32.1%	39.3%	34.3%	36.8%
Neutral	20.6%	12.7%	0.0%	14.3%	25.0%	27.9%	21.0%
Disagree	5.2%	1.8%	0.0%	14.3%	3.6%	7.8%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	2.1%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3e. More bicycle paths and routes							
Strongly agree	31.8%	43.6%	46.2%	34.5%	39.3%	19.9%	31.1%
Agree	30.3%	31.8%	53.8%	31.0%	25.0%	28.4%	30.2%
Neutral	27.1%	17.3%	0.0%	20.7%	25.0%	34.8%	27.0%
Disagree	7.5%	7.3%	0.0%	10.3%	7.1%	10.9%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	3.6%	6.0%	3.5%
Q3f. More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown							
Strongly agree	15.3%	17.3%	38.5%	13.8%	14.3%	5.9%	13.9%
Agree	33.3%	36.4%	30.8%	17.2%	35.7%	24.6%	31.3%
Neutral	35.7%	34.5%	30.8%	44.8%	35.7%	41.4%	36.9%
Disagree	12.2%	11.8%	0.0%	24.1%	3.6%	20.7%	13.9%
Strongly disagree	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	7.4%	4.1%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3g. More housing in and around downtown							
Strongly agree	9.2%	7.2%	15.4%	6.9%	3.6%	9.0%	8.7%
Agree	22.9%	29.7%	30.8%	17.2%	21.4%	21.4%	23.1%
Neutral	44.1%	50.5%	30.8%	41.4%	53.6%	46.8%	45.4%
Disagree	19.7%	9.0%	15.4%	31.0%	7.1%	14.4%	17.5%
Strongly disagree	4.1%	3.6%	7.7%	3.4%	14.3%	8.5%	5.2%
Q3h. More affordable housing within the City							
Strongly agree	35.2%	44.0%	53.8%	27.6%	42.9%	30.5%	35.2%
Agree	33.0%	33.9%	46.2%	37.9%	25.0%	41.4%	34.8%
Neutral	24.5%	16.5%	0.0%	31.0%	25.0%	21.2%	23.2%
Disagree	5.3%	4.6%	0.0%	3.4%	3.6%	4.9%	5.0%
Strongly disagree	2.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	2.0%	1.8%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3i. More employment opportunities							
Strongly agree	63.2%	57.7%	15.4%	66.7%	67.9%	60.5%	61.5%
Agree	27.1%	35.1%	84.6%	26.7%	17.9%	31.2%	29.4%
Neutral	7.7%	7.2%	0.0%	6.7%	14.3%	6.3%	7.4%
Disagree	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Strongly disagree	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.7%
Q3j. Better protection of natural resources							
Strongly agree	37.7%	50.5%	30.8%	41.4%	42.9%	37.9%	39.3%
Agree	38.6%	32.4%	38.5%	34.5%	42.9%	40.4%	38.2%
Neutral	19.1%	14.4%	23.1%	17.2%	14.3%	17.7%	18.2%
Disagree	2.8%	2.7%	7.7%	3.4%	0.0%	3.0%	2.9%
Strongly disagree	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	1.0%	1.5%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3k. Expanded public transportation							
Strongly agree	23.9%	33.3%	53.8%	20.7%	28.6%	23.9%	25.2%
Agree	28.5%	36.0%	30.8%	27.6%	28.6%	24.4%	28.7%
Neutral	29.4%	22.5%	7.7%	41.4%	25.0%	39.3%	30.5%
Disagree	10.4%	5.4%	7.7%	6.9%	7.1%	7.0%	8.9%
Strongly disagree	7.9%	2.7%	0.0%	3.4%	10.7%	5.5%	6.7%
Q3l. More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake							
Strongly agree	14.9%	20.7%	23.1%	6.9%	14.3%	8.4%	14.1%
Agree	27.5%	27.9%	46.2%	31.0%	32.1%	18.8%	26.5%
Neutral	36.6%	36.0%	23.1%	51.7%	28.6%	50.5%	39.2%
Disagree	15.3%	11.7%	0.0%	3.4%	14.3%	15.3%	14.2%
Strongly disagree	5.6%	3.6%	7.7%	6.9%	10.7%	6.9%	6.0%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3m. More activities for teenagers							
Strongly agree	18.4%	25.2%	15.4%	20.7%	17.9%	21.8%	19.9%
Agree	38.2%	36.0%	38.5%	44.8%	35.7%	39.6%	38.3%
Neutral	36.8%	35.1%	46.2%	34.5%	39.3%	34.7%	36.3%
Disagree	4.5%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	2.5%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	2.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.7%
Q3n. More activities for seniors							
Strongly agree	10.3%	21.6%	7.7%	14.3%	14.3%	22.4%	14.2%
Agree	36.3%	40.5%	53.8%	28.6%	42.9%	40.3%	37.7%
Neutral	46.3%	36.0%	38.5%	53.6%	39.3%	33.3%	42.4%
Disagree	5.6%	1.8%	0.0%	3.6%	3.6%	2.5%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.4%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3o. Improved access to local foods							
Strongly agree	23.9%	30.9%	61.5%	31.0%	32.1%	13.9%	23.6%
Agree	34.7%	46.4%	30.8%	37.9%	35.7%	42.1%	37.4%
Neutral	33.3%	21.8%	7.7%	24.1%	28.6%	35.6%	32.0%
Disagree	5.0%	0.9%	0.0%	6.9%	3.6%	6.4%	4.8%
Strongly disagree	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.2%
Q3p. Better management of growth							
Strongly agree	35.0%	42.3%	30.8%	27.6%	32.1%	42.1%	36.7%
Agree	35.1%	33.3%	53.8%	41.4%	35.7%	32.2%	34.9%
Neutral	23.7%	20.7%	15.4%	20.7%	28.6%	19.3%	22.5%
Disagree	4.5%	3.6%	0.0%	6.9%	3.6%	4.5%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	2.0%	1.6%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3q. Maintaining the rural character of the County							
Strongly agree	20.0%	24.3%	7.7%	17.2%	25.0%	29.6%	22.5%
Agree	34.3%	36.0%	23.1%	48.3%	35.7%	36.0%	35.2%
Neutral	34.3%	28.8%	38.5%	31.0%	25.0%	28.6%	32.1%
Disagree	9.4%	8.1%	30.8%	3.4%	14.3%	3.4%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	2.0%
Q3r. New or expanded conference space							
Strongly agree	5.3%	3.6%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%	5.2%
Agree	19.8%	21.6%	15.4%	17.2%	10.7%	19.4%	19.4%
Neutral	46.2%	51.4%	38.5%	55.2%	42.9%	56.2%	49.0%
Disagree	22.0%	17.1%	23.1%	17.2%	35.7%	11.4%	19.4%
Strongly disagree	6.8%	6.3%	0.0%	10.3%	10.7%	7.0%	7.0%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3s. Multi-use neighborhoods							
Strongly agree	8.4%	8.3%	7.7%	3.4%	7.1%	5.9%	7.6%
Agree	28.8%	33.9%	61.5%	34.5%	28.6%	31.2%	30.3%
Neutral	47.2%	50.5%	23.1%	44.8%	46.4%	47.0%	47.4%
Disagree	12.0%	6.4%	7.7%	17.2%	17.9%	9.9%	11.3%
Strongly disagree	3.5%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	3.4%
Q3t. Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities							
Strongly agree	21.7%	26.1%	23.1%	10.3%	21.4%	15.8%	20.7%
Agree	40.9%	38.7%	61.5%	37.9%	42.9%	36.1%	39.7%
Neutral	29.7%	27.9%	15.4%	41.4%	32.1%	36.6%	31.2%
Disagree	5.0%	2.7%	0.0%	10.3%	3.6%	7.4%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	2.7%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	2.9%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3u. More arts and cultural opportunities							
Strongly agree	17.2%	25.2%	30.8%	13.8%	17.9%	8.0%	16.2%
Agree	38.7%	36.9%	53.8%	37.9%	32.1%	35.3%	37.7%
Neutral	32.8%	28.8%	7.7%	31.0%	46.4%	39.8%	33.9%
Disagree	7.5%	8.1%	0.0%	17.2%	3.6%	10.9%	8.4%
Strongly disagree	3.8%	0.9%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%	3.8%
Q3v. Development of the communications network (fiber)							
Strongly agree	35.4%	40.0%	53.8%	31.0%	32.1%	20.6%	32.9%
Agree	33.1%	27.3%	30.8%	31.0%	35.7%	32.7%	32.2%
Neutral	26.8%	27.3%	7.7%	34.5%	25.0%	37.7%	29.2%
Disagree	3.4%	4.5%	0.0%	3.4%	7.1%	6.0%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	0.9%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	1.6%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q3w. Stronger retirement community							
Strongly agree	10.2%	20.9%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	28.2%	14.5%
Agree	32.3%	32.7%	46.2%	32.1%	44.4%	34.7%	33.2%
Neutral	49.1%	42.7%	53.8%	57.1%	33.3%	34.7%	45.4%
Disagree	6.3%	3.6%	0.0%	10.7%	11.1%	1.5%	5.3%
Strong disagree	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	1.0%	1.7%
Q3x. Other							
Strongly agree	82.1%	72.7%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	57.9%	72.9%
Agree	6.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.8%	7.5%
Neutral	10.4%	9.1%	50.0%	0.0%	75.0%	10.5%	13.1%
Disagree	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
Strongly disagree	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	15.8%	5.6%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	3.7%	0.9%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	3.5%
More attractive City entrances	1.1%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	1.0%	1.2%
More parks and open space	3.0%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	1.9%	2.7%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	4.7%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	2.9%	4.3%
More bicycle paths and routes	1.4%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.3%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	3.1%	3.6%	15.4%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
More housing in and around downtown	1.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.5%
More affordable housing within the City	9.6%	9.8%	15.4%	3.3%	6.9%	9.7%	9.6%
More employment opportunities	29.3%	23.2%	7.7%	46.7%	31.0%	26.6%	28.2%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	4.2%	7.1%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	4.3%	4.6%
Expanded public transportation	2.0%	0.9%	7.7%	0.0%	3.4%	1.4%	1.8%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	1.6%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.3%
More activities for teenagers	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.9%	2.1%
More activities for seniors	0.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.4%
Improved access to local foods	0.5%	4.5%	15.4%	0.0%	3.4%	1.0%	1.2%
Better management of growth	7.3%	6.3%	0.0%	6.7%	3.4%	11.6%	7.8%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.3%	3.6%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	4.8%	3.8%
New or expanded conference space	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.0%	0.8%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	1.9%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
More arts and cultural opportunities	1.4%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	3.4%	1.0%	1.2%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	5.9%	2.7%	23.1%	0.0%	10.3%	1.9%	4.9%
Stronger retirement community	0.8%	4.5%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	2.9%	1.6%
Other	5.1%	4.5%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	3.4%	4.6%
No response	4.8%	8.9%	0.0%	6.7%	10.3%	13.0%	7.2%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	2.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.9%
More attractive City entrances	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.4%
More parks and open space	2.6%	0.9%	15.4%	3.3%	0.0%	4.3%	3.1%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	5.3%	8.0%	0.0%	13.3%	6.9%	3.4%	5.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	5.7%	7.1%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	1.9%	5.0%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	3.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.5%	2.5%
More housing in and around downtown	2.0%	0.9%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	2.4%	1.9%
More affordable housing within the City	10.1%	11.6%	15.4%	6.7%	17.2%	8.7%	10.0%
More employment opportunities	13.7%	13.4%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	14.0%	13.2%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	6.2%	6.3%	7.7%	10.0%	3.4%	5.8%	6.3%
Expanded public transportation	3.4%	6.3%	15.4%	6.7%	10.3%	3.9%	4.3%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	4.5%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	3.2%
More activities for teenagers	4.3%	3.6%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	3.4%	4.1%
More activities for seniors	0.8%	1.8%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	5.3%	1.8%
Improved access to local foods	3.0%	2.7%	15.4%	3.3%	0.0%	1.4%	2.7%
Better management of growth	7.9%	8.0%	0.0%	13.3%	3.4%	8.7%	8.0%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.9%	3.6%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	5.3%	4.1%
New or expanded conference space	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.0%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	0.8%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.7%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	3.9%	3.6%	7.7%	0.0%	10.3%	2.9%	3.7%
More arts and cultural opportunities	1.2%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	4.7%	1.8%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	3.4%	4.1%
Stronger retirement community	0.9%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	1.8%
Other	0.6%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.6%
No response	6.1%	8.9%	0.0%	10.0%	10.3%	13.5%	8.1%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	2.3%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	3.4%	0.5%	1.7%
More attractive City entrances	2.5%	3.6%	0.0%	3.3%	10.3%	1.4%	2.6%
More parks and open space	2.6%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	6.8%	6.3%	15.4%	6.7%	6.9%	4.8%	6.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	4.5%	2.7%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	1.4%	3.6%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	3.1%	1.8%	15.4%	0.0%	6.9%	1.0%	2.7%
More housing in and around downtown	2.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.7%
More affordable housing within the City	3.7%	4.5%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	7.2%	4.3%
More employment opportunities	8.9%	6.3%	0.0%	10.0%	6.9%	9.2%	8.6%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	6.2%	7.1%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	4.3%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	3.7%	5.4%	30.8%	3.3%	6.9%	3.9%	4.4%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	3.0%	1.8%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	1.4%	2.7%
More activities for teenagers	3.7%	4.5%	0.0%	6.7%	3.4%	7.2%	4.5%
More activities for seniors	2.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	4.8%	2.9%
Improved access to local foods	2.6%	5.4%	0.0%	10.0%	6.9%	3.4%	3.3%
Better management of growth	8.2%	7.1%	7.7%	10.0%	3.4%	7.2%	7.9%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	5.8%	3.3%
New or expanded conference space	1.1%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.1%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	2.4%	2.2%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	5.3%	5.4%	0.0%	6.7%	3.4%	1.9%	4.6%
More arts and cultural opportunities	3.7%	1.8%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	1.0%	2.9%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	8.5%	6.3%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	1.4%	6.6%
Stronger retirement community	1.4%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	2.2%
Other	0.6%	0.9%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.7%
No response	8.2%	9.8%	0.0%	13.3%	10.3%	16.9%	10.4%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. 4th Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	1.1%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	1.4%	1.5%
More attractive City entrances	2.8%	0.9%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	3.4%	2.8%
More parks and open space	3.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	13.8%	1.9%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	5.0%	5.4%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	4.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	4.8%	5.4%	0.0%	6.7%	3.4%	3.4%	4.5%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	3.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	2.4%
More housing in and around downtown	1.6%	0.9%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.2%
More affordable housing within the City	5.7%	8.9%	15.4%	13.3%	3.4%	2.9%	5.7%
More employment opportunities	3.7%	7.1%	15.4%	3.3%	3.4%	5.3%	4.5%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	5.7%	5.4%	7.7%	3.3%	10.3%	5.3%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	3.9%	5.4%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	2.9%	3.6%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	3.0%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	1.9%	2.6%
More activities for teenagers	4.2%	2.7%	7.7%	10.0%	0.0%	3.4%	4.2%
More activities for seniors	1.7%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.9%	1.9%
Improved access to local foods	4.8%	6.3%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	1.0%	4.0%
Better management of growth	6.8%	4.5%	7.7%	3.3%	10.3%	6.3%	6.4%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.4%	3.6%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	3.9%	3.7%
New or expanded conference space	2.5%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.9%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	1.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.3%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	7.0%	6.3%	0.0%	10.0%	6.9%	6.3%	6.8%
More arts and cultural opportunities	3.9%	0.9%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	3.4%	3.5%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	5.9%	5.4%	7.7%	6.7%	0.0%	4.3%	5.4%
Stronger retirement community	2.3%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	3.2%
Other	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	1.0%	1.1%
No response	11.6%	12.5%	0.0%	13.3%	17.2%	24.2%	14.4%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. Best Represent							
A stronger community identity	9.2%	6.3%	15.4%	0.0%	10.3%	9.7%	8.7%
More attractive City entrances	7.9%	7.1%	7.7%	10.0%	13.8%	8.2%	8.0%
More parks and open space	11.2%	11.6%	15.4%	6.7%	17.2%	11.6%	11.5%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	21.7%	25.0%	38.5%	20.0%	20.7%	14.5%	20.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	16.5%	17.9%	15.4%	13.3%	10.3%	7.7%	14.4%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	12.6%	8.0%	30.8%	10.0%	13.8%	3.4%	10.3%
More housing in and around downtown	7.5%	3.6%	7.7%	3.3%	0.0%	6.3%	6.4%
More affordable housing within the City	29.2%	34.8%	46.2%	26.7%	27.6%	28.5%	29.6%
More employment opportunities	55.6%	50.0%	23.1%	66.7%	48.3%	55.1%	54.5%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)							
Better protection of natural resources	22.4%	25.9%	15.4%	26.7%	17.2%	19.8%	22.4%
Expanded public transportation	13.0%	17.9%	53.8%	13.3%	20.7%	12.1%	14.1%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	12.0%	9.8%	7.7%	6.7%	10.3%	3.9%	9.8%
More activities for teenagers	14.9%	10.7%	7.7%	20.0%	13.8%	15.9%	14.9%
More activities for seniors	4.7%	9.8%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	13.0%	7.0%
Improved access to local foods	10.9%	18.8%	30.8%	16.7%	13.8%	6.8%	11.3%
Better management of growth	30.3%	25.9%	15.4%	33.3%	20.7%	33.8%	30.2%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	13.5%	13.4%	0.0%	20.0%	13.8%	19.8%	15.0%
New or expanded conference space	5.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	4.1%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)							
Multi-use neighborhoods	5.0%	3.6%	7.7%	6.7%	3.4%	5.8%	5.0%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	18.0%	17.0%	7.7%	16.7%	20.7%	11.1%	16.4%
More arts and cultural opportunities	10.2%	6.3%	7.7%	10.0%	13.8%	5.3%	8.8%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	25.0%	16.1%	38.5%	16.7%	24.1%	11.1%	20.9%
Stronger retirement community	5.4%	11.6%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	20.8%	8.8%
Other	7.6%	6.3%	7.7%	6.7%	10.3%	4.8%	6.9%
No response	4.8%	8.9%	0.0%	6.7%	10.3%	13.0%	7.2%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5a. Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities							
Major strength	34.9%	40.9%	30.8%	46.4%	14.3%	33.8%	35.0%
Strength	47.6%	42.7%	53.8%	42.9%	50.0%	41.8%	45.9%
Neutral	14.8%	14.5%	15.4%	7.1%	35.7%	22.4%	16.8%
Weakness	2.4%	1.8%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	2.0%	2.1%
Major weakness	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Q5b. Availability of retail choices							
Major strength	6.2%	5.4%	7.7%	3.6%	10.7%	7.9%	6.5%
Strength	38.5%	49.5%	69.2%	32.1%	28.6%	34.0%	38.8%
Neutral	30.6%	26.1%	15.4%	17.9%	32.1%	31.0%	29.5%
Weakness	21.5%	14.4%	0.0%	39.3%	21.4%	19.7%	20.7%
Major weakness	3.2%	4.5%	7.7%	7.1%	7.1%	7.4%	4.5%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5c. Existing sidewalk network							
Major strength	4.4%	2.7%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.9%	3.9%
Strength	31.5%	35.5%	61.5%	42.9%	35.7%	24.6%	31.4%
Neutral	42.2%	36.4%	23.1%	35.7%	35.7%	48.8%	42.4%
Weakness	19.2%	21.8%	15.4%	17.9%	21.4%	20.2%	19.5%
Major weakness	2.7%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	2.5%	2.9%
Q5d. Protection of natural resources							
Major strength	2.7%	3.7%	0.0%	6.9%	3.6%	6.0%	3.5%
Strength	25.7%	25.9%	23.1%	31.0%	28.6%	26.1%	26.0%
Neutral	55.5%	53.7%	61.5%	41.4%	53.6%	51.8%	54.1%
Weakness	14.4%	14.8%	7.7%	17.2%	10.7%	13.6%	14.4%
Major weakness	1.7%	1.9%	7.7%	3.4%	3.6%	2.5%	2.1%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5e. Public transportation							
Major strength	4.1%	4.5%	7.7%	7.1%	14.3%	5.9%	4.9%
Strength	32.7%	37.8%	38.5%	28.6%	17.9%	32.7%	33.0%
Neutral	45.8%	35.1%	23.1%	46.4%	42.9%	45.5%	44.0%
Weakness	15.1%	17.1%	30.8%	17.9%	17.9%	14.4%	15.5%
Major weakness	2.4%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	1.5%	2.7%
Q5f. Character of neighborhoods							
Major strength	10.4%	8.1%	7.7%	3.4%	3.6%	7.5%	9.2%
Strength	46.2%	42.3%	53.8%	51.7%	42.9%	42.0%	45.1%
Neutral	33.1%	31.5%	38.5%	27.6%	46.4%	39.0%	34.4%
Weakness	9.6%	16.2%	0.0%	17.2%	3.6%	11.0%	10.5%
Major weakness	0.6%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.5%	0.8%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5g. Availability of housing choices							
Major strength	3.9%	4.5%	7.7%	3.7%	7.1%	6.5%	4.7%
Strength	25.2%	26.1%	38.5%	14.8%	28.6%	30.3%	26.2%
Neutral	41.3%	39.6%	23.1%	40.7%	32.1%	40.8%	40.4%
Weakness	24.6%	26.1%	15.4%	37.0%	25.0%	19.9%	24.1%
Major weakness	5.0%	3.6%	15.4%	3.7%	7.1%	2.5%	4.6%
Q5h. Availability of parks and open space							
Major strength	12.8%	15.5%	7.7%	21.4%	10.7%	15.3%	13.5%
Strength	57.1%	60.9%	46.2%	53.6%	57.1%	50.2%	55.8%
Neutral	25.2%	14.5%	30.8%	10.7%	21.4%	25.6%	23.8%
Weakness	4.3%	7.3%	15.4%	14.3%	10.7%	8.4%	6.2%
Major weakness	0.6%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.7%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5i. Employment opportunities							
Major strength	3.1%	2.7%	7.7%	6.9%	3.6%	6.4%	4.0%
Strength	9.1%	13.6%	15.4%	3.4%	0.0%	10.8%	9.5%
Neutral	34.6%	40.0%	46.2%	27.6%	32.1%	38.4%	35.9%
Weakness	34.1%	33.6%	15.4%	34.5%	32.1%	31.0%	33.0%
Major weakness	19.0%	10.0%	15.4%	27.6%	32.1%	13.3%	17.6%
Q5j. Historic buildings and areas							
Major strength	15.7%	13.5%	7.7%	14.3%	10.7%	12.3%	14.5%
Strength	48.7%	62.2%	61.5%	53.6%	46.4%	48.8%	50.3%
Neutral	31.9%	17.1%	30.8%	28.6%	32.1%	36.0%	30.9%
Weakness	3.5%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	3.0%	4.0%
Major weakness	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%	0.3%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5k. Rate of growth							
Major strength	2.4%	2.7%	7.7%	3.7%	3.6%	6.0%	3.3%
Strength	21.1%	25.5%	15.4%	11.1%	10.7%	28.5%	22.4%
Neutral	51.4%	50.9%	61.5%	55.6%	53.6%	45.5%	50.4%
Weakness	18.6%	19.1%	7.7%	22.2%	25.0%	16.0%	18.4%
Major weakness	6.5%	1.8%	7.7%	7.4%	7.1%	4.0%	5.5%
Q5l. Unique local identity							
Major strength	36.6%	37.8%	38.5%	39.3%	10.7%	23.8%	33.5%
Strength	40.6%	44.1%	53.8%	28.6%	39.3%	45.0%	41.4%
Neutral	20.1%	14.4%	7.7%	32.1%	46.4%	26.7%	22.0%
Weakness	2.4%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	4.5%	2.9%
Major weakness	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5m. Opportunities for community involvement							
Major strength	20.1%	19.8%	15.4%	17.9%	10.7%	17.4%	19.0%
Strength	47.7%	51.4%	69.2%	50.0%	46.4%	37.8%	46.5%
Neutral	25.9%	26.1%	15.4%	25.0%	42.9%	35.3%	28.0%
Weakness	6.0%	2.7%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	6.5%	5.7%
Major weakness	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.8%
Q5n. Attention to environmental issues							
Major strength	11.2%	8.3%	15.4%	13.8%	7.1%	9.5%	10.5%
Strength	35.9%	43.1%	53.8%	37.9%	32.1%	34.2%	36.4%
Neutral	40.1%	33.9%	15.4%	31.0%	42.9%	39.2%	38.7%
Weakness	10.3%	11.9%	15.4%	13.8%	7.1%	15.1%	11.8%
Major weakness	2.5%	2.8%	0.0%	3.4%	10.7%	2.0%	2.6%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5o. Downtown							
Major strength	52.7%	51.4%	69.2%	53.6%	32.1%	31.0%	47.7%
Strength	33.6%	38.7%	30.8%	32.1%	32.1%	37.9%	35.1%
Neutral	10.0%	6.3%	0.0%	3.6%	28.6%	18.7%	11.5%
Weakness	3.0%	2.7%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	9.4%	4.5%
Major weakness	0.6%	0.9%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.0%	1.3%
Q5p. Population growth							
Major strength	3.5%	2.8%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	7.7%	4.1%
Strength	21.4%	28.4%	23.1%	28.6%	7.1%	25.5%	22.7%
Neutral	58.1%	56.0%	53.8%	57.1%	75.0%	53.1%	57.1%
Weakness	12.7%	8.3%	15.4%	10.7%	7.1%	11.7%	12.0%
Major weakness	4.4%	4.6%	7.7%	0.0%	10.7%	2.0%	4.0%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5q. Presence of family farms							
Major strength	9.4%	12.6%	30.8%	17.2%	7.1%	10.9%	10.5%
Strength	34.8%	38.7%	15.4%	48.3%	21.4%	28.4%	33.6%
Neutral	41.1%	32.4%	53.8%	17.2%	50.0%	38.8%	39.5%
Weakness	11.7%	9.9%	0.0%	13.8%	10.7%	17.9%	12.6%
Major weakness	3.0%	6.3%	0.0%	3.4%	10.7%	4.0%	3.8%
Q5r. Quality of life							
Major strength	27.5%	33.6%	30.8%	44.8%	17.9%	29.7%	28.7%
Strength	55.6%	52.7%	61.5%	41.4%	42.9%	50.0%	53.3%
Neutral	14.8%	9.1%	7.7%	3.4%	32.1%	13.9%	14.5%
Weakness	1.6%	4.5%	0.0%	10.3%	7.1%	4.0%	2.7%
Major weakness	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.9%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q5s. Existing roadway network							
Major strength	4.4%	4.6%	7.7%	13.8%	0.0%	10.3%	5.8%
Strength	27.1%	37.6%	46.2%	10.3%	17.9%	36.5%	29.6%
Neutral	34.4%	18.3%	23.1%	41.4%	42.9%	27.1%	31.6%
Weakness	24.3%	27.5%	23.1%	27.6%	25.0%	20.7%	24.0%
Major weakness	9.8%	11.9%	0.0%	6.9%	14.3%	5.4%	9.0%
Q5t. Other							
Major strength	16.4%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	14.0%
Strength	3.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	5.0%
Neutral	9.8%	8.3%	100.0%	33.3%	40.0%	0.0%	11.0%
Weakness	13.1%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%	15.0%
Major weakness	57.4%	50.0%	0.0%	66.7%	60.0%	43.8%	55.0%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. Most Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	9.0%	6.3%	15.4%	3.3%	0.0%	7.2%	7.9%
Availability of retail choices	1.1%	1.8%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	3.9%	1.7%
Existing sidewalk network	0.9%	0.9%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Protection of natural resources	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	2.9%	3.3%
Public transportation	1.4%	4.5%	7.7%	0.0%	17.2%	1.4%	2.2%
Character of neighborhoods	2.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	1.0%	1.7%
Availability of housing choices	3.3%	4.5%	7.7%	6.7%	3.4%	1.9%	3.3%
Availability of parks and open space	2.6%	0.9%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	1.4%	2.2%
Employment opportunities	11.0%	8.0%	7.7%	13.3%	24.1%	7.2%	10.4%
Historic buildings and areas	1.1%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.4%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.1%
Unique local identity	13.4%	12.5%	15.4%	10.0%	0.0%	9.7%	12.1%
Opportunities for community involvement	1.7%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	0.0%	1.5%
Attention to environmental issues	1.4%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.5%
Downtown	15.4%	17.0%	23.1%	16.7%	10.3%	9.7%	14.2%
Population growth	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%
Presence of family farms	1.9%	0.9%	0.0%	6.7%	3.4%	1.9%	2.0%
Quality of life	10.4%	9.8%	7.7%	16.7%	0.0%	15.5%	11.2%
Existing roadway network	5.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	3.4%	4.4%
Other	1.9%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	2.0%
No response	11.5%	13.4%	7.7%	16.7%	13.8%	24.2%	14.5%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. 2nd Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	4.8%	5.4%	7.7%	23.3%	3.4%	6.8%	5.8%
Availability of retail choices	2.8%	1.8%	7.7%	0.0%	6.9%	2.4%	2.7%
Existing sidewalk network	1.9%	1.8%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	2.0%	4.5%	7.7%	6.7%	3.4%	1.0%	2.4%
Public transportation	2.0%	3.6%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	2.9%	2.5%
Character of neighborhoods	4.3%	1.8%	7.7%	0.0%	3.4%	1.9%	3.4%
Availability of housing choices	4.2%	3.6%	7.7%	6.7%	10.3%	3.9%	4.3%
Availability of parks and open space	4.3%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	3.7%
Employment opportunities	7.8%	8.9%	15.4%	3.3%	10.3%	9.2%	8.1%
Historic buildings and areas	3.7%	3.6%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	2.9%	3.5%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. 2nd Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	0.9%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	1.4%	1.4%
Unique local identity	9.3%	8.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	5.8%	8.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.5%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	2.9%	3.6%
Attention to environmental issues	2.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	1.7%
Downtown	16.1%	11.6%	15.4%	13.3%	10.3%	11.1%	14.4%
Population growth	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.9%
Presence of family farms	2.5%	3.6%	7.7%	3.3%	0.0%	2.4%	2.6%
Quality of life	9.6%	13.4%	0.0%	13.3%	6.9%	10.6%	10.1%
Existing roadway network	1.6%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	2.0%
Other	0.3%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
No response	14.1%	14.3%	7.7%	16.7%	13.8%	25.6%	16.5%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. 3rd Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	11.0%	10.7%	15.4%	10.0%	3.4%	4.3%	9.4%
Availability of retail choices	3.7%	4.5%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	3.4%	3.9%
Existing sidewalk network	2.0%	1.8%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	0.5%	1.8%
Protection of natural resources	2.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	1.0%	2.1%
Public transportation	1.6%	2.7%	7.7%	0.0%	6.9%	5.8%	2.7%
Character of neighborhoods	2.2%	4.5%	7.7%	3.3%	0.0%	1.9%	2.5%
Availability of housing choices	3.6%	4.5%	7.7%	0.0%	3.4%	2.9%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	4.7%	3.6%	23.1%	6.7%	3.4%	6.8%	5.2%
Employment opportunities	3.7%	4.5%	7.7%	6.7%	3.4%	2.4%	3.7%
Historic buildings and areas	3.9%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	2.4%	3.5%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. 3rd Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	2.8%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.4%	2.3%
Unique local identity	7.8%	9.8%	0.0%	13.3%	0.0%	3.9%	7.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.2%	3.6%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	3.4%	3.7%
Attention to environmental issues	2.6%	3.6%	7.7%	6.7%	0.0%	2.4%	3.0%
Downtown	11.5%	5.4%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	7.7%	9.6%
Population growth	0.9%	1.8%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.3%
Presence of family farms	3.1%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	3.9%	3.2%
Quality of life	9.6%	11.6%	0.0%	3.3%	10.3%	10.1%	9.6%
Existing roadway network	1.9%	0.9%	0.0%	10.0%	3.4%	5.8%	2.8%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
No response	16.1%	16.1%	7.7%	16.7%	24.1%	28.5%	18.9%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. 4th Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	7.6%	10.7%	15.4%	6.7%	3.4%	9.2%	8.2%
Availability of retail choices	3.7%	1.8%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	4.8%	3.8%
Existing sidewalk network	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	1.9%	1.8%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.9%
Public transportation	2.5%	1.8%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	1.0%	2.3%
Character of neighborhoods	3.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	3.3%
Availability of housing choices	3.3%	2.7%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	4.3%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	6.2%	5.4%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	4.8%	5.7%
Employment opportunities	2.0%	0.9%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	1.9%	2.1%
Historic buildings and areas	3.1%	8.9%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	3.4%	3.6%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. 4th Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	2.5%	0.9%	15.4%	3.3%	10.3%	1.4%	2.5%
Unique local identity	5.7%	8.0%	15.4%	3.3%	0.0%	4.3%	5.5%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.2%	4.5%	7.7%	6.7%	0.0%	3.4%	4.1%
Attention to environmental issues	3.4%	1.8%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	1.0%	2.8%
Downtown	6.7%	10.7%	7.7%	3.3%	0.0%	7.7%	7.0%
Population growth	1.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.4%
Presence of family farms	3.3%	4.5%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	1.4%	3.3%
Quality of life	13.2%	8.0%	0.0%	10.0%	13.8%	6.3%	11.0%
Existing roadway network	2.3%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	2.9%	2.6%
Other	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.9%
No response	19.6%	21.4%	7.7%	23.3%	31.0%	32.9%	22.8%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. Most Important							
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	32.5%	33.0%	53.8%	43.3%	10.3%	27.5%	31.4%
Availability of retail choices	11.3%	9.8%	23.1%	10.0%	20.7%	14.5%	12.1%
Existing sidewalk network	7.3%	4.5%	15.4%	3.3%	6.9%	1.9%	5.8%
Protection of natural resources	9.8%	11.6%	15.4%	6.7%	13.8%	7.2%	9.8%
Public transportation	7.5%	12.5%	30.8%	6.7%	31.0%	11.1%	9.7%
Character of neighborhoods	12.3%	8.0%	15.4%	3.3%	10.3%	9.2%	10.9%
Availability of housing choices	14.3%	15.2%	23.1%	23.3%	17.2%	13.0%	14.5%
Availability of parks and open space	17.9%	13.4%	23.1%	13.3%	13.8%	15.9%	16.8%
Employment opportunities	24.5%	22.3%	30.8%	30.0%	44.8%	20.8%	24.4%
Historic buildings and areas	11.8%	20.5%	0.0%	6.7%	13.8%	10.6%	12.1%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)							
Rate of growth	7.5%	5.4%	15.4%	6.7%	20.7%	6.3%	7.4%
Unique local identity	36.2%	38.4%	30.8%	30.0%	3.4%	23.7%	32.7%
Opportunities for community involvement	14.6%	12.5%	7.7%	13.3%	6.9%	9.7%	13.0%
Attention to environmental issues	9.6%	10.7%	15.4%	10.0%	10.3%	4.3%	9.0%
Downtown	49.7%	44.6%	53.8%	36.7%	27.6%	36.2%	45.2%
Population growth	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	4.8%	3.8%
Presence of family farms	10.7%	11.6%	7.7%	16.7%	13.8%	9.7%	11.1%
Quality of life	42.9%	42.9%	7.7%	43.3%	31.0%	42.5%	41.9%
Existing roadway network	11.0%	8.9%	0.0%	10.0%	20.7%	15.9%	11.8%
Other	3.9%	5.4%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	3.9%	3.8%
No response	11.5%	13.4%	7.7%	16.7%	13.8%	24.2%	14.5%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q7a. Ease of travel by car on highways							
Very satisfied	22.6%	22.0%	38.5%	20.0%	3.4%	24.0%	22.5%
Satisfied	53.1%	56.0%	46.2%	63.3%	48.3%	56.0%	53.9%
Neutral	10.2%	9.2%	7.7%	10.0%	24.1%	10.5%	10.6%
Dissatisfied	9.6%	8.3%	7.7%	3.3%	13.8%	7.5%	9.0%
Very dissatisfied	4.4%	4.6%	0.0%	3.3%	10.3%	2.0%	4.0%
Q7b. Ease of travel by car on major streets							
Very satisfied	10.8%	7.3%	7.7%	10.0%	6.9%	14.8%	10.9%
Satisfied	33.1%	39.1%	53.8%	50.0%	34.5%	40.4%	35.8%
Neutral	16.8%	20.0%	23.1%	3.3%	17.2%	20.7%	17.7%
Dissatisfied	28.2%	24.5%	15.4%	26.7%	27.6%	16.7%	25.4%
Very dissatisfied	11.1%	9.1%	0.0%	10.0%	13.8%	7.4%	10.2%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q7c. Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets							
Very satisfied	11.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	3.4%	8.9%	10.1%
Satisfied	48.2%	50.9%	53.8%	60.0%	55.2%	49.8%	49.3%
Neutral	23.5%	22.7%	30.8%	10.0%	24.1%	25.6%	23.6%
Dissatisfied	13.5%	10.9%	7.7%	16.7%	13.8%	10.8%	12.9%
Very dissatisfied	3.8%	5.5%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	4.9%	4.2%
Q7d. Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods							
Very satisfied	10.9%	8.3%	23.1%	10.7%	6.9%	14.8%	11.4%
Satisfied	46.4%	56.9%	61.5%	64.3%	37.9%	45.3%	47.4%
Neutral	24.6%	22.0%	7.7%	17.9%	31.0%	22.2%	24.0%
Dissatisfied	13.1%	9.2%	7.7%	7.1%	20.7%	10.8%	12.2%
Very dissatisfied	5.0%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	6.9%	5.1%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q7e. Ease of walking in City of Lawrence							
Very satisfied	15.5%	14.7%	0.0%	6.9%	3.6%	17.5%	15.1%
Satisfied	47.8%	49.5%	69.2%	65.5%	50.0%	40.4%	47.4%
Neutral	22.3%	15.6%	23.1%	17.2%	25.0%	28.4%	22.5%
Dissatisfied	12.9%	17.4%	7.7%	6.9%	17.9%	9.8%	12.7%
Very dissatisfied	1.5%	2.8%	0.0%	3.4%	3.6%	3.8%	2.2%
Q7f. Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence							
Very satisfied	7.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	6.8%
Satisfied	28.6%	31.3%	36.4%	30.8%	34.6%	23.5%	28.4%
Neutral	35.4%	26.3%	9.1%	34.6%	38.5%	47.1%	36.2%
Dissatisfied	21.8%	28.3%	45.5%	30.8%	11.5%	17.6%	22.0%
Very dissatisfied	7.2%	7.1%	9.1%	3.8%	15.4%	3.3%	6.6%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q7g. Safety of walking in City of Lawrence							
Very satisfied	11.4%	11.9%	0.0%	3.4%	7.1%	12.8%	11.2%
Satisfied	42.3%	40.4%	53.8%	51.7%	42.9%	45.3%	42.9%
Neutral	24.6%	25.7%	30.8%	20.7%	28.6%	26.3%	25.1%
Dissatisfied	18.4%	16.5%	7.7%	20.7%	17.9%	10.6%	16.6%
Very dissatisfied	3.4%	5.5%	7.7%	3.4%	3.6%	5.0%	4.2%
Q7h. Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence							
Very satisfied	5.4%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	5.8%	5.5%
Satisfied	19.9%	13.9%	18.2%	18.5%	18.5%	22.7%	19.6%
Neutral	34.1%	26.7%	18.2%	37.0%	37.0%	42.2%	34.8%
Dissatisfied	30.3%	40.6%	36.4%	33.3%	18.5%	22.7%	29.9%
Very dissatisfied	10.2%	10.9%	27.3%	11.1%	22.2%	6.5%	10.2%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q7i. Existing bicycle system throughout County							
Very satisfied	5.3%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	5.5%
Satisfied	19.0%	17.5%	10.0%	23.1%	12.0%	17.6%	18.5%
Neutral	40.0%	32.0%	50.0%	42.3%	48.0%	51.4%	41.5%
Dissatisfied	25.8%	36.1%	40.0%	23.1%	12.0%	14.9%	24.6%
Very dissatisfied	9.9%	8.2%	0.0%	11.5%	28.0%	8.8%	9.9%
Q7j. Existing walking and hiking system throughout County							
Very satisfied	5.7%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	7.6%	6.0%
Satisfied	33.4%	24.2%	11.1%	33.3%	30.8%	32.9%	32.0%
Neutral	38.4%	32.6%	66.7%	41.7%	42.3%	44.3%	39.2%
Dissatisfied	18.2%	28.4%	11.1%	20.8%	3.8%	10.8%	17.5%
Very dissatisfied	4.3%	7.4%	11.1%	4.2%	19.2%	4.4%	5.2%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q7k. Existing road system in County							
Very satisfied	8.0%	5.8%	0.0%	3.3%	3.7%	6.9%	7.3%
Satisfied	42.0%	42.3%	45.5%	46.7%	44.4%	50.0%	43.5%
Neutral	37.5%	37.5%	45.5%	40.0%	44.4%	30.3%	36.6%
Dissatisfied	10.1%	12.5%	9.1%	6.7%	7.4%	9.0%	9.9%
Very dissatisfied	2.5%	1.9%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	3.7%	2.7%
Q7l. Quality of public transportation (bus service)							
Very satisfied	7.4%	9.1%	8.3%	8.3%	4.2%	4.9%	7.0%
Satisfied	27.8%	26.3%	41.7%	25.0%	29.2%	37.8%	29.8%
Neutral	44.8%	46.5%	8.3%	50.0%	45.8%	47.0%	45.0%
Dissatisfied	14.5%	11.1%	41.7%	12.5%	16.7%	6.1%	12.8%
Very dissatisfied	5.5%	7.1%	0.0%	4.2%	4.2%	4.3%	5.5%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q7m. Other							
Very satisfied	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	8.5%
Satisfied	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	4.2%
Neutral	5.3%	10.0%	50.0%	0.0%	40.0%	7.7%	9.9%
Dissatisfied	21.1%	10.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	16.9%
Very dissatisfied	57.9%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	61.5%	60.6%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q8. Most Important							
Ease of travel by car on highways	8.7%	5.4%	0.0%	10.0%	10.3%	7.2%	8.0%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	27.8%	25.0%	30.8%	33.3%	24.1%	22.2%	26.6%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	3.7%	1.8%	7.7%	0.0%	6.9%	3.9%	3.6%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	2.0%	2.7%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	2.4%	2.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	6.1%	6.3%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	6.3%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	6.5%	8.0%	7.7%	6.7%	3.4%	3.4%	5.9%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	5.7%	7.1%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	5.8%	5.7%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	7.3%	8.9%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	5.8%	7.0%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	3.4%	2.3%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)							
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	2.3%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	3.1%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	6.3%	3.7%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	9.5%	9.8%	23.1%	10.0%	13.8%	7.7%	9.4%
Other	2.6%	3.6%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	1.0%	2.6%
No response	12.1%	13.4%	7.7%	16.7%	13.8%	22.2%	14.3%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q8. 2nd Important							
Ease of travel by car on highways	5.9%	2.7%	7.7%	6.7%	10.3%	5.3%	5.5%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	14.0%	11.6%	0.0%	10.0%	10.3%	10.1%	12.5%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	7.9%	8.0%	7.7%	3.3%	13.8%	9.2%	8.2%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	5.3%	1.8%	0.0%	3.3%	10.3%	5.3%	5.1%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	6.2%	9.8%	7.7%	3.3%	3.4%	3.9%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	8.1%	7.1%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	3.4%	6.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	9.3%	7.1%	15.4%	10.0%	10.3%	13.5%	10.1%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	10.9%	17.9%	23.1%	20.0%	6.9%	7.2%	11.1%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	3.7%	6.3%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	2.4%	3.6%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q8. 2nd Important (Cont.)							
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	2.2%	0.9%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	3.4%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	4.7%	0.9%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	3.9%	4.0%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	3.7%	8.0%	23.1%	3.3%	3.4%	2.9%	4.2%
Other	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.6%
No response	17.5%	17.9%	7.7%	16.7%	24.1%	28.5%	19.8%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q8. 3rd Important							
Ease of travel by car on highways	3.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.9%	2.8%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	4.7%	8.0%	15.4%	3.3%	10.3%	4.8%	5.3%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	6.8%	3.6%	15.4%	6.7%	3.4%	7.7%	6.7%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	7.3%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.2%	7.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	7.1%	5.4%	7.7%	13.3%	13.8%	6.3%	7.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	6.2%	8.0%	0.0%	13.3%	3.4%	3.4%	5.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	7.8%	8.0%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	6.8%	7.4%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	9.2%	6.3%	30.8%	10.0%	3.4%	7.7%	8.6%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	5.7%	4.5%	0.0%	6.7%	3.4%	3.4%	5.0%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q8. 3rd Important (Cont.)							
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	6.5%	8.0%	15.4%	10.0%	0.0%	4.8%	6.4%
Existing road system in County	5.6%	7.1%	0.0%	3.3%	6.9%	2.9%	5.2%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	7.0%	8.0%	0.0%	10.0%	13.8%	4.3%	6.8%
Other	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.6%
No response	22.8%	19.6%	15.4%	16.7%	31.0%	35.3%	25.0%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q8. Most Important							
Ease of travel by car on highways	17.5%	12.5%	7.7%	16.7%	24.1%	14.5%	16.3%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	46.4%	44.6%	46.2%	46.7%	44.8%	37.2%	44.4%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	18.5%	13.4%	30.8%	10.0%	24.1%	20.8%	18.5%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	14.6%	13.4%	7.7%	6.7%	13.8%	16.9%	14.8%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	19.4%	21.4%	23.1%	20.0%	20.7%	16.4%	19.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	20.8%	23.2%	15.4%	23.3%	13.8%	10.1%	18.5%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	22.8%	22.3%	15.4%	23.3%	17.2%	26.1%	23.2%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	27.3%	33.0%	53.8%	36.7%	17.2%	20.8%	26.7%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	12.0%	10.7%	0.0%	13.3%	6.9%	9.2%	10.9%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)							
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	11.0%	13.4%	15.4%	16.7%	0.0%	10.6%	11.2%
Existing road system in County	13.4%	11.6%	0.0%	10.0%	10.3%	13.0%	12.9%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	20.2%	25.9%	46.2%	23.3%	31.0%	15.0%	20.4%
Other	3.6%	3.6%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	3.4%	3.7%
No response	12.1%	13.4%	7.7%	16.7%	13.8%	22.2%	14.3%

Respondent Employment

Q9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q9. How satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?							
Very satisfied	4.5%	4.5%	15.4%	3.3%	0.0%	10.6%	5.6%
Satisfied	25.8%	29.5%	23.1%	20.0%	24.1%	24.6%	25.6%
Neutral	30.7%	26.8%	7.7%	26.7%	44.8%	27.1%	29.5%
Dissatisfied	11.6%	16.1%	7.7%	23.3%	6.9%	9.2%	12.0%
Very dissatisfied	6.1%	1.8%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	4.8%	5.3%
Don't know	21.3%	21.4%	38.5%	23.3%	17.2%	23.7%	21.9%

Respondent Employment

Q11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q11. How satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?							
Very satisfied	3.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	2.9%
Satisfied	29.2%	27.7%	30.8%	20.0%	24.1%	32.9%	29.2%
Neutral	35.9%	35.7%	30.8%	33.3%	31.0%	32.4%	35.1%
Dissatisfied	13.7%	18.8%	0.0%	23.3%	10.3%	13.5%	14.2%
Very dissatisfied	4.0%	1.8%	0.0%	3.3%	10.3%	4.8%	4.2%
Don't know	13.8%	15.2%	38.5%	20.0%	24.1%	13.0%	14.4%

Respondent Employment

Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?							
Very satisfied	2.2%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	2.2%
Satisfied	18.9%	17.0%	23.1%	16.7%	13.8%	23.7%	19.3%
Neutral	39.0%	35.7%	30.8%	30.0%	34.5%	38.6%	38.3%
Dissatisfied	5.6%	3.6%	0.0%	10.0%	10.3%	5.8%	5.5%
Very dissatisfied	1.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	2.4%	1.5%
Don't know	32.9%	40.2%	46.2%	43.3%	37.9%	26.6%	33.1%

Respondent Employment

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q15a. The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area.							
Strongly agree	31.8%	34.5%	46.2%	46.7%	21.4%	32.5%	32.7%
Agree	38.4%	30.9%	38.5%	30.0%	32.1%	31.5%	35.6%
Neutral	17.5%	18.2%	15.4%	10.0%	17.9%	21.5%	18.0%
Disagree	8.4%	10.9%	0.0%	13.3%	21.4%	11.0%	9.8%
Strongly disagree	3.8%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	3.5%	3.9%
Q15b. Future retail development should primarily be located at the intersection of main streets.							
Strongly agree	5.8%	7.5%	7.7%	3.3%	3.7%	7.1%	6.0%
Agree	19.0%	32.7%	23.1%	26.7%	22.2%	21.2%	21.2%
Neutral	44.6%	35.5%	23.1%	46.7%	40.7%	43.4%	43.1%
Disagree	26.8%	22.4%	46.2%	23.3%	22.2%	24.7%	26.1%
Strongly disagree	3.8%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	3.5%	3.6%

Respondent Employment

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q15c. Future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods.							
Strongly agree	9.1%	13.0%	15.4%	13.3%	14.3%	7.1%	9.5%
Agree	35.3%	32.4%	53.8%	46.7%	32.1%	27.8%	34.0%
Neutral	32.3%	27.8%	15.4%	30.0%	35.7%	40.4%	33.1%
Disagree	18.4%	22.2%	15.4%	10.0%	17.9%	18.2%	18.5%
Strongly disagree	4.9%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%	4.9%
Q15d. Available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings.							
Strongly agree	55.9%	64.5%	69.2%	63.3%	62.1%	46.3%	55.6%
Agree	24.6%	24.5%	30.8%	26.7%	10.3%	30.5%	25.6%
Neutral	10.0%	5.5%	0.0%	6.7%	17.2%	13.3%	10.0%
Disagree	7.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	6.9%	6.2%
Strongly disagree	2.5%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	3.0%	2.5%

Respondent Employment

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q16a. I would like to see agricultural uses maintained in the County.							
Strongly agree	42.4%	46.2%	53.8%	56.7%	44.8%	44.3%	44.2%
Agree	38.7%	36.8%	23.1%	26.7%	20.7%	32.0%	35.8%
Neutral	15.6%	13.2%	7.7%	13.3%	31.0%	22.2%	16.8%
Disagree	2.9%	2.8%	15.4%	3.3%	3.4%	1.0%	2.6%
Strongly disagree	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%
Q16b. I would like to see major development directed inside the City limits.							
Strongly agree	20.0%	24.5%	38.5%	23.3%	13.8%	18.5%	20.6%
Agree	36.5%	34.9%	38.5%	30.0%	37.9%	40.5%	37.0%
Neutral	33.2%	29.2%	23.1%	33.3%	34.5%	27.5%	31.4%
Disagree	8.5%	8.5%	0.0%	13.3%	6.9%	12.0%	9.2%
Strongly disagree	1.8%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	1.5%	1.9%

Respondent Employment

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q16c. I would like to see more shopping opportunities in or near my neighborhood.							
Strongly agree	11.9%	14.0%	30.8%	20.0%	25.0%	8.3%	12.1%
Agree	27.3%	29.9%	38.5%	23.3%	39.3%	21.6%	26.9%
Neutral	36.1%	35.5%	23.1%	26.7%	10.7%	43.6%	36.7%
Disagree	18.5%	14.0%	7.7%	23.3%	17.9%	20.6%	18.3%
Strongly disagree	6.2%	6.5%	0.0%	6.7%	7.1%	5.9%	6.1%
Q16d. I would like to see more employment centers located near my home.							
Strongly agree	12.8%	7.5%	0.0%	20.0%	32.1%	6.4%	11.4%
Agree	24.4%	29.9%	61.5%	13.3%	17.9%	13.8%	23.0%
Neutral	41.0%	38.3%	30.8%	50.0%	42.9%	50.2%	42.7%
Disagree	15.8%	22.4%	0.0%	13.3%	7.1%	19.7%	16.8%
Strongly disagree	5.9%	1.9%	7.7%	3.3%	0.0%	9.9%	6.1%

Respondent Employment

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q16e. I would like to see a modest increase in height of development if it means less expansion of the city out into the County.							
Strongly agree	16.8%	15.5%	15.4%	13.3%	14.8%	12.9%	15.8%
Agree	37.2%	38.8%	53.8%	23.3%	40.7%	35.3%	36.9%
Neutral	31.5%	25.2%	15.4%	30.0%	22.2%	33.3%	30.6%
Disagree	11.4%	16.5%	15.4%	16.7%	11.1%	13.4%	12.5%
Strongly disagree	3.0%	3.9%	0.0%	16.7%	11.1%	5.0%	4.1%
Q16f. I would like to see Downtown accommodate more development.							
Strongly agree	13.7%	20.6%	30.8%	10.0%	22.2%	10.8%	14.0%
Agree	36.1%	29.0%	46.2%	30.0%	18.5%	28.6%	33.4%
Neutral	30.7%	28.0%	7.7%	23.3%	29.6%	41.9%	32.2%
Disagree	14.1%	18.7%	7.7%	26.7%	18.5%	14.8%	15.2%
Strongly disagree	5.4%	3.7%	7.7%	10.0%	11.1%	3.9%	5.2%

Respondent Employment

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q16g. I would like to see development that includes a better mix of uses in order to live, work, and play in close proximity.							
Strongly agree	28.4%	42.6%	53.8%	34.5%	29.6%	22.8%	29.3%
Agree	43.4%	39.8%	30.8%	37.9%	44.4%	43.1%	42.8%
Neutral	23.5%	11.1%	15.4%	24.1%	25.9%	26.2%	22.8%
Disagree	2.7%	4.6%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	5.0%	3.2%
Strongly disagree	1.9%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	2.0%

Respondent Employment

Q17. From the following list, please check ALL the reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County. (Check all that apply)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q17a. The reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County.							
Not enough time	53.6%	50.0%	92.3%	36.7%	17.2%	16.9%	44.6%
Difficult to travel to meetings	5.6%	8.9%	23.1%	6.7%	10.3%	15.0%	8.5%
Not sure how to get involved	34.0%	47.3%	46.2%	60.0%	55.2%	27.1%	35.6%
Don't believe I can make a difference	33.7%	33.0%	7.7%	56.7%	48.3%	41.1%	35.8%
Don't have enough information	39.1%	41.1%	69.2%	36.7%	48.3%	41.5%	40.7%
Other	11.3%	8.0%	0.0%	10.0%	6.9%	17.9%	12.1%
None Chosen	4.3%	3.6%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	6.8%	4.5%

Respondent Employment

Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?							
Very knowledgeable	2.8%	0.9%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	1.9%	2.3%
Somewhat knowledgeable	20.0%	17.9%	7.7%	30.0%	13.8%	26.1%	20.8%
Not sure	11.5%	13.4%	7.7%	3.3%	24.1%	15.9%	12.8%
Not knowledgeable	63.7%	65.2%	84.6%	63.3%	58.6%	54.1%	62.0%
Don't Know	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.9%	2.1%

Respondent Employment

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?							
0 - 2 years	6.8%	5.5%	30.8%	16.7%	17.2%	3.4%	6.9%
3 - 5 years	6.5%	12.7%	46.2%	6.7%	0.0%	2.9%	6.7%
6 - 10 years	12.4%	7.3%	0.0%	6.7%	13.8%	7.8%	10.7%
11 - 20 years	29.0%	25.5%	15.4%	23.3%	24.1%	11.7%	24.6%
21 years or more	45.4%	49.1%	7.7%	46.7%	44.8%	74.1%	51.1%

Respondent Employment

Q21. What is your age?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q21. What is your age?							
Under 35 years	18.4%	25.7%	92.3%	6.7%	28.6%	0.5%	16.3%
35 - 44 years	24.2%	17.4%	7.7%	23.3%	3.6%	1.0%	18.1%
45 - 54 years	31.2%	22.0%	0.0%	40.0%	32.1%	3.4%	24.6%
55 - 64 years	19.1%	15.6%	0.0%	20.0%	35.7%	23.6%	19.8%
65 - 74 years	6.6%	16.5%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	36.9%	13.7%
75+ years	0.5%	2.8%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	34.5%	7.5%

Respondent Employment

Q22. Do you own or rent your home?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q22. Do you own or rent your home?							
Own	83.0%	72.2%	23.1%	96.7%	69.0%	92.6%	83.0%
Rent	17.0%	27.8%	76.9%	3.3%	31.0%	7.4%	17.0%

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?							
Single family	84.6%	75.0%	30.8%	90.0%	65.5%	86.8%	83.0%
Duplex/triplex	8.5%	11.1%	15.4%	3.3%	6.9%	6.4%	8.3%
Apartment/condo	6.6%	13.0%	53.8%	0.0%	20.7%	4.9%	7.7%
Mobile home	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%	6.7%	6.9%	2.0%	1.1%

Respondent Employment

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:							
Under 25,000	2.8%	24.2%	50.0%	7.4%	50.0%	11.8%	8.7%
$25,000 - $49,999	15.5%	19.2%	41.7%	7.4%	11.5%	25.3%	17.8%
$50,000 - $74,999	19.8%	19.2%	8.3%	14.8%	7.7%	16.7%	18.6%
$75,000 - $99,999	20.1%	13.1%	0.0%	18.5%	11.5%	25.3%	20.0%
$100,000 - $149,999	25.5%	15.2%	0.0%	25.9%	15.4%	13.4%	21.4%
$150,000 or more	16.3%	9.1%	0.0%	25.9%	3.8%	7.5%	13.5%

Q26. Your gender

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q26. Your gender:							
Male	51.6%	28.3%	46.2%	6.7%	50.0%	55.3%	48.4%
Female	48.4%	71.7%	53.8%	93.3%	50.0%	44.7%	51.6%

Respondent Employment

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?							
Yes	4.8%	4.6%	7.7%	3.3%	7.4%	2.5%	4.4%
No	95.2%	95.4%	92.3%	96.7%	92.6%	97.5%	95.6%

Q28. Which of the following best describes your race? (Without "Not Provided)

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q28. Which of the following best describes your race?							
African American (Non-Hispanic)	0.9%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.9%	1.2%
White (Non-Hispanic)	91.6%	90.2%	76.9%	90.0%	86.2%	91.3%	90.4%
Native American	2.3%	1.8%	0.0%	3.3%	3.4%	2.9%	2.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.3%	0.0%	23.1%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	1.9%
Other	2.3%	3.6%	7.7%	3.3%	6.9%	2.9%	3.0%

Respondent Employment

Q29. What is your current employment status?

N=1046	Q29. What is your current employment status?						Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Full-time student	Full-time homemaker	Unemployed	Retired	
Q29. What is your current employment status?							
Full time employment	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	62.2%
Part time employment	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%
Full-time student	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Full-time homemaker	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%
Unemployed	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	2.8%
Retired	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	20.0%

Respondent Employment

Q30. Where do you work?

N=756	Q29. What is your current employment status?		Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	
Q30. Where do you work?			
City of Lawrence	60.4%	68.8%	61.6%
Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	7.3%	8.9%	7.5%
KC Metro area	14.0%	5.4%	12.7%
Topeka Metro area	12.3%	7.1%	11.5%
Other	12.9%	9.8%	12.4%

Respondent Employment

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Q29. What is your current employment status?		Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?			
Agriculture	2.3%	1.8%	2.2%
Administrative or Support	5.7%	7.1%	6.0%
Construction	3.0%	0.9%	2.6%
Manufacturing	5.0%	0.9%	4.4%
Wholesale Trade	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%
Food, Hospitality, Entertainment	2.5%	8.9%	3.4%
Retail	4.7%	8.9%	5.3%
Health Services	13.7%	15.2%	13.9%
Transportation and Warehousing	1.2%	2.7%	1.5%
Finance, Insurance, or Real Estate	6.2%	4.5%	6.0%
Professional Services	11.0%	6.3%	10.3%
Scientific or Technical Services	8.1%	1.8%	7.1%

Respondent Employment

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Q29. What is your current employment status?		Total
	Full time employment	Part time employment	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do? (Cont.)			
Educational Services (Pre-school-12th grade)	8.7%	13.4%	9.4%
Educational Services (University/College)	13.7%	18.8%	14.4%
Government	6.4%	1.8%	5.7%
Armed Services	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%
Other	12.0%	14.3%	12.3%

Section 8
Where Respondents Work

Respondent Employment

Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?						
City of Lawrence	82.7%	34.8%	75.9%	78.4%	65.1%	75.7%
Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	17.3%	65.2%	24.1%	21.6%	34.9%	24.3%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1a. Maintaining rural character						
Very important	26.7%	48.9%	22.1%	28.8%	37.3%	30.6%
Somewhat important	39.9%	42.2%	48.8%	41.1%	34.9%	40.2%
Not sure	18.9%	6.7%	15.1%	17.8%	15.7%	17.2%
Not important	14.5%	2.2%	14.0%	12.3%	12.0%	12.0%
Q1b. Preserving historic buildings						
Very important	54.6%	50.0%	49.4%	46.6%	67.1%	52.5%
Somewhat important	35.4%	45.7%	42.4%	46.6%	28.2%	38.5%
Not sure	5.8%	4.3%	5.9%	5.5%	2.4%	5.0%
Not important	4.3%	0.0%	2.4%	1.4%	2.4%	4.0%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1c. Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods						
Very important	46.5%	31.1%	34.5%	41.7%	47.6%	41.0%
Somewhat important	38.9%	51.1%	47.1%	38.9%	33.3%	42.0%
Not sure	10.8%	13.3%	10.3%	12.5%	14.3%	12.0%
Not important	3.8%	4.4%	8.0%	6.9%	4.8%	5.0%
Q1d. Development of the Clinton Lake Area						
Very important	17.1%	19.6%	22.1%	22.2%	20.0%	17.0%
Somewhat important	34.3%	28.3%	36.0%	22.2%	34.1%	34.2%
Not sure	22.6%	21.7%	18.6%	25.0%	20.0%	21.5%
Not important	26.0%	30.4%	23.3%	30.6%	25.9%	27.3%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1e. Quality housing for all income groups						
Very important	57.9%	45.7%	44.8%	51.4%	54.1%	54.0%
Somewhat important	28.3%	37.0%	33.3%	32.4%	25.9%	30.2%
Not sure	8.3%	6.5%	12.6%	4.1%	9.4%	8.9%
Not important	5.5%	10.9%	9.2%	12.2%	10.6%	6.9%
Q1f. Walking and biking trails						
Very important	51.4%	45.7%	47.1%	50.7%	44.7%	45.8%
Somewhat important	37.5%	26.1%	39.1%	30.1%	42.4%	38.4%
Not sure	6.0%	6.5%	5.7%	6.8%	9.4%	7.4%
Not important	5.1%	21.7%	8.0%	12.3%	3.5%	8.4%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1g. Maintaining community identity.						
Very important	50.2%	41.3%	44.8%	47.3%	47.1%	47.2%
Somewhat important	30.9%	32.6%	44.8%	37.8%	36.5%	33.7%
Not sure	15.5%	13.0%	9.2%	9.5%	12.9%	15.0%
Not important	3.4%	13.0%	1.1%	5.4%	3.5%	4.1%
Q1h. Downtown stability						
Very important	63.6%	52.2%	65.5%	70.3%	57.1%	60.8%
Somewhat important	26.0%	28.3%	24.1%	23.0%	28.6%	27.6%
Not sure	6.0%	8.7%	5.7%	4.1%	8.3%	6.3%
Not important	4.5%	10.9%	4.6%	2.7%	6.0%	5.3%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1i. Transportation alternatives to the car						
Very important	41.6%	34.8%	29.9%	28.4%	46.4%	39.4%
Somewhat important	33.3%	28.3%	40.2%	41.9%	20.2%	33.9%
Not sure	11.7%	19.6%	11.5%	8.1%	11.9%	12.2%
Not important	13.4%	17.4%	18.4%	21.6%	21.4%	14.5%
Q1j. Availability of arts and cultural opportunities						
Very important	43.7%	26.1%	36.8%	35.1%	37.6%	38.6%
Somewhat important	38.8%	37.0%	43.7%	39.2%	45.9%	41.3%
Not sure	10.2%	15.2%	9.2%	12.2%	10.6%	11.0%
Not important	7.2%	21.7%	10.3%	13.5%	5.9%	9.2%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1k. Appearance of multi-family residential developments						
Very important	26.2%	17.4%	18.4%	21.9%	29.8%	25.3%
Somewhat important	38.7%	41.3%	43.7%	35.6%	35.7%	40.8%
Not sure	23.2%	26.1%	26.4%	24.7%	13.1%	21.2%
Not important	11.8%	15.2%	11.5%	17.8%	21.4%	12.7%
Q1l. Incorporating natural areas into development projects						
Very important	45.5%	30.4%	42.5%	33.8%	47.1%	42.5%
Somewhat important	31.3%	41.3%	29.9%	44.6%	32.9%	32.6%
Not sure	13.6%	15.2%	17.2%	13.5%	8.2%	14.1%
Not important	9.6%	13.0%	10.3%	8.1%	11.8%	10.8%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1m. Creating employment opportunities						
Very important	75.4%	73.3%	71.3%	67.6%	77.6%	73.6%
Somewhat important	19.9%	26.7%	26.4%	27.0%	15.3%	21.1%
Not sure	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	3.5%	3.2%
Not important	2.1%	0.0%	2.3%	2.7%	3.5%	2.1%
Q1n. Parks, recreation, open space						
Very important	60.3%	50.0%	66.7%	50.0%	56.5%	58.0%
Somewhat important	33.3%	45.7%	29.9%	44.6%	37.6%	35.5%
Not sure	4.3%	4.3%	1.1%	5.4%	3.5%	4.6%
Not important	2.1%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	2.4%	1.9%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1o. Protecting high value farmland						
Very important	42.3%	58.7%	35.6%	39.2%	55.3%	45.0%
Somewhat important	31.6%	23.9%	32.2%	37.8%	22.4%	30.3%
Not sure	17.3%	13.0%	23.0%	16.2%	15.3%	17.1%
Not important	8.8%	4.3%	9.2%	6.8%	7.1%	7.6%
Q1p. Appearance of commercial areas						
Very important	30.0%	30.4%	26.4%	20.3%	31.0%	31.1%
Somewhat important	51.7%	54.3%	52.9%	51.4%	51.2%	51.1%
Not sure	13.8%	4.3%	16.1%	20.3%	8.3%	12.7%
Not important	4.5%	10.9%	4.6%	8.1%	9.5%	5.1%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1q. Managing future growth						
Very important	58.9%	54.3%	56.3%	58.1%	52.9%	58.5%
Somewhat important	33.8%	37.0%	34.5%	25.7%	36.5%	31.9%
Not sure	4.7%	4.3%	8.0%	13.5%	7.1%	6.6%
Not important	2.6%	4.3%	1.1%	2.7%	3.5%	3.0%
Q1r. Activities and housing for the Retirement Community						
Very important	28.9%	28.3%	17.2%	22.2%	29.4%	29.2%
Somewhat important	48.0%	50.0%	50.6%	47.2%	38.8%	47.5%
Not sure	17.1%	13.0%	20.7%	16.7%	22.4%	16.1%
Not important	6.0%	8.7%	11.5%	13.9%	9.4%	7.3%

Respondent Employment

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q1s. Other						
Very important	92.8%	71.4%	77.8%	75.0%	93.3%	85.4%
Somewhat important	2.9%	14.3%	22.2%	16.7%	6.7%	7.0%
Not sure	2.9%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%
Not important	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	3.8%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q2. Most Important						
Maintaining rural character	2.7%	10.9%	5.7%	4.1%	7.0%	5.3%
Preserving historic buildings	3.6%	0.0%	3.4%	2.7%	7.0%	3.9%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	3.8%	0.0%	2.3%	2.7%	5.8%	3.3%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	1.9%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	1.2%	1.3%
Quality housing for all income groups	14.1%	10.9%	12.6%	16.2%	14.0%	13.0%
Walking and biking trails	3.8%	0.0%	3.4%	5.4%	3.5%	3.1%
Maintaining community identity	6.3%	6.5%	6.9%	12.2%	2.3%	5.4%
Downtown stability	12.4%	4.3%	11.5%	10.8%	3.5%	9.9%
Transportation alternatives to the car	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	1.2%	2.6%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)						
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	0.6%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	0.8%	4.3%	3.4%	1.4%	3.5%	1.5%
Creating employment opportunities	24.4%	28.3%	32.2%	25.7%	20.9%	24.3%
Parks, recreation, open space	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%	0.0%	1.2%	1.7%
Protecting high value farmland	2.3%	10.9%	1.1%	1.4%	5.8%	3.5%
Appearance of commercial areas	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Managing future growth	7.4%	6.5%	5.7%	2.7%	4.7%	6.9%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	1.5%
Other	4.4%	6.5%	4.6%	6.8%	5.8%	4.9%
None chosen	3.4%	6.5%	2.3%	4.1%	9.3%	5.4%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q2. 3rd Important						
Maintaining rural character	1.9%	4.3%	1.1%	1.4%	3.5%	2.0%
Preserving historic buildings	2.9%	2.2%	8.0%	4.1%	1.2%	3.6%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	4.6%	6.5%	4.6%	6.8%	4.7%	4.6%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	2.1%	2.2%	4.6%	2.7%	1.2%	2.1%
Quality housing for all income groups	6.9%	6.5%	5.7%	4.1%	2.3%	5.8%
Walking and biking trails	6.5%	8.7%	6.9%	5.4%	8.1%	6.2%
Maintaining community identity	4.4%	4.3%	2.3%	5.4%	1.2%	3.7%
Downtown stability	9.7%	10.9%	6.9%	13.5%	10.5%	9.6%
Transportation alternatives to the car	6.1%	4.3%	3.4%	5.4%	9.3%	6.2%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q2. 3rd Important (Cont.)						
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	4.8%	2.2%	8.0%	1.4%	7.0%	4.6%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	0.8%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	4.8%	0.0%	2.3%	5.4%	5.8%	4.6%
Creating employment opportunities	10.1%	15.2%	6.9%	6.8%	10.5%	9.8%
Parks, recreation, open space	8.2%	6.5%	10.3%	8.1%	7.0%	7.6%
Protecting high value farmland	4.0%	10.9%	4.6%	10.8%	8.1%	5.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	4.4%	2.2%	3.4%	1.4%	1.2%	3.2%
Managing future growth	9.7%	4.3%	10.3%	10.8%	5.8%	9.0%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	1.9%	2.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
None chosen	5.1%	6.5%	3.4%	6.8%	11.6%	7.6%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q2. 4th Important						
Maintaining rural character	2.9%	6.5%	4.6%	2.7%	4.7%	2.9%
Preserving historic buildings	5.9%	4.3%	3.4%	4.1%	5.8%	4.7%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	4.4%	8.7%	4.6%	5.4%	5.8%	4.8%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	3.2%	4.3%	2.3%	5.4%	1.2%	2.7%
Quality housing for all income groups	6.1%	4.3%	2.3%	6.8%	3.5%	5.2%
Walking and biking trails	4.0%	6.5%	6.9%	4.1%	2.3%	4.7%
Maintaining community identity	4.8%	0.0%	8.0%	2.7%	5.8%	4.9%
Downtown stability	4.6%	0.0%	9.2%	5.4%	7.0%	5.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	6.5%	6.5%	2.3%	4.1%	1.2%	4.4%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q2. 4th Important (Cont.)						
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	7.6%	0.0%	4.6%	5.4%	4.7%	6.1%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	2.5%	2.2%	1.1%	2.7%	2.3%	2.7%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	5.3%	0.0%	6.9%	6.8%	2.3%	4.7%
Creating employment opportunities	7.4%	8.7%	5.7%	6.8%	7.0%	7.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	7.6%	4.3%	8.0%	8.1%	9.3%	7.3%
Protecting high value farmland	4.2%	13.0%	4.6%	5.4%	7.0%	4.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%	2.7%	0.0%	2.6%
Managing future growth	8.8%	21.7%	10.3%	12.2%	14.0%	10.3%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	3.4%	0.0%	4.6%	1.4%	3.5%	3.8%
Other	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.2%	1.6%
None chosen	6.1%	6.5%	8.0%	6.8%	11.6%	9.2%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q2. Most Important						
Maintaining rural character	9.7%	30.4%	13.8%	14.9%	17.4%	13.7%
Preserving historic buildings	15.8%	10.9%	19.5%	13.5%	17.4%	15.8%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	18.9%	17.4%	13.8%	18.9%	19.8%	16.9%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	9.5%	8.7%	16.1%	10.8%	7.0%	8.9%
Quality housing for all income groups	36.6%	30.4%	28.7%	32.4%	32.6%	33.8%
Walking and biking trails	20.2%	19.6%	26.4%	18.9%	17.4%	18.8%
Maintaining community identity	20.0%	13.0%	20.7%	23.0%	12.8%	18.2%
Downtown stability	41.3%	30.4%	49.4%	47.3%	27.9%	38.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	20.8%	19.6%	6.9%	16.2%	22.1%	18.6%

Respondent Employment

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)						
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	17.7%	2.2%	14.9%	12.2%	16.3%	15.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	6.1%	4.3%	4.6%	8.1%	3.5%	6.1%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	12.8%	6.5%	12.6%	14.9%	15.1%	12.8%
Creating employment opportunities	55.4%	63.0%	60.9%	59.5%	47.7%	55.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	23.2%	21.7%	29.9%	18.9%	22.1%	22.3%
Protecting high value farmland	14.9%	45.7%	12.6%	20.3%	27.9%	18.4%
Appearance of commercial areas	8.6%	4.3%	5.7%	6.8%	1.2%	7.5%
Managing future growth	33.1%	34.8%	33.3%	31.1%	30.2%	32.5%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	8.0%	4.3%	8.0%	1.4%	9.3%	9.9%
Other	8.6%	6.5%	5.7%	9.5%	9.3%	8.4%
None chosen	3.4%	6.5%	2.3%	4.1%	9.3%	5.4%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3a. A stronger community identity						
Strongly agree	18.6%	15.9%	17.4%	13.5%	20.2%	17.5%
Agree	43.4%	36.4%	45.3%	48.6%	31.0%	42.1%
Neutral	32.4%	43.2%	34.9%	32.4%	41.7%	35.1%
Disagree	5.0%	4.5%	1.2%	4.1%	6.0%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	0.6%	0.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.2%	1.2%
Q3b. More attractive City entrances						
Strongly agree	12.3%	13.0%	16.1%	8.1%	4.7%	11.8%
Agree	32.3%	39.1%	34.5%	29.7%	36.5%	35.6%
Neutral	41.3%	37.0%	42.5%	44.6%	40.0%	39.8%
Disagree	11.5%	6.5%	6.9%	16.2%	12.9%	10.1%
Strongly disagree	2.6%	4.3%	0.0%	1.4%	5.9%	2.7%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3c. More parks and open space						
Strongly agree	26.6%	17.8%	19.5%	18.9%	25.9%	23.3%
Agree	46.6%	40.0%	56.3%	50.0%	37.6%	45.7%
Neutral	22.5%	35.6%	20.7%	28.4%	28.2%	25.6%
Disagree	3.2%	6.7%	3.4%	2.7%	5.9%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.6%
Q3d. More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails						
Strongly agree	40.6%	26.7%	27.6%	35.1%	34.1%	34.7%
Agree	36.5%	40.0%	41.4%	31.1%	38.8%	36.8%
Neutral	17.4%	22.2%	24.1%	27.0%	20.0%	21.0%
Disagree	4.5%	6.7%	3.4%	6.8%	4.7%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	1.1%	4.4%	3.4%	0.0%	2.4%	2.1%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3e. More bicycle paths and routes						
Strongly agree	37.3%	15.2%	27.6%	35.1%	27.4%	31.1%
Agree	29.2%	37.0%	33.3%	25.7%	27.4%	30.2%
Neutral	24.9%	28.3%	26.4%	27.0%	29.8%	27.0%
Disagree	6.4%	10.9%	8.0%	8.1%	13.1%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	2.1%	8.7%	4.6%	4.1%	2.4%	3.5%
Q3f. More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown						
Strongly agree	15.8%	2.2%	23.0%	16.2%	10.6%	13.9%
Agree	33.0%	39.1%	27.6%	39.2%	34.1%	31.3%
Neutral	36.7%	30.4%	33.3%	31.1%	38.8%	36.9%
Disagree	10.9%	26.1%	13.8%	10.8%	12.9%	13.9%
Strongly disagree	3.6%	2.2%	2.3%	2.7%	3.5%	4.1%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3g. More housing in and around downtown						
Strongly agree	11.7%	2.2%	5.7%	6.8%	1.2%	8.7%
Agree	24.2%	17.4%	25.3%	17.6%	27.1%	23.1%
Neutral	42.2%	63.0%	46.0%	50.0%	49.4%	45.4%
Disagree	17.8%	17.4%	19.5%	18.9%	18.8%	17.5%
Strongly disagree	4.2%	0.0%	3.4%	6.8%	3.5%	5.2%
Q3h. More affordable housing within the City						
Strongly agree	41.7%	28.3%	21.4%	25.7%	35.3%	35.2%
Agree	32.8%	32.6%	36.9%	33.8%	31.8%	34.8%
Neutral	19.8%	34.8%	32.1%	27.0%	24.7%	23.2%
Disagree	4.3%	4.3%	7.1%	8.1%	7.1%	5.0%
Strongly disagree	1.5%	0.0%	2.4%	5.4%	1.2%	1.8%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3i. More employment opportunities						
Strongly agree	64.0%	64.4%	57.5%	64.4%	54.1%	61.5%
Agree	27.3%	26.7%	29.9%	28.8%	34.1%	29.4%
Neutral	7.2%	8.9%	8.0%	6.8%	9.4%	7.4%
Disagree	0.8%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	1.2%	1.0%
Strongly disagree	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	0.7%
Q3j. Better protection of natural resources						
Strongly agree	43.5%	28.3%	25.6%	35.1%	41.2%	39.3%
Agree	36.1%	41.3%	50.0%	35.1%	35.3%	38.2%
Neutral	17.2%	21.7%	16.3%	21.6%	22.4%	18.2%
Disagree	1.7%	6.5%	3.5%	8.1%	0.0%	2.9%
Strongly disagree	1.5%	2.2%	4.7%	0.0%	1.2%	1.5%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3k. Expanded public transportation						
Strongly agree	28.7%	10.9%	16.3%	19.2%	26.5%	25.2%
Agree	29.5%	32.6%	32.6%	32.9%	22.9%	28.7%
Neutral	27.0%	32.6%	31.4%	26.0%	34.9%	30.5%
Disagree	9.1%	17.4%	12.8%	6.8%	8.4%	8.9%
Strongly disagree	5.7%	6.5%	7.0%	15.1%	7.2%	6.7%
Q3l. More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake						
Strongly agree	14.9%	8.7%	22.1%	18.9%	11.8%	14.1%
Agree	25.7%	30.4%	30.2%	25.7%	31.8%	26.5%
Neutral	39.9%	41.3%	25.6%	36.5%	30.6%	39.2%
Disagree	14.2%	13.0%	17.4%	12.2%	20.0%	14.2%
Strongly disagree	5.3%	6.5%	4.7%	6.8%	5.9%	6.0%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3m. More activities for teenagers						
Strongly agree	20.1%	17.4%	19.5%	17.6%	21.2%	19.9%
Agree	39.4%	30.4%	27.6%	44.6%	35.3%	38.3%
Neutral	34.1%	50.0%	47.1%	33.8%	34.1%	36.3%
Disagree	4.4%	2.2%	3.4%	2.7%	5.9%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	1.9%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%	3.5%	1.7%
Q3n. More activities for seniors						
Strongly agree	11.7%	15.2%	11.5%	8.1%	16.5%	14.2%
Agree	39.5%	23.9%	36.8%	35.1%	32.9%	37.7%
Neutral	43.5%	56.5%	44.8%	45.9%	42.4%	42.4%
Disagree	4.2%	4.3%	4.6%	9.5%	4.7%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	1.1%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%	3.5%	1.4%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3o. Improved access to local foods						
Strongly agree	25.6%	23.9%	21.8%	20.3%	24.7%	23.6%
Agree	37.5%	37.0%	29.9%	40.5%	34.1%	37.4%
Neutral	31.1%	30.4%	41.4%	25.7%	35.3%	32.0%
Disagree	4.3%	6.5%	3.4%	6.8%	3.5%	4.8%
Strongly disagree	1.5%	2.2%	3.4%	6.8%	2.4%	2.2%
Q3p. Better management of growth						
Strongly agree	39.2%	32.6%	27.6%	36.1%	32.1%	36.7%
Agree	33.9%	28.3%	37.9%	34.7%	36.9%	34.9%
Neutral	21.2%	30.4%	27.6%	23.6%	27.4%	22.5%
Disagree	4.2%	4.3%	5.7%	5.6%	2.4%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	1.5%	4.3%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	1.6%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3q. Maintaining the rural character of the County						
Strongly agree	19.9%	34.8%	12.6%	17.6%	27.1%	22.5%
Agree	33.1%	41.3%	37.9%	44.6%	31.8%	35.2%
Neutral	35.2%	19.6%	40.2%	28.4%	28.2%	32.1%
Disagree	9.3%	4.3%	6.9%	8.1%	11.8%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	2.5%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%	1.2%	2.0%
Q3r. New or expanded conference space						
Strongly agree	6.4%	2.2%	4.6%	2.7%	2.4%	5.2%
Agree	22.0%	13.0%	16.1%	18.9%	14.1%	19.4%
Neutral	46.6%	54.3%	51.7%	39.2%	50.6%	49.0%
Disagree	20.1%	19.6%	19.5%	29.7%	20.0%	19.4%
Strongly disagree	4.9%	10.9%	8.0%	9.5%	12.9%	7.0%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3s. Multi-use neighborhoods						
Strongly agree	10.2%	6.5%	5.7%	4.1%	4.8%	7.6%
Agree	32.2%	13.0%	28.7%	23.3%	31.3%	30.3%
Neutral	45.1%	67.4%	46.0%	57.5%	42.2%	47.4%
Disagree	9.5%	10.9%	17.2%	11.0%	15.7%	11.3%
Strongly disagree	3.0%	2.2%	2.3%	4.1%	6.0%	3.4%
Q3t. Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities						
Strongly agree	22.2%	20.0%	21.2%	23.3%	19.0%	20.7%
Agree	40.0%	37.8%	43.5%	45.2%	36.9%	39.7%
Neutral	30.5%	31.1%	28.2%	23.3%	35.7%	31.2%
Disagree	4.4%	8.9%	2.4%	5.5%	6.0%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	2.2%	4.7%	2.7%	2.4%	2.9%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3u. More arts and cultural opportunities						
Strongly agree	21.4%	6.5%	14.0%	13.7%	14.1%	16.2%
Agree	38.0%	28.3%	41.9%	41.1%	36.5%	37.7%
Neutral	30.1%	47.8%	34.9%	30.1%	35.3%	33.9%
Disagree	7.2%	15.2%	3.5%	9.6%	10.6%	8.4%
Strongly disagree	3.2%	2.2%	5.8%	5.5%	3.5%	3.8%
Q3v. Development of the communications network (fiber)						
Strongly agree	36.0%	26.1%	44.2%	39.2%	31.0%	32.9%
Agree	30.9%	30.4%	31.4%	33.8%	36.9%	32.2%
Neutral	28.9%	39.1%	20.9%	23.0%	23.8%	29.2%
Disagree	3.6%	2.2%	1.2%	4.1%	6.0%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	0.6%	2.2%	2.3%	0.0%	2.4%	1.6%

Respondent Employment

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q3w. Stronger retirement community						
Strongly agree	12.6%	10.9%	6.9%	8.1%	16.5%	14.5%
Agree	32.8%	28.3%	36.8%	31.1%	25.9%	33.2%
Neutral	47.8%	54.3%	42.5%	51.4%	50.6%	45.4%
Disagree	5.3%	6.5%	9.2%	8.1%	4.7%	5.3%
Strong disagree	1.5%	0.0%	4.6%	1.4%	2.4%	1.7%
Q3x. Other						
Strongly agree	80.4%	60.0%	50.0%	88.9%	100.0%	72.9%
Agree	7.8%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.5%
Neutral	9.8%	20.0%	25.0%	11.1%	0.0%	13.1%
Disagree	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. Best Represent						
A stronger community identity	3.2%	2.2%	4.6%	5.4%	3.5%	3.5%
More attractive City entrances	0.8%	0.0%	5.7%	1.4%	0.0%	1.2%
More parks and open space	2.7%	0.0%	3.4%	2.7%	4.7%	2.7%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	5.1%	4.3%	4.6%	2.7%	4.7%	4.3%
More bicycle paths and routes	1.9%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	2.3%	1.3%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	2.9%	0.0%	5.7%	2.7%	2.3%	2.8%
More housing in and around downtown	1.7%	2.2%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	1.5%
More affordable housing within the City	9.9%	10.9%	6.9%	12.2%	9.3%	9.6%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)						
More employment opportunities	26.7%	39.1%	32.2%	32.4%	22.1%	28.2%
Better protection of natural resources	4.4%	4.3%	4.6%	2.7%	8.1%	4.6%
Expanded public transportation	1.9%	4.3%	0.0%	1.4%	2.3%	1.8%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	2.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	1.3%
More activities for teenagers	1.9%	0.0%	2.3%	2.7%	4.7%	2.1%
More activities for seniors	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Improved access to local foods	1.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Better management of growth	8.0%	6.5%	5.7%	9.5%	2.3%	7.8%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.2%	6.5%	2.3%	4.1%	3.5%	3.8%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)						
New or expanded conference space	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.1%
Multi-use neighborhoods	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.8%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
More arts and cultural opportunities	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	1.2%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	5.1%	6.5%	10.3%	5.4%	2.3%	4.9%
Stronger retirement community	1.5%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	1.6%
Other	4.8%	4.3%	1.1%	8.1%	8.1%	4.6%
No response	5.9%	4.3%	3.4%	2.7%	11.6%	7.2%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent						
A stronger community identity	1.7%	6.5%	2.3%	2.7%	1.2%	1.9%
More attractive City entrances	1.1%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%
More parks and open space	2.7%	2.2%	4.6%	1.4%	0.0%	3.1%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	6.3%	2.2%	5.7%	4.1%	4.7%	5.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	6.1%	4.3%	8.0%	4.1%	5.8%	5.0%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	2.5%	0.0%	4.6%	2.7%	5.8%	2.5%
More housing in and around downtown	2.1%	2.2%	0.0%	2.7%	1.2%	1.9%
More affordable housing within the City	10.7%	10.9%	10.3%	6.8%	9.3%	10.0%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)						
More employment opportunities	13.5%	13.0%	11.5%	16.2%	14.0%	13.2%
Better protection of natural resources	6.1%	8.7%	3.4%	6.8%	7.0%	6.3%
Expanded public transportation	5.1%	0.0%	2.3%	2.7%	1.2%	4.3%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	2.7%	8.7%	6.9%	5.4%	4.7%	3.2%
More activities for teenagers	4.2%	0.0%	4.6%	8.1%	3.5%	4.1%
More activities for seniors	1.1%	2.2%	1.1%	1.4%	2.3%	1.8%
Improved access to local foods	3.4%	4.3%	2.3%	4.1%	0.0%	2.7%
Better management of growth	7.8%	8.7%	10.3%	8.1%	4.7%	8.0%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.4%	8.7%	2.3%	5.4%	3.5%	4.1%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)						
New or expanded conference space	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.0%
Multi-use neighborhoods	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	0.7%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	3.6%	4.3%	3.4%	6.8%	2.3%	3.7%
More arts and cultural opportunities	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	2.3%	1.1%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	3.8%	6.5%	3.4%	4.1%	7.0%	4.1%
Stronger retirement community	0.8%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	1.2%	1.8%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
No response	6.5%	6.5%	3.4%	4.1%	14.0%	8.1%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent						
A stronger community identity	2.1%	0.0%	1.1%	2.7%	1.2%	1.7%
More attractive City entrances	2.7%	4.3%	2.3%	1.4%	1.2%	2.6%
More parks and open space	2.7%	2.2%	2.3%	2.7%	5.8%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	6.5%	10.9%	5.7%	5.4%	7.0%	6.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	4.2%	2.2%	4.6%	4.1%	4.7%	3.6%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	2.9%	2.2%	4.6%	1.4%	2.3%	2.7%
More housing in and around downtown	2.1%	0.0%	4.6%	1.4%	0.0%	1.7%
More affordable housing within the City	4.4%	2.2%	1.1%	4.1%	5.8%	4.3%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)						
More employment opportunities	9.3%	8.7%	9.2%	6.8%	8.1%	8.6%
Better protection of natural resources	5.3%	10.9%	3.4%	12.2%	7.0%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	4.0%	0.0%	3.4%	4.1%	4.7%	4.4%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	1.7%	2.2%	6.9%	4.1%	3.5%	2.7%
More activities for teenagers	4.0%	4.3%	4.6%	2.7%	2.3%	4.5%
More activities for seniors	2.7%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	3.5%	2.9%
Improved access to local foods	2.9%	2.2%	4.6%	2.7%	2.3%	3.3%
Better management of growth	7.8%	13.0%	3.4%	10.8%	8.1%	7.9%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	3.4%	6.5%	1.1%	5.4%	1.2%	3.3%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)						
New or expanded conference space	0.6%	2.2%	2.3%	2.7%	0.0%	1.1%
Multi-use neighborhoods	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%	1.4%	2.3%	2.2%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	5.3%	6.5%	4.6%	6.8%	2.3%	4.6%
More arts and cultural opportunities	4.0%	0.0%	6.9%	2.7%	0.0%	2.9%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	8.4%	6.5%	8.0%	9.5%	5.8%	6.6%
Stronger retirement community	1.5%	2.2%	2.3%	0.0%	3.5%	2.2%
Other	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	0.7%
No response	8.4%	8.7%	6.9%	5.4%	16.3%	10.4%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. 4th Best Represent						
A stronger community identity	1.1%	4.3%	1.1%	2.7%	1.2%	1.5%
More attractive City entrances	1.9%	6.5%	3.4%	1.4%	2.3%	2.8%
More parks and open space	2.9%	0.0%	6.9%	4.1%	0.0%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	4.6%	6.5%	4.6%	4.1%	8.1%	4.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	5.9%	4.3%	4.6%	1.4%	2.3%	4.5%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	1.9%	2.2%	1.1%	10.8%	3.5%	2.4%
More housing in and around downtown	1.7%	2.2%	0.0%	1.4%	1.2%	1.2%
More affordable housing within the City	6.1%	6.5%	3.4%	8.1%	5.8%	5.7%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)						
More employment opportunities	3.8%	4.3%	3.4%	5.4%	5.8%	4.5%
Better protection of natural resources	6.5%	6.5%	3.4%	4.1%	3.5%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	4.4%	4.3%	2.3%	4.1%	3.5%	3.6%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	3.2%	2.2%	2.3%	1.4%	3.5%	2.6%
More activities for teenagers	3.8%	4.3%	8.0%	4.1%	2.3%	4.2%
More activities for seniors	1.1%	2.2%	4.6%	1.4%	2.3%	1.9%
Improved access to local foods	4.2%	8.7%	5.7%	2.7%	8.1%	4.0%
Better management of growth	6.3%	4.3%	8.0%	5.4%	10.5%	6.4%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	2.9%	6.5%	2.3%	2.7%	7.0%	3.7%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)						
New or expanded conference space	3.2%	4.3%	1.1%	1.4%	0.0%	1.9%
Multi-use neighborhoods	1.5%	2.2%	0.0%	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	7.2%	4.3%	9.2%	9.5%	1.2%	6.8%
More arts and cultural opportunities	4.0%	0.0%	2.3%	4.1%	2.3%	3.5%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	5.5%	4.3%	10.3%	5.4%	2.3%	5.4%
Stronger retirement community	2.9%	0.0%	1.1%	1.4%	3.5%	3.2%
Other	1.3%	0.0%	1.1%	1.4%	0.0%	1.1%
No response	12.2%	8.7%	9.2%	10.8%	18.6%	14.4%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. Best Represent						
A stronger community identity	8.0%	13.0%	9.2%	13.5%	7.0%	8.7%
More attractive City entrances	6.5%	10.9%	14.9%	4.1%	5.8%	8.0%
More parks and open space	11.2%	4.3%	17.2%	10.8%	10.5%	11.5%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	22.5%	23.9%	20.7%	16.2%	24.4%	20.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	18.1%	10.9%	18.4%	9.5%	15.1%	14.4%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	10.3%	4.3%	16.1%	17.6%	14.0%	10.3%
More housing in and around downtown	7.6%	6.5%	4.6%	8.1%	2.3%	6.4%
More affordable housing within the City	31.2%	30.4%	21.8%	31.1%	30.2%	29.6%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)						
More employment opportunities	53.3%	65.2%	56.3%	60.8%	50.0%	54.5%
Better protection of natural resources	22.3%	30.4%	14.9%	25.7%	25.6%	22.4%
Expanded public transportation	15.4%	8.7%	8.0%	12.2%	11.6%	14.1%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	9.9%	13.0%	17.2%	10.8%	12.8%	9.8%
More activities for teenagers	13.9%	8.7%	19.5%	17.6%	12.8%	14.9%
More activities for seniors	5.3%	4.3%	8.0%	2.7%	8.1%	7.0%
Improved access to local foods	11.8%	15.2%	13.8%	9.5%	10.5%	11.3%
Better management of growth	29.9%	32.6%	27.6%	33.8%	25.6%	30.2%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	12.8%	28.3%	8.0%	17.6%	15.1%	15.0%

Respondent Employment

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)						
New or expanded conference space	5.5%	6.5%	3.4%	4.1%	2.3%	4.1%
Multi-use neighborhoods	5.1%	4.3%	4.6%	4.1%	4.7%	5.0%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	18.3%	17.4%	19.5%	23.0%	5.8%	16.4%
More arts and cultural opportunities	11.2%	0.0%	9.2%	9.5%	7.0%	8.8%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	22.7%	23.9%	32.2%	24.3%	17.4%	20.9%
Stronger retirement community	6.7%	4.3%	6.9%	1.4%	11.6%	8.8%
Other	7.6%	4.3%	4.6%	9.5%	9.3%	6.9%
No response	5.9%	4.3%	3.4%	2.7%	11.6%	7.2%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5a. Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities						
Major strength	36.1%	31.1%	37.2%	35.1%	33.7%	35.0%
Strength	47.9%	46.7%	41.9%	45.9%	41.9%	45.9%
Neutral	13.7%	15.6%	16.3%	17.6%	23.3%	16.8%
Weakness	1.9%	6.7%	4.7%	1.4%	1.2%	2.1%
Major weakness	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Q5b. Availability of retail choices						
Major strength	6.0%	4.4%	4.7%	9.5%	5.8%	6.5%
Strength	39.7%	53.3%	40.7%	35.1%	36.0%	38.8%
Neutral	30.9%	15.6%	30.2%	33.8%	30.2%	29.5%
Weakness	19.3%	22.2%	19.8%	20.3%	25.6%	20.7%
Major weakness	4.1%	4.4%	4.7%	1.4%	2.3%	4.5%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5c. Existing sidewalk network						
Major strength	3.4%	4.5%	3.5%	9.6%	3.5%	3.9%
Strength	27.3%	25.0%	40.7%	49.3%	34.1%	31.4%
Neutral	43.7%	47.7%	39.5%	31.5%	42.4%	42.4%
Weakness	22.6%	15.9%	14.0%	9.6%	16.5%	19.5%
Major weakness	3.0%	6.8%	2.3%	0.0%	3.5%	2.9%
Q5d. Protection of natural resources						
Major strength	2.4%	0.0%	2.3%	5.5%	4.8%	3.5%
Strength	23.2%	13.6%	30.2%	32.9%	34.5%	26.0%
Neutral	56.0%	75.0%	59.3%	43.8%	46.4%	54.1%
Weakness	16.5%	11.4%	7.0%	13.7%	13.1%	14.4%
Major weakness	1.9%	0.0%	1.2%	4.1%	1.2%	2.1%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5e. Public transportation						
Major strength	4.1%	2.2%	4.7%	2.7%	5.8%	4.9%
Strength	30.5%	46.7%	42.4%	33.8%	34.9%	33.0%
Neutral	44.3%	42.2%	38.8%	50.0%	44.2%	44.0%
Weakness	18.6%	4.4%	11.8%	9.5%	12.8%	15.5%
Major weakness	2.6%	4.4%	2.4%	4.1%	2.3%	2.7%
Q5f. Character of neighborhoods						
Major strength	9.0%	2.2%	11.6%	10.8%	15.1%	9.2%
Strength	47.2%	35.6%	41.9%	54.1%	38.4%	45.1%
Neutral	32.8%	51.1%	36.0%	23.0%	34.9%	34.4%
Weakness	10.3%	11.1%	8.1%	10.8%	11.6%	10.5%
Major weakness	0.6%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%	0.0%	0.8%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5g. Availability of housing choices						
Major strength	3.2%	4.5%	5.8%	9.5%	3.5%	4.7%
Strength	23.1%	25.0%	25.6%	31.1%	30.6%	26.2%
Neutral	40.6%	50.0%	48.8%	35.1%	41.2%	40.4%
Weakness	27.6%	18.2%	14.0%	20.3%	23.5%	24.1%
Major weakness	5.6%	2.3%	5.8%	4.1%	1.2%	4.6%
Q5h. Availability of parks and open space						
Major strength	12.3%	13.3%	10.7%	21.9%	10.7%	13.5%
Strength	59.4%	44.4%	57.1%	54.8%	56.0%	55.8%
Neutral	23.0%	37.8%	27.4%	16.4%	27.4%	23.8%
Weakness	4.9%	2.2%	4.8%	5.5%	3.6%	6.2%
Major weakness	0.4%	2.2%	0.0%	1.4%	2.4%	0.7%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5i. Employment opportunities						
Major strength	3.6%	6.7%	2.3%	1.4%	3.5%	4.0%
Strength	9.4%	11.1%	9.3%	12.3%	9.4%	9.5%
Neutral	35.6%	40.0%	24.4%	31.5%	45.9%	35.9%
Weakness	35.0%	31.1%	36.0%	35.6%	24.7%	33.0%
Major weakness	16.4%	11.1%	27.9%	19.2%	16.5%	17.6%
Q5j. Historic buildings and areas						
Major strength	14.5%	13.3%	16.3%	21.6%	15.1%	14.5%
Strength	51.9%	51.1%	40.7%	58.1%	47.7%	50.3%
Neutral	29.3%	31.1%	39.5%	16.2%	33.7%	30.9%
Weakness	4.3%	2.2%	3.5%	4.1%	3.5%	4.0%
Major weakness	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5k. Rate of growth						
Major strength	2.1%	4.5%	0.0%	2.7%	3.5%	3.3%
Strength	20.8%	18.2%	24.4%	24.3%	27.1%	22.4%
Neutral	52.9%	45.5%	46.5%	50.0%	47.1%	50.4%
Weakness	17.8%	27.3%	20.9%	20.3%	16.5%	18.4%
Major weakness	6.4%	4.5%	8.1%	2.7%	5.9%	5.5%
Q5l. Unique local identity						
Major strength	37.0%	26.7%	39.5%	37.8%	33.7%	33.5%
Strength	40.2%	42.2%	40.7%	44.6%	43.0%	41.4%
Neutral	19.4%	26.7%	16.3%	16.2%	23.3%	22.0%
Weakness	3.0%	4.4%	3.5%	1.4%	0.0%	2.9%
Major weakness	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5m. Opportunities for community involvement						
Major strength	20.1%	11.1%	19.8%	20.3%	23.3%	19.0%
Strength	49.8%	51.1%	39.5%	50.0%	39.5%	46.5%
Neutral	23.7%	31.1%	33.7%	25.7%	34.9%	28.0%
Weakness	5.8%	6.7%	7.0%	4.1%	2.3%	5.7%
Major weakness	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Q5n. Attention to environmental issues						
Major strength	8.2%	15.6%	11.6%	13.7%	18.8%	10.5%
Strength	37.1%	40.0%	34.9%	37.0%	30.6%	36.4%
Neutral	39.9%	35.6%	44.2%	37.0%	41.2%	38.7%
Weakness	12.1%	8.9%	8.1%	8.2%	7.1%	11.8%
Major weakness	2.8%	0.0%	1.2%	4.1%	2.4%	2.6%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5o. Downtown						
Major strength	53.7%	42.2%	54.7%	59.5%	40.7%	47.7%
Strength	33.5%	37.8%	31.4%	29.7%	40.7%	35.1%
Neutral	8.5%	15.6%	10.5%	10.8%	14.0%	11.5%
Weakness	3.2%	4.4%	1.2%	0.0%	4.7%	4.5%
Major weakness	1.1%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Q5p. Population growth						
Major strength	3.0%	8.9%	2.3%	2.8%	3.5%	4.1%
Strength	21.2%	20.0%	20.9%	33.3%	24.4%	22.7%
Neutral	58.3%	57.8%	61.6%	52.8%	53.5%	57.1%
Weakness	12.5%	11.1%	10.5%	8.3%	14.0%	12.0%
Major weakness	5.0%	2.2%	4.7%	2.8%	4.7%	4.0%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5q. Presence of family farms						
Major strength	9.0%	17.8%	7.0%	15.1%	11.6%	10.5%
Strength	36.4%	40.0%	34.9%	34.2%	25.6%	33.6%
Neutral	39.2%	26.7%	48.8%	39.7%	41.9%	39.5%
Weakness	11.6%	13.3%	7.0%	8.2%	18.6%	12.6%
Major weakness	3.9%	2.2%	2.3%	2.7%	2.3%	3.8%
Q5r. Quality of life						
Major strength	26.9%	37.8%	27.9%	37.8%	23.3%	28.7%
Strength	56.8%	46.7%	59.3%	45.9%	53.5%	53.3%
Neutral	13.5%	11.1%	11.6%	13.5%	22.1%	14.5%
Weakness	2.1%	4.4%	1.2%	1.4%	1.2%	2.7%
Major weakness	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%

Respondent Employment

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q5s. Existing roadway network						
Major strength	4.5%	11.1%	1.2%	5.4%	4.8%	5.8%
Strength	28.3%	28.9%	37.2%	27.0%	28.9%	29.6%
Neutral	33.6%	17.8%	23.3%	32.4%	38.6%	31.6%
Weakness	24.2%	20.0%	26.7%	28.4%	21.7%	24.0%
Major weakness	9.4%	22.2%	11.6%	6.8%	6.0%	9.0%
Q5t. Other						
Major strength	19.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	20.0%	14.0%
Strength	2.2%	0.0%	12.5%	14.3%	0.0%	5.0%
Neutral	6.5%	33.3%	0.0%	14.3%	20.0%	11.0%
Weakness	15.2%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	20.0%	15.0%
Major weakness	56.5%	66.7%	75.0%	57.1%	40.0%	55.0%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. Most Important						
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	8.0%	6.5%	10.3%	9.5%	9.3%	7.9%
Availability of retail choices	1.3%	2.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
Existing sidewalk network	0.8%	2.2%	1.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.8%
Protection of natural resources	3.6%	0.0%	1.1%	4.1%	8.1%	3.3%
Public transportation	1.9%	2.2%	2.3%	1.4%	0.0%	2.2%
Character of neighborhoods	1.5%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%	4.7%	1.7%
Availability of housing choices	3.8%	0.0%	1.1%	6.8%	2.3%	3.3%
Availability of parks and open space	1.9%	0.0%	4.6%	1.4%	4.7%	2.2%
Employment opportunities	9.1%	15.2%	18.4%	8.1%	9.3%	10.4%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)						
Historic buildings and areas	1.1%	2.2%	2.3%	4.1%	1.2%	1.4%
Rate of growth	0.4%	2.2%	2.3%	1.4%	2.3%	1.1%
Unique local identity	13.9%	8.7%	12.6%	12.2%	12.8%	12.1%
Opportunities for community involvement	1.9%	2.2%	0.0%	1.4%	3.5%	1.5%
Attention to environmental issues	2.1%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%	1.2%	1.5%
Downtown	19.4%	4.3%	9.2%	14.9%	7.0%	14.2%
Population growth	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Presence of family farms	1.7%	4.3%	0.0%	5.4%	1.2%	2.0%
Quality of life	10.5%	15.2%	10.3%	8.1%	9.3%	11.2%
Existing roadway network	3.2%	13.0%	8.0%	6.8%	3.5%	4.4%
Other	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	2.3%	2.0%
No response	12.2%	17.4%	9.2%	6.8%	17.4%	14.5%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. 2nd Important						
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	5.7%	2.2%	3.4%	5.4%	4.7%	5.8%
Availability of retail choices	2.1%	6.5%	3.4%	1.4%	3.5%	2.7%
Existing sidewalk network	1.3%	2.2%	0.0%	5.4%	3.5%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	2.7%	4.3%	0.0%	1.4%	2.3%	2.4%
Public transportation	2.3%	0.0%	4.6%	4.1%	0.0%	2.5%
Character of neighborhoods	4.2%	0.0%	3.4%	2.7%	4.7%	3.4%
Availability of housing choices	4.0%	6.5%	4.6%	1.4%	4.7%	4.3%
Availability of parks and open space	3.2%	2.2%	6.9%	6.8%	7.0%	3.7%
Employment opportunities	8.8%	6.5%	5.7%	6.8%	8.1%	8.1%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. 2nd Important (Cont.)						
Historic buildings and areas	4.2%	0.0%	1.1%	5.4%	2.3%	3.5%
Rate of growth	0.8%	2.2%	3.4%	1.4%	0.0%	1.4%
Unique local identity	9.7%	6.5%	9.2%	10.8%	8.1%	8.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.8%	2.2%	1.1%	4.1%	3.5%	3.6%
Attention to environmental issues	2.1%	4.3%	1.1%	0.0%	3.5%	1.7%
Downtown	15.2%	13.0%	20.7%	17.6%	10.5%	14.4%
Population growth	0.8%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	0.9%
Presence of family farms	2.5%	6.5%	1.1%	1.4%	2.3%	2.6%
Quality of life	9.3%	10.9%	13.8%	10.8%	7.0%	10.1%
Existing roadway network	1.5%	2.2%	2.3%	4.1%	1.2%	2.0%
Other	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	0.5%
No response	14.1%	21.7%	11.5%	9.5%	20.9%	16.5%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. 3rd Important						
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	12.4%	2.2%	11.5%	9.5%	5.8%	9.4%
Availability of retail choices	3.4%	6.5%	5.7%	5.4%	2.3%	3.9%
Existing sidewalk network	2.5%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Protection of natural resources	2.1%	6.5%	2.3%	1.4%	2.3%	2.1%
Public transportation	1.5%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%	4.7%	2.7%
Character of neighborhoods	2.9%	0.0%	3.4%	1.4%	2.3%	2.5%
Availability of housing choices	4.2%	2.2%	2.3%	4.1%	1.2%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	4.0%	2.2%	4.6%	6.8%	5.8%	5.2%
Employment opportunities	3.2%	13.0%	1.1%	5.4%	3.5%	3.7%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. 3rd Important (Cont.)						
Historic buildings and areas	4.4%	0.0%	4.6%	4.1%	2.3%	3.5%
Rate of growth	3.4%	2.2%	1.1%	2.7%	0.0%	2.3%
Unique local identity	7.6%	8.7%	2.3%	12.2%	11.6%	7.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.0%	2.2%	3.4%	2.7%	8.1%	3.7%
Attention to environmental issues	2.3%	4.3%	1.1%	4.1%	4.7%	3.0%
Downtown	10.1%	2.2%	17.2%	12.2%	9.3%	9.6%
Population growth	0.8%	0.0%	3.4%	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%
Presence of family farms	2.1%	6.5%	2.3%	1.4%	8.1%	3.2%
Quality of life	10.9%	6.5%	12.6%	12.2%	2.3%	9.6%
Existing roadway network	1.5%	4.3%	3.4%	0.0%	1.2%	2.8%
Other	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	0.5%
No response	16.0%	23.9%	13.8%	12.2%	22.1%	18.9%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. 4th Important						
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	7.2%	4.3%	9.2%	9.5%	11.6%	8.2%
Availability of retail choices	3.4%	2.2%	6.9%	2.7%	1.2%	3.8%
Existing sidewalk network	1.5%	4.3%	5.7%	2.7%	0.0%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	1.9%	0.0%	1.1%	1.4%	3.5%	1.9%
Public transportation	2.9%	4.3%	1.1%	2.7%	1.2%	2.3%
Character of neighborhoods	3.8%	4.3%	2.3%	0.0%	2.3%	3.3%
Availability of housing choices	3.6%	4.3%	2.3%	2.7%	3.5%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	6.7%	2.2%	5.7%	8.1%	2.3%	5.7%
Employment opportunities	1.9%	2.2%	1.1%	1.4%	2.3%	2.1%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. 4th Important (Cont.)						
Historic buildings and areas	4.2%	2.2%	4.6%	2.7%	3.5%	3.6%
Rate of growth	1.7%	8.7%	2.3%	2.7%	1.2%	2.5%
Unique local identity	6.7%	4.3%	6.9%	5.4%	1.2%	5.5%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.4%	4.3%	5.7%	1.4%	3.5%	4.1%
Attention to environmental issues	3.2%	0.0%	1.1%	1.4%	8.1%	2.8%
Downtown	6.7%	2.2%	8.0%	12.2%	7.0%	7.0%
Population growth	1.5%	0.0%	2.3%	2.7%	2.3%	1.4%
Presence of family farms	3.8%	8.7%	0.0%	2.7%	2.3%	3.3%
Quality of life	10.9%	10.9%	16.1%	18.9%	12.8%	11.0%
Existing roadway network	2.3%	4.3%	1.1%	2.7%	5.8%	2.6%
Other	0.8%	0.0%	1.1%	1.4%	1.2%	0.9%
No response	20.8%	26.1%	14.9%	14.9%	23.3%	22.8%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. Most Important						
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	33.3%	15.2%	34.5%	33.8%	31.4%	31.4%
Availability of retail choices	10.1%	17.4%	18.4%	9.5%	7.0%	12.1%
Existing sidewalk network	6.1%	15.2%	6.9%	9.5%	3.5%	5.8%
Protection of natural resources	10.3%	10.9%	4.6%	8.1%	16.3%	9.8%
Public transportation	8.6%	6.5%	10.3%	9.5%	5.8%	9.7%
Character of neighborhoods	12.4%	4.3%	11.5%	5.4%	14.0%	10.9%
Availability of housing choices	15.6%	13.0%	10.3%	14.9%	11.6%	14.5%
Availability of parks and open space	15.8%	6.5%	21.8%	23.0%	19.8%	16.8%
Employment opportunities	22.9%	37.0%	26.4%	21.6%	23.3%	24.4%

Respondent Employment

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)						
Historic buildings and areas	13.9%	4.3%	12.6%	16.2%	9.3%	12.1%
Rate of growth	6.3%	15.2%	9.2%	8.1%	3.5%	7.4%
Unique local identity	37.9%	28.3%	31.0%	40.5%	33.7%	32.7%
Opportunities for community involvement	15.2%	10.9%	10.3%	9.5%	18.6%	13.0%
Attention to environmental issues	9.7%	8.7%	5.7%	6.8%	17.4%	9.0%
Downtown	51.4%	21.7%	55.2%	56.8%	33.7%	45.2%
Population growth	3.2%	2.2%	6.9%	4.1%	4.7%	3.8%
Presence of family farms	10.1%	26.1%	3.4%	10.8%	14.0%	11.1%
Quality of life	41.7%	43.5%	52.9%	50.0%	31.4%	41.9%
Existing roadway network	8.4%	23.9%	14.9%	13.5%	11.6%	11.8%
Other	4.0%	0.0%	3.4%	5.4%	5.8%	3.8%
No response	12.2%	17.4%	9.2%	6.8%	17.4%	14.5%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q7a. Ease of travel by car on highways						
Very satisfied	22.3%	13.3%	20.9%	27.0%	27.9%	22.5%
Satisfied	57.1%	53.3%	45.3%	48.6%	45.3%	53.9%
Neutral	10.5%	2.2%	8.1%	9.5%	14.0%	10.6%
Dissatisfied	7.5%	17.8%	16.3%	10.8%	7.0%	9.0%
Very dissatisfied	2.6%	13.3%	9.3%	4.1%	5.8%	4.0%
Q7b. Ease of travel by car on major streets						
Very satisfied	10.9%	0.0%	4.7%	13.5%	14.1%	10.9%
Satisfied	35.7%	28.9%	27.9%	32.4%	34.1%	35.8%
Neutral	17.7%	15.6%	12.8%	16.2%	23.5%	17.7%
Dissatisfied	27.7%	31.1%	34.9%	29.7%	17.6%	25.4%
Very dissatisfied	8.1%	24.4%	19.8%	8.1%	10.6%	10.2%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q7c. Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets						
Very satisfied	11.3%	2.2%	4.7%	16.2%	14.1%	10.1%
Satisfied	49.0%	40.0%	53.5%	39.2%	52.9%	49.3%
Neutral	22.4%	31.1%	20.9%	31.1%	22.4%	23.6%
Dissatisfied	13.9%	20.0%	10.5%	12.2%	9.4%	12.9%
Very dissatisfied	3.4%	6.7%	10.5%	1.4%	1.2%	4.2%
Q7d. Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods						
Very satisfied	10.7%	2.2%	4.7%	17.8%	14.3%	11.4%
Satisfied	51.0%	35.6%	44.2%	42.5%	44.0%	47.4%
Neutral	21.8%	28.9%	31.4%	24.7%	27.4%	24.0%
Dissatisfied	12.4%	22.2%	9.3%	12.3%	13.1%	12.2%
Very dissatisfied	4.1%	11.1%	10.5%	2.7%	1.2%	5.1%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q7e. Ease of walking in City of Lawrence						
Very satisfied	15.1%	12.2%	10.7%	27.8%	13.4%	15.1%
Satisfied	46.5%	36.6%	58.3%	41.7%	53.7%	47.4%
Neutral	20.6%	36.6%	21.4%	20.8%	22.0%	22.5%
Dissatisfied	16.0%	9.8%	7.1%	9.7%	11.0%	12.7%
Very dissatisfied	1.8%	4.9%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%
Q7f. Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence						
Very satisfied	6.0%	8.8%	5.3%	16.1%	4.1%	6.8%
Satisfied	27.0%	35.3%	34.2%	35.5%	24.7%	28.4%
Neutral	31.3%	32.4%	47.4%	27.4%	45.2%	36.2%
Dissatisfied	26.5%	17.6%	6.6%	21.0%	23.3%	22.0%
Very dissatisfied	9.2%	5.9%	6.6%	0.0%	2.7%	6.6%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q7g. Safety of walking in City of Lawrence						
Very satisfied	11.5%	7.5%	9.5%	19.7%	12.2%	11.2%
Satisfied	41.3%	35.0%	54.8%	40.8%	34.1%	42.9%
Neutral	22.3%	40.0%	21.4%	22.5%	35.4%	25.1%
Dissatisfied	21.0%	15.0%	10.7%	16.9%	12.2%	16.6%
Very dissatisfied	4.0%	2.5%	3.6%	0.0%	6.1%	4.2%
Q7h. Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence						
Very satisfied	4.8%	5.7%	5.2%	14.5%	4.1%	5.5%
Satisfied	18.3%	11.4%	26.0%	25.8%	14.9%	19.6%
Neutral	28.4%	48.6%	42.9%	32.3%	40.5%	34.8%
Dissatisfied	36.1%	25.7%	15.6%	22.6%	35.1%	29.9%
Very dissatisfied	12.3%	8.6%	10.4%	4.8%	5.4%	10.2%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q7i. Existing bicycle system throughout County						
Very satisfied	4.3%	5.4%	4.1%	15.8%	4.3%	5.5%
Satisfied	16.8%	18.9%	21.6%	24.6%	18.8%	18.5%
Neutral	38.2%	37.8%	51.4%	35.1%	34.8%	41.5%
Dissatisfied	31.3%	24.3%	10.8%	12.3%	34.8%	24.6%
Very dissatisfied	9.4%	13.5%	12.2%	12.3%	7.2%	9.9%
Q7j. Existing walking and hiking system throughout County						
Very satisfied	5.6%	5.6%	2.6%	18.3%	1.3%	6.0%
Satisfied	29.5%	36.1%	42.9%	33.3%	34.7%	32.0%
Neutral	38.5%	30.6%	39.0%	36.7%	37.3%	39.2%
Dissatisfied	21.3%	19.4%	11.7%	10.0%	24.0%	17.5%
Very dissatisfied	5.1%	8.3%	3.9%	1.7%	2.7%	5.2%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q7k. Existing road system in County						
Very satisfied	6.8%	11.4%	4.7%	10.0%	9.0%	7.3%
Satisfied	43.1%	38.6%	41.9%	40.0%	43.6%	43.5%
Neutral	39.0%	22.7%	37.2%	34.3%	38.5%	36.6%
Dissatisfied	9.3%	18.2%	11.6%	12.9%	7.7%	9.9%
Very dissatisfied	1.8%	9.1%	4.7%	2.9%	1.3%	2.7%
Q7l. Quality of public transportation (bus service)						
Very satisfied	7.2%	2.9%	4.5%	13.0%	8.2%	7.0%
Satisfied	25.0%	35.3%	38.8%	27.8%	28.8%	29.8%
Neutral	46.6%	44.1%	43.3%	46.3%	39.7%	45.0%
Dissatisfied	14.7%	11.8%	9.0%	9.3%	16.4%	12.8%
Very dissatisfied	6.4%	5.9%	4.5%	3.7%	6.8%	5.5%

Respondent Employment

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q7m. Other						
Very satisfied	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%
Satisfied	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	4.2%
Neutral	6.3%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.9%
Dissatisfied	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	71.4%	16.9%
Very dissatisfied	65.6%	75.0%	100.0%	66.7%	28.6%	60.6%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q8. Most Important						
Ease of travel by car on highways	5.7%	17.4%	14.9%	8.1%	8.1%	8.0%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	24.6%	30.4%	37.9%	33.8%	20.9%	26.6%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	3.8%	2.2%	1.1%	2.7%	3.5%	3.6%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	1.7%	4.3%	4.6%	1.4%	1.2%	2.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	7.4%	4.3%	2.3%	6.8%	3.5%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	8.2%	0.0%	2.3%	6.8%	5.8%	5.9%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	6.7%	2.2%	5.7%	2.7%	10.5%	5.7%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	9.3%	0.0%	5.7%	6.8%	4.7%	7.0%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)						
Existing bicycle system throughout County	1.5%	4.3%	3.4%	2.7%	3.5%	2.3%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	2.9%	4.3%	1.1%	1.4%	2.3%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	2.3%	13.0%	0.0%	2.7%	8.1%	3.7%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	10.5%	2.2%	6.9%	6.8%	10.5%	9.4%
Other	3.4%	4.3%	1.1%	1.4%	2.3%	2.6%
No response	12.0%	10.9%	12.6%	16.2%	15.1%	14.3%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q8. 2nd Important						
Ease of travel by car on highways	4.8%	8.7%	8.0%	4.1%	5.8%	5.5%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	12.4%	23.9%	17.2%	13.5%	8.1%	12.5%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	8.0%	13.0%	12.6%	6.8%	2.3%	8.2%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	5.1%	8.7%	2.3%	2.7%	7.0%	5.1%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	6.9%	6.5%	4.6%	8.1%	8.1%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	8.8%	8.7%	10.3%	4.1%	3.5%	6.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	9.1%	4.3%	5.7%	12.2%	10.5%	10.1%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	12.4%	2.2%	9.2%	9.5%	18.6%	11.1%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q8. 2nd Important (Cont.)						
Existing bicycle system throughout County	5.1%	2.2%	1.1%	2.7%	1.2%	3.6%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	1.7%	4.3%	0.0%	2.7%	4.7%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	3.2%	4.3%	4.6%	9.5%	2.3%	4.0%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	4.8%	0.0%	3.4%	4.1%	4.7%	4.2%
Other	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.2%	0.6%
No response	17.3%	13.0%	20.7%	18.9%	22.1%	19.8%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q8. 3rd Important						
Ease of travel by car on highways	2.7%	2.2%	5.7%	5.4%	1.2%	2.8%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	4.6%	0.0%	2.3%	8.1%	11.6%	5.3%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	6.5%	4.3%	6.9%	5.4%	7.0%	6.7%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	8.8%	10.9%	6.9%	2.7%	4.7%	7.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	7.8%	2.2%	5.7%	4.1%	8.1%	7.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	6.7%	8.7%	6.9%	1.4%	7.0%	5.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	8.6%	6.5%	2.3%	8.1%	10.5%	7.4%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	9.5%	10.9%	3.4%	8.1%	7.0%	8.6%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q8. 3rd Important (Cont.)						
Existing bicycle system throughout County	5.1%	4.3%	5.7%	8.1%	7.0%	5.0%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	4.8%	8.7%	10.3%	10.8%	7.0%	6.4%
Existing road system in County	4.4%	13.0%	10.3%	8.1%	3.5%	5.2%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	7.6%	8.7%	6.9%	5.4%	3.5%	6.8%
Other	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
No response	22.3%	19.6%	26.4%	24.3%	22.1%	25.0%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q8. Most Important						
Ease of travel by car on highways	13.3%	28.3%	28.7%	17.6%	15.1%	16.3%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	41.7%	54.3%	57.5%	55.4%	40.7%	44.4%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	18.3%	19.6%	20.7%	14.9%	12.8%	18.5%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	15.6%	23.9%	13.8%	6.8%	12.8%	14.8%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	22.1%	13.0%	12.6%	18.9%	19.8%	19.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	23.8%	17.4%	19.5%	12.2%	16.3%	18.5%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	24.4%	13.0%	13.8%	23.0%	31.4%	23.2%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	31.2%	13.0%	18.4%	24.3%	30.2%	26.7%

Respondent Employment

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)						
Existing bicycle system throughout County	11.6%	10.9%	10.3%	13.5%	11.6%	10.9%
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	9.5%	17.4%	11.5%	14.9%	14.0%	11.2%
Existing road system in County	9.9%	30.4%	14.9%	20.3%	14.0%	12.9%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	22.9%	10.9%	17.2%	16.2%	18.6%	20.4%
Other	4.2%	4.3%	1.1%	2.7%	3.5%	3.7%
No response	12.0%	10.9%	12.6%	16.2%	15.1%	14.3%

Respondent Employment

Q9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q9. How satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?						
Very satisfied	4.0%	2.2%	6.9%	8.1%	2.3%	5.6%
Satisfied	27.6%	23.9%	33.3%	18.9%	20.9%	25.6%
Neutral	29.7%	30.4%	29.9%	31.1%	30.2%	29.5%
Dissatisfied	13.3%	6.5%	6.9%	17.6%	11.6%	12.0%
Very dissatisfied	5.3%	6.5%	5.7%	5.4%	4.7%	5.3%
Don't know	20.2%	30.4%	17.2%	18.9%	30.2%	21.9%

Respondent Employment

Q11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q11. How satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?						
Very satisfied	3.2%	0.0%	2.3%	4.1%	2.3%	2.9%
Satisfied	26.5%	26.1%	39.1%	36.5%	26.7%	29.2%
Neutral	38.7%	26.1%	29.9%	24.3%	39.5%	35.1%
Dissatisfied	14.1%	10.9%	12.6%	21.6%	14.0%	14.2%
Very dissatisfied	4.6%	8.7%	1.1%	0.0%	2.3%	4.2%
Don't know	12.8%	28.3%	14.9%	13.5%	15.1%	14.4%

Respondent Employment

Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?						
Very satisfied	1.9%	0.0%	3.4%	5.4%	1.2%	2.2%
Satisfied	17.1%	19.6%	21.8%	23.0%	17.4%	19.3%
Neutral	39.2%	37.0%	31.0%	36.5%	41.9%	38.3%
Dissatisfied	4.6%	6.5%	9.2%	5.4%	3.5%	5.5%
Very dissatisfied	1.5%	2.2%	3.4%	1.4%	0.0%	1.5%
Don't know	35.8%	34.8%	31.0%	28.4%	36.0%	33.1%

Respondent Employment

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q15a. The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area.						
Strongly agree	34.8%	31.1%	31.7%	32.4%	19.0%	32.7%
Agree	37.0%	22.2%	39.0%	42.3%	34.5%	35.6%
Neutral	16.9%	28.9%	9.8%	11.3%	28.6%	18.0%
Disagree	7.5%	13.3%	13.4%	7.0%	15.5%	9.8%
Strongly disagree	3.8%	4.4%	6.1%	7.0%	2.4%	3.9%
Q15b. Future retail development should primarily be located at the intersection of main streets.						
Strongly agree	6.3%	11.6%	6.0%	7.1%	2.4%	6.0%
Agree	19.6%	11.6%	25.3%	17.1%	27.4%	21.2%
Neutral	44.4%	44.2%	42.2%	44.3%	35.7%	43.1%
Disagree	26.5%	27.9%	24.1%	27.1%	31.0%	26.1%
Strongly disagree	3.2%	4.7%	2.4%	4.3%	3.6%	3.6%

Respondent Employment

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q15c. Future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods.						
Strongly agree	12.0%	6.7%	3.6%	4.3%	9.5%	9.5%
Agree	35.5%	31.1%	26.5%	41.4%	29.8%	34.0%
Neutral	28.7%	33.3%	41.0%	34.3%	38.1%	33.1%
Disagree	18.4%	24.4%	22.9%	18.6%	17.9%	18.5%
Strongly disagree	5.4%	4.4%	6.0%	1.4%	4.8%	4.9%
Q15d. Available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings.						
Strongly agree	57.9%	38.6%	51.2%	59.7%	66.7%	55.6%
Agree	23.2%	25.0%	32.9%	25.0%	22.6%	25.6%
Neutral	9.8%	15.9%	7.3%	8.3%	6.0%	10.0%
Disagree	6.2%	15.9%	7.3%	5.6%	2.4%	6.2%
Strongly disagree	3.0%	4.5%	1.2%	1.4%	2.4%	2.5%

Respondent Employment

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q16a. I would like to see agricultural uses maintained in the County.						
Strongly agree	43.9%	60.0%	30.5%	43.1%	42.9%	44.2%
Agree	37.6%	28.9%	47.6%	37.5%	38.1%	35.8%
Neutral	15.3%	6.7%	19.5%	13.9%	16.7%	16.8%
Disagree	3.0%	4.4%	2.4%	4.2%	0.0%	2.6%
Strongly disagree	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	2.4%	0.5%
Q16b. I would like to see major development directed inside the City limits.						
Strongly agree	20.7%	13.6%	14.5%	23.6%	29.8%	20.6%
Agree	38.1%	38.6%	42.2%	27.8%	26.2%	37.0%
Neutral	31.4%	34.1%	33.7%	36.1%	32.1%	31.4%
Disagree	8.7%	11.4%	4.8%	11.1%	8.3%	9.2%
Strongly disagree	1.1%	2.3%	4.8%	1.4%	3.6%	1.9%

Respondent Employment

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q16c. I would like to see more shopping opportunities in or near my neighborhood.						
Strongly agree	12.9%	13.3%	14.5%	9.6%	8.3%	12.1%
Agree	27.7%	20.0%	24.1%	26.0%	31.0%	26.9%
Neutral	37.0%	46.7%	36.1%	27.4%	36.9%	36.7%
Disagree	16.1%	11.1%	21.7%	27.4%	19.0%	18.3%
Strongly disagree	6.2%	8.9%	3.6%	9.6%	4.8%	6.1%
Q16d. I would like to see more employment centers located near my home.						
Strongly agree	11.6%	13.3%	16.9%	9.6%	10.8%	11.4%
Agree	23.4%	28.9%	28.9%	32.9%	24.1%	23.0%
Neutral	43.3%	35.6%	37.3%	30.1%	43.4%	42.7%
Disagree	16.5%	8.9%	13.3%	23.3%	18.1%	16.8%
Strongly disagree	5.2%	13.3%	3.6%	4.1%	3.6%	6.1%

Respondent Employment

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q16e. I would like to see a modest increase in height of development if it means less expansion of the city out into the County.						
Strongly agree	16.8%	13.3%	13.4%	16.4%	19.8%	15.8%
Agree	39.6%	31.1%	37.8%	34.2%	33.3%	36.9%
Neutral	29.5%	33.3%	30.5%	32.9%	34.6%	30.6%
Disagree	11.0%	15.6%	18.3%	13.7%	7.4%	12.5%
Strongly disagree	3.2%	6.7%	0.0%	2.7%	4.9%	4.1%
Q16f. I would like to see Downtown accommodate more development.						
Strongly agree	16.6%	11.1%	12.0%	8.2%	12.0%	14.0%
Agree	32.8%	31.1%	43.4%	38.4%	33.7%	33.4%
Neutral	30.6%	26.7%	25.3%	30.1%	38.6%	32.2%
Disagree	15.1%	24.4%	14.5%	17.8%	9.6%	15.2%
Strongly disagree	5.0%	6.7%	4.8%	5.5%	6.0%	5.2%

Respondent Employment

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q16g. I would like to see development that includes a better mix of uses in order to live, work, and play in close proximity.						
Strongly agree	32.9%	26.7%	28.9%	23.3%	26.2%	29.3%
Agree	41.5%	35.6%	45.8%	49.3%	45.2%	42.8%
Neutral	20.9%	33.3%	20.5%	21.9%	25.0%	22.8%
Disagree	3.0%	2.2%	3.6%	2.7%	2.4%	3.2%
Strongly disagree	1.7%	2.2%	1.2%	2.7%	1.2%	2.0%

Respondent Employment

Q17. From the following list, please check ALL the reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County. (Check all that apply)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q17a. The reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County.						
Not enough time	54.1%	60.9%	46.0%	52.7%	43.0%	44.6%
Difficult to travel to meetings	4.8%	13.0%	8.0%	9.5%	8.1%	8.5%
Not sure how to get involved	34.5%	28.3%	40.2%	37.8%	37.2%	35.6%
Don't believe I can make a difference	34.7%	45.7%	25.3%	31.1%	31.4%	35.8%
Don't have enough information	38.3%	34.8%	43.7%	39.2%	44.2%	40.7%
Other	10.5%	10.9%	11.5%	10.8%	12.8%	12.1%
None Chosen	4.6%	6.5%	6.9%	1.4%	3.5%	4.5%

Respondent Employment

Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?						
Very knowledgeable	2.9%	4.3%	3.4%	0.0%	1.2%	2.3%
Somewhat knowledgeable	23.4%	13.0%	16.1%	14.9%	12.8%	20.8%
Not sure	11.6%	13.0%	11.5%	10.8%	12.8%	12.8%
Not knowledgeable	60.2%	67.4%	64.4%	73.0%	70.9%	62.0%
Don't Know	1.9%	2.2%	4.6%	1.4%	2.3%	2.1%

Respondent Employment

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?						
0 - 2 years	6.3%	0.0%	6.1%	8.2%	9.5%	6.9%
3 - 5 years	6.1%	8.9%	2.4%	12.3%	11.9%	6.7%
6 - 10 years	9.9%	11.1%	14.6%	16.4%	14.3%	10.7%
11 - 20 years	28.5%	20.0%	34.1%	31.5%	22.6%	24.6%
21 years or more	49.0%	60.0%	42.7%	31.5%	41.7%	51.1%

Respondent Employment

Q21. What is your age?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q21. What is your age?						
Under 35 years	19.6%	11.1%	14.6%	27.8%	15.3%	16.3%
35 - 44 years	22.2%	20.0%	28.0%	25.0%	24.7%	18.1%
45 - 54 years	29.4%	31.1%	34.1%	26.4%	27.1%	24.6%
55 - 64 years	19.4%	24.4%	17.1%	13.9%	17.6%	19.8%
65 - 74 years	8.1%	13.3%	6.1%	2.8%	14.1%	13.7%
75+ years	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	1.2%	7.5%

Q22. Do you own or rent your home?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q22. Do you own or rent your home?						
Own	79.7%	95.6%	89.2%	82.2%	80.0%	83.0%
Rent	20.3%	4.4%	10.8%	17.8%	20.0%	17.0%

Respondent Employment

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?						
Single family	81.4%	97.8%	89.2%	82.2%	85.9%	83.0%
Duplex/triplex	9.4%	0.0%	7.2%	12.3%	5.9%	8.3%
Apartment/condo	8.8%	2.2%	3.6%	5.5%	8.2%	7.7%
Mobile home	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:						
Under 25,000	8.1%	2.3%	2.6%	1.4%	3.6%	8.7%
$25,000 - $49,999	18.0%	4.5%	7.7%	8.6%	26.5%	17.8%
$50,000 - $74,999	20.0%	38.6%	11.5%	12.9%	16.9%	18.6%
$75,000 - $99,999	19.4%	20.5%	25.6%	14.3%	19.3%	20.0%
$100,000 - $149,999	20.3%	25.0%	33.3%	44.3%	15.7%	21.4%
$150,000 or more	14.2%	9.1%	19.2%	18.6%	18.1%	13.5%

Respondent Employment

Q26. Your gender:

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q26. Your gender:						
Male	44.8%	51.1%	63.0%	43.8%	53.6%	48.4%
Female	55.2%	48.9%	37.0%	56.2%	46.4%	51.6%

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?						
Yes	4.5%	2.2%	2.5%	2.8%	10.6%	4.4%
No	95.5%	97.8%	97.5%	97.2%	89.4%	95.6%

Respondent Employment

Q28. Which of the following best describes your race? (Without "Not Provided)

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q28. Which of the following best describes your race?						
African American (Non-Hispanic)	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.2%	1.2%
White (Non-Hispanic)	90.7%	95.7%	92.0%	93.2%	87.2%	90.4%
Native American	3.2%	2.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.1%	0.0%	3.4%	1.4%	1.2%	1.9%
Other	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%	1.4%	7.0%	3.0%

Respondent Employment

Q29. What is your current employment status?

N=1046	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q29. What is your current employment status?						
Full time employment	81.9%	80.4%	91.9%	89.2%	83.5%	62.2%
Part time employment	16.2%	15.2%	7.0%	9.5%	12.9%	10.8%
Full-time student	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Full-time homemaker	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%
Unemployed	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
Retired	1.9%	2.2%	0.0%	1.4%	3.5%	20.0%

Respondent Employment

Q30. Where do you work?

N=756	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q30. Where do you work?						
City of Lawrence	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	61.6%
Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	2.8%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.5%
KC Metro area	2.2%	2.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%
Topeka Metro area	1.7%	2.3%	5.9%	100.0%	0.0%	11.5%
Other	1.7%	4.5%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%	12.4%

Respondent Employment

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?						
Agriculture	1.3%	15.9%	0.0%	1.4%	2.4%	2.2%
Administrative or Support	6.5%	11.4%	2.4%	1.4%	8.5%	6.0%
Construction	3.0%	2.3%	2.4%	0.0%	3.7%	2.6%
Manufacturing	3.4%	9.1%	8.2%	5.5%	2.4%	4.4%
Wholesale Trade	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.3%
Food, Hospitality, Entertainment	4.9%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	3.4%
Retail	6.2%	9.1%	2.4%	2.7%	3.7%	5.3%
Health Services	14.0%	0.0%	20.0%	21.9%	8.5%	13.9%
Transportation and Warehousing	1.1%	2.3%	2.4%	0.0%	2.4%	1.5%
Finance, Insurance, or Real Estate	6.5%	2.3%	9.4%	4.1%	3.7%	6.0%
Professional Services	9.7%	2.3%	12.9%	15.1%	11.0%	10.3%
Scientific or Technical Services	5.6%	6.8%	14.1%	6.8%	9.8%	7.1%

Respondent Employment

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756	Q30. Where do you work?					Total
	City of Lawrence	Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	KC Metro area	Topeka Metro area	Other	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do? (Cont.)						
Educational Services (Pre-school-12th grade)	9.0%	29.5%	8.2%	2.7%	8.5%	9.4%
Educational Services (University/College)	19.8%	2.3%	1.2%	4.1%	13.4%	14.4%
Government	3.7%	4.5%	5.9%	21.9%	2.4%	5.7%
Armed Services	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	1.2%	0.4%
Other	10.5%	4.5%	14.1%	13.7%	23.2%	12.3%

Section 9
Whether Respondents Own or Rent and Length of Residency

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?								
City of Lawrence	91.5%	82.6%	76.6%	83.9%	68.9%	71.8%	96.6%	75.7%
Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural-Outside City Limits)	8.5%	17.4%	23.4%	16.1%	31.1%	28.2%	3.4%	24.3%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1a. Maintaining rural character								
Very important	22.9%	25.0%	30.6%	22.5%	36.2%	31.1%	27.2%	30.6%
Somewhat important	37.1%	51.5%	35.2%	45.5%	37.2%	40.1%	39.1%	40.2%
Not sure	24.3%	13.2%	13.0%	21.7%	16.0%	17.2%	18.9%	17.2%
Not important	15.7%	10.3%	21.3%	10.2%	10.6%	11.5%	14.8%	12.0%
Q1b. Preserving historic buildings								
Very important	54.9%	49.3%	52.3%	53.2%	52.3%	50.8%	61.6%	52.5%
Somewhat important	36.6%	42.0%	40.4%	39.1%	37.8%	40.0%	30.8%	38.5%
Not sure	7.0%	4.3%	3.7%	4.8%	5.1%	4.8%	5.8%	5.0%
Not important	1.4%	4.3%	3.7%	2.8%	4.8%	4.4%	1.7%	4.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1c. Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods								
Very important	42.3%	37.7%	38.5%	42.8%	41.0%	40.1%	46.5%	41.0%
Somewhat important	42.3%	42.0%	47.7%	38.8%	42.4%	42.9%	37.8%	42.0%
Not sure	9.9%	17.4%	5.5%	12.0%	13.0%	12.1%	11.0%	12.0%
Not important	5.6%	2.9%	8.3%	6.4%	3.6%	5.0%	4.7%	5.0%
Q1d. Development of the Clinton Lake Area								
Very important	31.0%	27.5%	14.8%	18.9%	12.8%	15.2%	26.5%	17.0%
Somewhat important	31.0%	27.5%	38.0%	34.5%	34.7%	33.9%	35.9%	34.2%
Not sure	21.1%	26.1%	18.5%	18.9%	23.0%	22.0%	18.8%	21.5%
Not important	16.9%	18.8%	28.7%	27.7%	29.5%	28.9%	18.8%	27.3%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1e. Quality housing for all income groups								
Very important	60.6%	56.5%	52.3%	51.6%	54.3%	50.2%	73.3%	54.0%
Somewhat important	25.4%	27.5%	32.1%	32.8%	30.1%	33.1%	18.0%	30.2%
Not sure	8.5%	10.1%	5.5%	8.8%	9.1%	9.0%	6.4%	8.9%
Not important	5.6%	5.8%	10.1%	6.8%	6.5%	7.8%	2.3%	6.9%
Q1f. Walking and biking trails								
Very important	66.2%	63.8%	46.8%	54.0%	36.7%	43.1%	60.5%	45.8%
Somewhat important	22.5%	26.1%	39.4%	36.4%	42.8%	40.1%	29.7%	38.4%
Not sure	5.6%	5.8%	4.6%	5.6%	9.4%	8.0%	4.1%	7.4%
Not important	5.6%	4.3%	9.2%	4.0%	11.1%	8.8%	5.8%	8.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1g. Maintaining community identity.								
Very important	59.2%	60.9%	38.5%	51.4%	43.8%	46.1%	54.1%	47.2%
Somewhat important	29.6%	24.6%	39.4%	33.1%	34.6%	35.1%	27.9%	33.7%
Not sure	7.0%	10.1%	17.4%	11.2%	18.0%	14.4%	15.7%	15.0%
Not important	4.2%	4.3%	4.6%	4.4%	3.6%	4.4%	2.3%	4.1%
Q1h. Downtown stability								
Very important	63.4%	71.0%	56.0%	65.7%	58.2%	61.5%	58.1%	60.8%
Somewhat important	28.2%	21.7%	34.9%	23.5%	28.4%	26.6%	32.0%	27.6%
Not sure	7.0%	2.9%	2.8%	5.6%	7.8%	5.9%	8.7%	6.3%
Not important	1.4%	4.3%	6.4%	5.2%	5.5%	6.0%	1.2%	5.3%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1i. Transportation alternatives to the car								
Very important	42.3%	49.3%	37.6%	38.2%	38.7%	36.6%	52.9%	39.4%
Somewhat important	32.4%	36.2%	39.4%	34.3%	32.8%	35.1%	29.7%	33.9%
Not sure	15.5%	8.7%	7.3%	11.6%	13.7%	12.9%	9.3%	12.2%
Not important	9.9%	5.8%	15.6%	15.9%	14.9%	15.4%	8.1%	14.5%
Q1j. Availability of arts and cultural opportunities								
Very important	39.4%	40.6%	35.8%	41.0%	37.3%	37.4%	44.4%	38.6%
Somewhat important	42.3%	39.1%	40.4%	41.8%	41.7%	41.7%	40.4%	41.3%
Not sure	14.1%	10.1%	11.0%	8.8%	11.9%	11.0%	10.5%	11.0%
Not important	4.2%	10.1%	12.8%	8.4%	9.2%	9.9%	4.7%	9.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1k. Appearance of multi-family residential developments								
Very important	26.8%	24.6%	25.9%	23.6%	25.7%	25.6%	22.7%	25.3%
Somewhat important	31.0%	42.0%	38.9%	37.2%	44.2%	42.1%	36.6%	40.8%
Not sure	35.2%	15.9%	21.3%	24.0%	18.5%	19.4%	28.5%	21.2%
Not important	7.0%	17.4%	13.9%	15.2%	11.6%	12.9%	12.2%	12.7%
Q1l. Incorporating natural areas into development projects								
Very important	42.3%	50.7%	40.4%	42.8%	42.0%	43.3%	39.0%	42.5%
Somewhat important	28.2%	30.4%	38.5%	36.8%	30.2%	33.5%	29.1%	32.6%
Not sure	15.5%	13.0%	11.9%	9.2%	16.8%	13.7%	15.7%	14.1%
Not important	14.1%	5.8%	9.2%	11.2%	11.1%	9.6%	16.3%	10.8%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1m. Creating employment opportunities								
Very important	70.4%	71.0%	68.8%	73.9%	75.3%	74.4%	70.9%	73.6%
Somewhat important	23.9%	26.1%	22.9%	20.5%	20.2%	20.7%	22.7%	21.1%
Not sure	4.2%	1.4%	4.6%	3.2%	3.0%	3.0%	4.7%	3.2%
Not important	1.4%	1.4%	3.7%	2.4%	1.5%	2.0%	1.7%	2.1%
Q1n. Parks, recreation, open space								
Very important	69.0%	56.5%	52.3%	66.1%	54.0%	57.3%	62.8%	58.0%
Somewhat important	26.8%	37.7%	44.0%	30.3%	37.3%	36.4%	30.8%	35.5%
Not sure	2.8%	2.9%	1.8%	2.8%	6.5%	4.4%	5.2%	4.6%
Not important	1.4%	2.9%	1.8%	0.8%	2.1%	1.9%	1.2%	1.9%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1o. Protecting high value farmland								
Very important	33.8%	42.0%	40.4%	40.2%	50.5%	45.8%	40.9%	45.0%
Somewhat important	35.2%	29.0%	25.7%	32.5%	29.6%	29.8%	32.7%	30.3%
Not sure	21.1%	24.6%	21.1%	21.3%	12.7%	16.7%	19.3%	17.1%
Not important	9.9%	4.3%	12.8%	6.0%	7.2%	7.7%	7.0%	7.6%
Q1p. Appearance of commercial areas								
Very important	28.2%	24.6%	28.7%	27.3%	34.2%	32.8%	22.1%	31.1%
Somewhat important	53.5%	59.4%	51.9%	54.2%	48.6%	51.2%	51.7%	51.1%
Not sure	14.1%	8.7%	13.9%	14.1%	12.3%	11.2%	20.3%	12.7%
Not important	4.2%	7.2%	5.6%	4.4%	4.9%	4.7%	5.8%	5.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1q. Managing future growth								
Very important	64.8%	58.0%	54.1%	61.0%	57.4%	58.8%	57.6%	58.5%
Somewhat important	26.8%	40.6%	34.9%	30.3%	31.7%	31.7%	33.1%	31.9%
Not sure	7.0%	0.0%	9.2%	5.2%	7.8%	6.4%	8.1%	6.6%
Not important	1.4%	1.4%	1.8%	3.6%	3.0%	3.2%	1.2%	3.0%
Q1r. Activities and housing for the Retirement Community								
Very important	24.3%	24.6%	19.3%	26.6%	33.6%	28.1%	33.3%	29.2%
Somewhat important	41.4%	47.8%	50.5%	50.0%	46.9%	49.1%	41.5%	47.5%
Not sure	27.1%	18.8%	22.9%	14.5%	13.7%	15.6%	19.3%	16.1%
Not important	7.1%	8.7%	7.3%	8.9%	5.7%	7.2%	5.8%	7.3%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q1s. Other								
Very important	66.7%	81.8%	78.6%	88.9%	88.0%	86.7%	80.6%	85.4%
Somewhat important	0.0%	9.1%	7.1%	8.3%	6.0%	7.5%	3.2%	7.0%
Not sure	22.2%	9.1%	7.1%	0.0%	2.4%	2.5%	9.7%	3.8%
Not important	11.1%	0.0%	7.1%	2.8%	3.6%	3.3%	6.5%	3.8%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q2. Most Important								
Maintaining rural character	5.6%	1.4%	9.0%	4.3%	5.5%	6.0%	1.7%	5.3%
Preserving historic buildings	7.0%	2.9%	3.6%	3.1%	4.2%	4.0%	4.0%	3.9%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	7.0%	2.9%	2.7%	3.5%	3.0%	3.2%	4.0%	3.3%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	4.2%	0.0%	1.8%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%	1.7%	1.3%
Quality housing for all income groups	15.5%	14.5%	9.0%	12.6%	13.3%	10.3%	25.1%	13.0%
Walking and biking trails	2.8%	7.2%	5.4%	3.9%	1.7%	2.7%	4.6%	3.1%
Maintaining community identity	2.8%	11.6%	8.1%	5.9%	4.4%	5.2%	7.4%	5.4%
Downtown stability	12.7%	13.0%	8.1%	12.6%	8.5%	10.9%	6.3%	9.9%
Transportation alternatives to the car	8.5%	5.8%	5.4%	0.8%	1.7%	1.9%	6.3%	2.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)								
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	2.8%	1.4%	1.8%	0.8%	1.1%	1.5%	0.0%	1.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	1.4%	2.9%	1.8%	1.6%	1.1%	1.2%	2.3%	1.5%
Creating employment opportunities	15.5%	21.7%	25.2%	24.0%	25.9%	26.3%	16.0%	24.3%
Parks, recreation, open space	5.6%	0.0%	1.8%	1.6%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	1.7%
Protecting high value farmland	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	2.0%	5.5%	4.2%	0.6%	3.5%
Appearance of commercial areas	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%	1.1%	0.6%
Managing future growth	2.8%	7.2%	6.3%	7.5%	7.2%	7.3%	5.7%	6.9%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	2.5%	1.5%	1.7%	1.5%
Other	1.4%	4.3%	5.4%	5.1%	4.9%	4.7%	4.6%	4.9%
None chosen	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	8.3%	6.1%	5.2%	5.1%	5.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q2. 3rd Important								
Maintaining rural character	0.0%	2.9%	3.6%	0.8%	2.5%	2.1%	1.7%	2.0%
Preserving historic buildings	4.2%	5.8%	7.2%	2.4%	3.2%	3.4%	5.1%	3.6%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	2.8%	2.9%	5.4%	5.9%	4.4%	4.3%	6.3%	4.6%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	2.8%	5.8%	0.0%	1.6%	2.3%	2.5%	0.6%	2.1%
Quality housing for all income groups	7.0%	11.6%	7.2%	5.1%	4.9%	5.5%	8.0%	5.8%
Walking and biking trails	8.5%	13.0%	4.5%	7.1%	4.7%	5.3%	10.3%	6.2%
Maintaining community identity	8.5%	0.0%	0.9%	4.7%	3.6%	3.6%	4.6%	3.7%
Downtown stability	9.9%	5.8%	9.9%	10.6%	9.7%	10.1%	7.4%	9.6%
Transportation alternatives to the car	1.4%	5.8%	6.3%	5.5%	7.2%	6.0%	6.3%	6.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q2. 3rd Important (Cont.)								
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	7.0%	4.3%	3.6%	3.5%	4.9%	4.7%	4.0%	4.6%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	0.0%	1.4%	2.7%	0.8%	1.3%	1.4%	0.6%	1.2%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	7.0%	4.3%	8.1%	5.1%	3.4%	4.5%	5.7%	4.6%
Creating employment opportunities	11.3%	8.7%	10.8%	10.2%	9.7%	10.1%	9.1%	9.8%
Parks, recreation, open space	16.9%	4.3%	6.3%	7.5%	6.8%	7.2%	8.6%	7.6%
Protecting high value farmland	1.4%	11.6%	7.2%	2.8%	6.8%	5.6%	6.9%	5.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	2.8%	2.9%	5.4%	3.1%	2.8%	3.6%	1.1%	3.2%
Managing future growth	5.6%	8.7%	5.4%	11.4%	9.1%	10.1%	4.0%	9.0%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	1.4%	0.0%	2.7%	1.6%	2.3%	2.2%	0.6%	2.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%	1.1%	0.8%
None chosen	1.4%	0.0%	1.8%	9.1%	9.7%	7.0%	8.0%	7.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q2. 4th Important								
Maintaining rural character	1.4%	1.4%	0.9%	2.0%	3.8%	2.9%	1.7%	2.9%
Preserving historic buildings	5.6%	1.4%	5.4%	3.1%	5.7%	4.6%	5.1%	4.7%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	4.2%	2.9%	6.3%	4.7%	4.9%	4.6%	6.3%	4.8%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	5.6%	2.9%	2.7%	2.8%	1.9%	2.6%	2.9%	2.7%
Quality housing for all income groups	2.8%	4.3%	7.2%	6.3%	4.5%	5.3%	4.6%	5.2%
Walking and biking trails	12.7%	7.2%	3.6%	2.8%	4.5%	4.2%	7.4%	4.7%
Maintaining community identity	8.5%	1.4%	6.3%	4.3%	4.9%	5.2%	4.0%	4.9%
Downtown stability	2.8%	5.8%	2.7%	4.7%	7.0%	5.8%	5.1%	5.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	4.2%	11.6%	2.7%	4.3%	4.0%	4.0%	6.3%	4.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q2. 4th Important (Cont.)								
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	11.3%	8.7%	9.0%	6.3%	4.5%	5.6%	9.1%	6.1%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	2.8%	1.4%	4.5%	2.4%	2.7%	2.9%	1.7%	2.7%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	5.6%	5.8%	6.3%	6.3%	3.4%	4.9%	3.4%	4.7%
Creating employment opportunities	5.6%	5.8%	7.2%	5.5%	8.7%	7.7%	5.1%	7.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	7.0%	8.7%	6.3%	9.8%	5.9%	7.4%	6.9%	7.3%
Protecting high value farmland	2.8%	7.2%	2.7%	5.1%	4.9%	4.8%	4.0%	4.7%
Appearance of commercial areas	2.8%	5.8%	1.8%	2.8%	2.3%	2.6%	2.9%	2.6%
Managing future growth	9.9%	11.6%	18.9%	11.0%	8.1%	10.8%	8.6%	10.3%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	0.0%	1.4%	0.9%	4.3%	5.1%	4.1%	2.9%	3.8%
Other	2.8%	4.3%	0.9%	0.8%	1.7%	1.5%	2.3%	1.6%
None chosen	1.4%	0.0%	3.6%	10.6%	11.4%	8.5%	9.7%	9.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q2. Most Important								
Maintaining rural character	9.9%	8.7%	16.2%	8.7%	16.7%	14.9%	7.4%	13.7%
Preserving historic buildings	23.9%	13.0%	18.9%	11.4%	16.7%	15.3%	18.9%	15.8%
Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	18.3%	11.6%	17.1%	18.1%	17.0%	16.5%	19.4%	16.9%
Development of the Clinton Lake Area	19.7%	11.6%	5.4%	9.1%	7.2%	8.9%	8.0%	8.9%
Quality housing for all income groups	33.8%	39.1%	33.3%	32.7%	33.7%	30.3%	51.4%	33.8%
Walking and biking trails	33.8%	36.2%	18.0%	20.5%	14.0%	16.7%	29.1%	18.8%
Maintaining community identity	23.9%	15.9%	20.7%	19.3%	16.9%	18.5%	18.3%	18.2%
Downtown stability	33.8%	43.5%	40.5%	38.6%	38.4%	40.0%	32.6%	38.5%
Transportation alternatives to the car	19.7%	30.4%	19.8%	17.3%	17.6%	17.5%	24.0%	18.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Top Four)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q2. Most Important (Cont.)								
Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	22.5%	17.4%	17.1%	14.6%	14.0%	15.1%	16.6%	15.2%
Appearance of multi-family residential developments	4.2%	2.9%	11.7%	5.1%	6.3%	6.2%	5.7%	6.1%
Incorporating natural areas into development projects	14.1%	14.5%	21.6%	15.0%	9.7%	13.0%	11.4%	12.8%
Creating employment opportunities	47.9%	53.6%	56.8%	53.5%	57.4%	58.1%	44.0%	55.4%
Parks, recreation, open space	38.0%	24.6%	20.7%	26.0%	18.2%	21.7%	25.1%	22.3%
Protecting high value farmland	8.5%	26.1%	15.3%	11.8%	22.9%	19.5%	14.3%	18.4%
Appearance of commercial areas	8.5%	10.1%	9.0%	7.5%	6.8%	8.0%	5.7%	7.5%
Managing future growth	26.8%	27.5%	35.1%	37.0%	31.3%	34.5%	24.6%	32.5%
Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	5.6%	2.9%	5.4%	9.1%	12.7%	10.8%	6.3%	9.9%
Other	4.2%	10.1%	8.1%	8.7%	8.5%	8.2%	8.6%	8.4%
None chosen	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	8.3%	6.1%	5.2%	5.1%	5.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3a. A stronger community identity								
Strongly agree	21.7%	17.6%	12.0%	17.5%	18.1%	17.2%	20.0%	17.5%
Agree	47.8%	47.1%	42.6%	42.3%	39.9%	41.4%	44.1%	42.1%
Neutral	26.1%	33.8%	38.9%	36.6%	35.8%	36.3%	31.2%	35.1%
Disagree	2.9%	1.5%	4.6%	3.3%	5.1%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	1.9%	0.4%	1.2%	1.0%	0.6%	1.2%
Q3b. More attractive City entrances								
Strongly agree	10.0%	14.5%	15.6%	11.6%	11.1%	12.6%	9.3%	11.8%
Agree	38.6%	27.5%	29.4%	30.0%	40.1%	35.7%	34.3%	35.6%
Neutral	38.6%	43.5%	38.5%	43.6%	38.0%	39.2%	43.0%	39.8%
Disagree	10.0%	14.5%	13.8%	12.8%	7.7%	9.6%	12.2%	10.1%
Strongly disagree	2.9%	0.0%	2.8%	2.0%	3.1%	2.9%	1.2%	2.7%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3c. More parks and open space								
Strongly agree	28.2%	20.3%	20.4%	25.6%	22.7%	23.1%	25.6%	23.3%
Agree	46.5%	44.9%	44.4%	50.8%	43.3%	44.8%	48.8%	45.7%
Neutral	23.9%	30.4%	27.8%	19.9%	27.9%	26.4%	23.3%	25.6%
Disagree	0.0%	4.3%	5.6%	3.7%	4.0%	4.2%	2.3%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	2.1%	1.6%	0.0%	1.6%
Q3d. More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails								
Strongly agree	46.5%	42.0%	37.3%	37.3%	30.3%	33.3%	41.5%	34.7%
Agree	35.2%	37.7%	40.0%	40.2%	34.3%	36.7%	36.8%	36.8%
Neutral	16.9%	15.9%	14.5%	17.7%	25.7%	22.2%	16.4%	21.0%
Disagree	1.4%	4.3%	6.4%	3.6%	6.9%	5.7%	4.7%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.2%	2.9%	2.1%	0.6%	2.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3e. More bicycle paths and routes								
Strongly agree	43.7%	39.1%	33.0%	34.5%	26.6%	29.1%	40.1%	31.1%
Agree	33.8%	34.8%	30.3%	34.5%	27.0%	30.3%	30.2%	30.2%
Neutral	18.3%	21.7%	26.6%	22.9%	31.0%	28.4%	21.5%	27.0%
Disagree	2.8%	4.3%	6.4%	6.0%	10.8%	8.7%	5.8%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	3.7%	2.0%	4.6%	3.4%	2.3%	3.5%
Q3f. More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown								
Strongly agree	25.4%	21.7%	15.5%	18.5%	8.8%	13.2%	16.9%	13.9%
Agree	38.0%	34.8%	30.9%	35.3%	27.8%	29.8%	37.8%	31.3%
Neutral	31.0%	29.0%	37.3%	30.9%	41.7%	38.2%	32.0%	36.9%
Disagree	4.2%	14.5%	13.6%	11.6%	16.5%	14.6%	11.6%	13.9%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	2.7%	3.6%	5.2%	4.3%	1.7%	4.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3g. More housing in and around downtown								
Strongly agree	5.6%	13.0%	8.2%	7.2%	9.2%	8.6%	8.7%	8.7%
Agree	26.8%	24.6%	19.1%	22.1%	23.9%	23.1%	25.0%	23.1%
Neutral	56.3%	47.8%	48.2%	47.4%	42.3%	45.0%	46.5%	45.4%
Disagree	9.9%	13.0%	22.7%	16.9%	18.4%	18.1%	15.1%	17.5%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	1.4%	1.8%	6.4%	6.1%	5.1%	4.7%	5.2%
Q3h. More affordable housing within the City								
Strongly agree	28.2%	42.0%	30.0%	33.5%	37.1%	30.0%	59.1%	35.2%
Agree	40.8%	24.6%	33.6%	35.9%	35.4%	36.9%	26.9%	34.8%
Neutral	23.9%	29.0%	24.5%	23.4%	21.9%	25.2%	12.9%	23.2%
Disagree	4.2%	4.3%	9.1%	5.2%	4.2%	5.8%	1.2%	5.0%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	0.0%	2.7%	2.0%	1.3%	2.0%	0.0%	1.8%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3i. More employment opportunities								
Strongly agree	52.9%	52.2%	61.8%	62.8%	63.4%	61.5%	62.8%	61.5%
Agree	40.0%	39.1%	23.6%	28.8%	28.4%	29.9%	26.7%	29.4%
Neutral	5.7%	7.2%	11.8%	7.2%	6.9%	7.1%	9.3%	7.4%
Disagree	0.0%	1.4%	2.7%	0.8%	0.8%	1.1%	0.6%	1.0%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%
Q3j. Better protection of natural resources								
Strongly agree	39.4%	43.5%	38.5%	37.9%	39.4%	38.6%	42.7%	39.3%
Agree	39.4%	34.8%	40.4%	39.9%	37.1%	38.0%	38.0%	38.2%
Neutral	15.5%	18.8%	17.4%	17.7%	19.2%	19.1%	14.6%	18.2%
Disagree	2.8%	2.9%	3.7%	2.4%	3.1%	2.7%	4.1%	2.9%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.2%	1.4%	0.6%	1.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3k. Expanded public transportation								
Strongly agree	31.0%	36.2%	25.7%	21.9%	24.4%	22.8%	36.3%	25.2%
Agree	22.5%	31.9%	25.7%	32.0%	28.0%	27.3%	34.5%	28.7%
Neutral	32.4%	29.0%	27.5%	28.7%	32.4%	32.8%	21.1%	30.5%
Disagree	7.0%	2.9%	11.0%	9.7%	9.0%	9.4%	6.4%	8.9%
Strongly disagree	7.0%	0.0%	10.1%	7.7%	6.1%	7.6%	1.8%	6.7%
Q3l. More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake								
Strongly agree	23.9%	29.0%	12.7%	15.2%	10.4%	12.6%	22.1%	14.1%
Agree	42.3%	23.2%	26.4%	29.2%	22.8%	24.9%	32.0%	26.5%
Neutral	25.4%	34.8%	38.2%	37.6%	43.2%	40.9%	32.0%	39.2%
Disagree	5.6%	5.8%	19.1%	14.0%	15.9%	15.6%	8.7%	14.2%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	7.2%	3.6%	4.0%	7.7%	6.0%	5.2%	6.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3m. More activities for teenagers								
Strongly agree	15.5%	10.1%	17.3%	17.2%	23.7%	20.3%	18.6%	19.9%
Agree	33.8%	36.2%	31.8%	40.4%	39.6%	38.3%	38.4%	38.3%
Neutral	39.4%	49.3%	43.6%	37.2%	32.1%	35.8%	37.8%	36.3%
Disagree	5.6%	4.3%	6.4%	4.4%	2.7%	3.8%	4.1%	3.8%
Strongly disagree	5.6%	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%	1.9%	1.8%	1.2%	1.7%
Q3n. More activities for seniors								
Strongly agree	19.7%	7.4%	8.2%	10.0%	17.5%	14.5%	12.8%	14.2%
Agree	22.5%	41.2%	33.6%	35.6%	41.5%	36.9%	40.7%	37.7%
Neutral	50.7%	47.1%	54.5%	46.8%	35.9%	42.7%	41.9%	42.4%
Disagree	4.2%	2.9%	2.7%	6.4%	4.0%	4.5%	4.1%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	1.5%	0.9%	1.2%	1.2%	1.4%	0.6%	1.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3o. Improved access to local foods								
Strongly agree	36.6%	34.8%	23.6%	22.1%	20.9%	20.9%	36.6%	23.6%
Agree	32.4%	40.6%	34.5%	37.3%	38.8%	38.0%	34.9%	37.4%
Neutral	26.8%	21.7%	30.0%	34.1%	33.4%	33.5%	25.6%	32.0%
Disagree	0.0%	2.9%	8.2%	4.4%	5.0%	5.3%	1.7%	4.8%
Strongly disagree	4.2%	0.0%	3.6%	2.0%	1.9%	2.4%	1.2%	2.2%
Q3p. Better management of growth								
Strongly agree	25.4%	23.2%	31.8%	42.0%	38.7%	39.1%	25.6%	36.7%
Agree	38.0%	44.9%	39.1%	33.2%	32.9%	33.0%	43.6%	34.9%
Neutral	33.8%	29.0%	20.9%	20.0%	21.7%	21.4%	27.9%	22.5%
Disagree	1.4%	1.4%	7.3%	4.0%	4.8%	5.0%	1.7%	4.4%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	1.4%	0.9%	0.8%	1.9%	1.5%	1.2%	1.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3q. Maintaining the rural character of the County								
Strongly agree	16.9%	17.4%	19.1%	15.2%	28.2%	22.8%	20.9%	22.5%
Agree	43.7%	44.9%	31.8%	37.2%	32.3%	35.4%	33.7%	35.2%
Neutral	25.4%	29.0%	34.5%	38.4%	30.0%	31.2%	36.6%	32.1%
Disagree	12.7%	8.7%	12.7%	7.6%	7.1%	8.5%	7.6%	8.2%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	1.8%	1.6%	2.5%	2.1%	1.2%	2.0%
Q3r. New or expanded conference space								
Strongly agree	5.6%	4.3%	7.3%	3.6%	5.4%	4.8%	7.0%	5.2%
Agree	21.1%	20.3%	11.9%	18.1%	21.1%	20.7%	12.8%	19.4%
Neutral	45.1%	49.3%	47.7%	51.2%	48.6%	49.1%	48.3%	49.0%
Disagree	22.5%	20.3%	28.4%	20.6%	16.9%	18.5%	25.0%	19.4%
Strongly disagree	5.6%	5.8%	4.6%	6.5%	8.1%	6.9%	7.0%	7.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3s. Multi-use neighborhoods								
Strongly agree	10.0%	7.5%	5.5%	7.3%	7.9%	7.0%	10.7%	7.6%
Agree	24.3%	31.3%	32.7%	31.3%	29.3%	30.5%	28.6%	30.3%
Neutral	57.1%	52.2%	41.8%	44.3%	48.8%	47.5%	48.2%	47.4%
Disagree	4.3%	9.0%	18.2%	13.8%	9.8%	11.3%	11.3%	11.3%
Strongly disagree	4.3%	0.0%	1.8%	3.3%	4.1%	3.6%	1.2%	3.4%
Q3t. Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities								
Strongly agree	40.8%	30.4%	22.0%	16.5%	18.0%	19.4%	27.5%	20.7%
Agree	29.6%	42.0%	43.1%	45.2%	37.4%	40.9%	33.9%	39.7%
Neutral	25.4%	20.3%	26.6%	31.5%	34.7%	31.1%	32.2%	31.2%
Disagree	1.4%	5.8%	6.4%	4.8%	6.1%	5.7%	4.7%	5.4%
Strongly disagree	2.8%	1.4%	1.8%	2.0%	3.6%	3.0%	1.8%	2.9%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3u. More arts and cultural opportunities								
Strongly agree	20.0%	18.8%	18.2%	16.1%	14.8%	14.7%	23.8%	16.2%
Agree	48.6%	36.2%	28.2%	43.0%	35.7%	37.2%	39.0%	37.7%
Neutral	27.1%	30.4%	40.0%	32.5%	35.1%	34.9%	30.2%	33.9%
Disagree	2.9%	13.0%	7.3%	6.0%	10.0%	9.1%	5.2%	8.4%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	1.4%	6.4%	2.4%	4.4%	4.0%	1.7%	3.8%
Q3v. Development of the communications network (fiber)								
Strongly agree	44.3%	49.3%	37.6%	38.3%	25.7%	32.0%	37.6%	32.9%
Agree	34.3%	24.6%	33.0%	32.3%	33.0%	33.1%	28.8%	32.2%
Neutral	18.6%	26.1%	23.9%	25.8%	33.6%	28.9%	30.0%	29.2%
Disagree	1.4%	0.0%	4.6%	3.2%	5.4%	4.5%	2.4%	4.1%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.4%	2.3%	1.5%	1.2%	1.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q3w. Stronger retirement community								
Strongly agree	16.9%	10.1%	7.3%	9.7%	18.5%	14.7%	12.3%	14.5%
Agree	21.1%	31.9%	32.1%	33.1%	35.2%	33.5%	31.6%	33.2%
Neutral	49.3%	56.5%	54.1%	48.8%	40.6%	45.4%	47.4%	45.4%
Disagree	8.5%	1.4%	5.5%	6.0%	4.6%	4.6%	7.6%	5.3%
Strong disagree	4.2%	0.0%	0.9%	2.4%	1.2%	1.7%	1.2%	1.7%
Q3x. Other								
Strongly agree	75.0%	75.0%	80.0%	87.0%	64.8%	74.7%	69.6%	72.9%
Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	13.0%	8.9%	4.3%	7.5%
Neutral	25.0%	25.0%	20.0%	8.7%	11.1%	11.4%	21.7%	13.1%
Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.3%	0.0%	0.9%
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%	3.8%	4.3%	5.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. Best Represent								
A stronger community identity	2.8%	5.8%	3.6%	3.1%	3.4%	3.5%	3.4%	3.5%
More attractive City entrances	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%	0.6%	1.2%
More parks and open space	4.2%	2.9%	2.7%	3.1%	2.3%	2.7%	2.9%	2.7%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	4.2%	5.8%	6.3%	5.1%	3.2%	4.1%	4.6%	4.3%
More bicycle paths and routes	0.0%	4.3%	1.8%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	2.3%	1.3%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	7.0%	4.3%	1.8%	3.9%	1.7%	2.7%	3.4%	2.8%
More housing in and around downtown	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%	0.6%	1.5%
More affordable housing within the City	8.5%	11.6%	7.2%	9.4%	9.8%	8.0%	17.1%	9.6%
More employment opportunities	23.9%	23.2%	27.0%	31.5%	28.8%	30.4%	20.0%	28.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)								
Better protection of natural resources	2.8%	5.8%	4.5%	3.1%	5.3%	4.6%	4.0%	4.6%
Expanded public transportation	2.8%	0.0%	1.8%	2.8%	1.5%	1.5%	3.4%	1.8%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	4.2%	1.4%	0.9%	1.2%	1.1%	1.6%	0.0%	1.3%
More activities for teenagers	1.4%	2.9%	0.9%	1.6%	2.7%	2.1%	2.3%	2.1%
More activities for seniors	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%
Improved access to local foods	2.8%	1.4%	1.8%	0.4%	1.3%	0.9%	2.9%	1.2%
Better management of growth	2.8%	1.4%	3.6%	8.7%	9.8%	9.0%	2.9%	7.8%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	7.0%	1.4%	5.4%	1.6%	4.4%	4.0%	2.3%	3.8%
New or expanded conference space	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)								
Multi-use neighborhoods	2.8%	1.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.8%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	4.2%	4.3%	0.9%	0.4%	1.1%	0.9%	3.4%	1.3%
More arts and cultural opportunities	2.8%	0.0%	1.8%	1.6%	0.9%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	5.6%	13.0%	8.1%	5.5%	2.8%	4.7%	6.3%	4.9%
Stronger retirement community	2.8%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%	1.7%	1.6%
Other	4.2%	2.9%	7.2%	4.7%	4.2%	4.1%	6.9%	4.6%
No response	1.4%	4.3%	6.3%	7.5%	8.1%	6.8%	7.4%	7.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent								
A stronger community identity	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	1.2%	2.7%	2.1%	1.1%	1.9%
More attractive City entrances	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	1.2%	1.7%	1.6%	0.6%	1.4%
More parks and open space	7.0%	0.0%	1.8%	3.5%	3.0%	3.1%	2.9%	3.1%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	9.9%	5.8%	5.4%	4.3%	5.3%	5.2%	6.9%	5.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	4.2%	11.6%	3.6%	6.3%	4.0%	4.8%	6.3%	5.0%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	2.8%	1.4%	3.6%	4.3%	1.3%	2.5%	2.3%	2.5%
More housing in and around downtown	2.8%	2.9%	0.0%	2.4%	1.9%	2.0%	1.7%	1.9%
More affordable housing within the City	5.6%	8.7%	8.1%	9.1%	11.9%	9.5%	13.7%	10.0%
More employment opportunities	8.5%	8.7%	18.0%	12.2%	13.4%	13.0%	13.7%	13.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)								
Better protection of natural resources	2.8%	10.1%	5.4%	6.3%	6.1%	6.6%	4.6%	6.3%
Expanded public transportation	9.9%	5.8%	2.7%	3.1%	4.4%	3.6%	6.9%	4.3%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	5.6%	5.8%	1.8%	5.1%	1.9%	2.8%	5.1%	3.2%
More activities for teenagers	2.8%	5.8%	6.3%	3.5%	4.0%	4.2%	3.4%	4.1%
More activities for seniors	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	0.4%	3.0%	2.1%	0.0%	1.8%
Improved access to local foods	4.2%	5.8%	3.6%	2.4%	2.1%	2.3%	4.0%	2.7%
Better management of growth	2.8%	1.4%	11.7%	9.8%	8.1%	9.0%	4.0%	8.0%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	0.0%	4.3%	5.4%	2.8%	5.1%	4.7%	1.7%	4.1%
New or expanded conference space	1.4%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	1.3%	1.2%	0.0%	1.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4, 2nd Best Represent (Cont.)								
Multi-use neighborhoods	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	11.3%	2.9%	5.4%	3.1%	2.7%	3.5%	4.6%	3.7%
More arts and cultural opportunities	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.6%	1.1%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	11.3%	7.2%	3.6%	4.7%	2.7%	4.0%	5.1%	4.1%
Stronger retirement community	1.4%	1.4%	0.9%	3.1%	1.3%	2.0%	0.6%	1.8%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.4%	0.8%	0.5%	1.1%	0.6%
No response	2.8%	4.3%	6.3%	8.3%	9.3%	7.6%	8.6%	8.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent								
A stronger community identity	2.8%	1.4%	0.9%	1.6%	1.7%	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%
More attractive City entrances	4.2%	2.9%	0.9%	2.8%	2.7%	2.8%	1.7%	2.6%
More parks and open space	2.8%	2.9%	6.3%	4.7%	1.3%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	11.3%	7.2%	7.2%	6.3%	5.5%	6.5%	6.3%	6.4%
More bicycle paths and routes	4.2%	5.8%	2.7%	3.9%	3.4%	3.5%	4.0%	3.6%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	4.2%	5.8%	2.7%	3.1%	1.9%	2.1%	5.7%	2.7%
More housing in and around downtown	2.8%	4.3%	0.9%	0.8%	1.7%	1.4%	2.9%	1.7%
More affordable housing within the City	0.0%	1.4%	4.5%	5.1%	4.7%	4.5%	3.4%	4.3%
More employment opportunities	9.9%	10.1%	5.4%	5.5%	10.4%	9.0%	6.9%	8.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)								
Better protection of natural resources	2.8%	5.8%	8.1%	5.5%	5.9%	6.1%	4.6%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	1.4%	15.9%	4.5%	4.7%	3.2%	3.6%	8.0%	4.4%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	2.8%	1.4%	3.6%	2.0%	2.3%	2.2%	3.4%	2.7%
More activities for teenagers	7.0%	1.4%	4.5%	4.7%	4.5%	4.6%	4.6%	4.5%
More activities for seniors	0.0%	4.3%	2.7%	2.8%	3.0%	2.6%	4.0%	2.9%
Improved access to local foods	7.0%	2.9%	3.6%	1.6%	3.8%	2.9%	5.7%	3.3%
Better management of growth	5.6%	4.3%	9.9%	9.4%	7.8%	8.6%	4.6%	7.9%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.2%	5.9%	3.9%	1.1%	3.3%
New or expanded conference space	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	1.2%	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. 3rd Best Represent (Cont.)								
Multi-use neighborhoods	1.4%	1.4%	1.8%	3.5%	1.9%	2.2%	2.3%	2.2%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	9.9%	7.2%	4.5%	4.7%	3.6%	4.6%	5.1%	4.6%
More arts and cultural opportunities	4.2%	1.4%	3.6%	3.5%	2.5%	2.8%	3.4%	2.9%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	8.5%	4.3%	9.0%	7.9%	5.7%	6.8%	6.3%	6.6%
Stronger retirement community	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	1.6%	3.0%	2.7%	0.0%	2.2%
Other	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%
No response	4.2%	4.3%	9.0%	11.0%	11.7%	10.1%	9.7%	10.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. 4th Best Represent								
A stronger community identity	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.1%	1.8%	0.6%	1.5%
More attractive City entrances	2.8%	2.9%	6.3%	2.4%	2.3%	2.9%	2.3%	2.8%
More parks and open space	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	5.1%	2.8%	2.8%	2.9%	2.9%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	7.0%	8.7%	4.5%	6.3%	3.0%	4.3%	6.3%	4.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	9.9%	5.8%	4.5%	5.5%	3.2%	4.2%	5.7%	4.5%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	4.2%	4.3%	4.5%	2.0%	1.7%	2.3%	2.9%	2.4%
More housing in and around downtown	5.6%	2.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	3.4%	1.2%
More affordable housing within the City	5.6%	7.2%	4.5%	3.9%	6.8%	5.3%	8.6%	5.7%
More employment opportunities	5.6%	7.2%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	4.6%	4.6%	4.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)								
Better protection of natural resources	9.9%	4.3%	2.7%	5.1%	6.3%	5.8%	5.7%	5.7%
Expanded public transportation	2.8%	4.3%	3.6%	3.1%	3.8%	3.3%	5.1%	3.6%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	1.4%	5.8%	3.6%	2.8%	2.1%	2.2%	4.6%	2.6%
More activities for teenagers	2.8%	1.4%	2.7%	2.8%	5.7%	4.3%	3.4%	4.2%
More activities for seniors	1.4%	0.0%	2.7%	1.2%	2.5%	2.3%	0.0%	1.9%
Improved access to local foods	2.8%	8.7%	6.3%	3.5%	3.2%	4.2%	2.9%	4.0%
Better management of growth	2.8%	2.9%	4.5%	9.8%	6.1%	6.9%	4.0%	6.4%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	4.2%	0.0%	1.8%	3.5%	4.7%	3.9%	2.9%	3.7%
New or expanded conference space	1.4%	0.0%	2.7%	2.8%	1.7%	2.1%	1.1%	1.9%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. 4th Best Represent (Cont.)								
Multi-use neighborhoods	0.0%	2.9%	0.9%	0.0%	2.1%	1.4%	1.1%	1.3%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	5.6%	8.7%	10.8%	4.3%	7.0%	7.0%	5.7%	6.8%
More arts and cultural opportunities	5.6%	0.0%	6.3%	2.8%	3.6%	3.5%	4.0%	3.5%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	5.6%	10.1%	8.1%	7.5%	3.0%	5.4%	5.1%	5.4%
Stronger retirement community	4.2%	1.4%	1.8%	1.6%	4.4%	3.3%	2.9%	3.2%
Other	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	1.2%	0.9%	0.8%	1.7%	1.1%
No response	5.6%	7.2%	12.6%	15.7%	15.9%	14.3%	12.6%	14.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. Best Represent								
A stronger community identity	5.6%	8.7%	6.3%	7.9%	9.8%	9.0%	6.9%	8.7%
More attractive City entrances	7.0%	7.2%	11.7%	7.5%	8.0%	8.8%	5.1%	8.0%
More parks and open space	15.5%	7.2%	10.8%	16.5%	9.5%	11.5%	11.4%	11.5%
More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	32.4%	27.5%	23.4%	22.0%	17.0%	20.1%	24.0%	20.7%
More bicycle paths and routes	18.3%	27.5%	12.6%	16.9%	11.7%	13.6%	18.3%	14.4%
More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	18.3%	15.9%	12.6%	13.4%	6.6%	9.6%	14.3%	10.3%
More housing in and around downtown	11.3%	10.1%	3.6%	5.5%	6.3%	6.0%	8.6%	6.4%
More affordable housing within the City	19.7%	29.0%	24.3%	27.6%	33.3%	27.2%	42.9%	29.6%
More employment opportunities	47.9%	49.3%	55.0%	53.5%	56.8%	57.0%	45.1%	54.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)								
Better protection of natural resources	18.3%	26.1%	20.7%	20.1%	23.5%	23.0%	18.9%	22.4%
Expanded public transportation	16.9%	26.1%	12.6%	13.8%	12.9%	12.1%	23.4%	14.1%
More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	14.1%	14.5%	9.9%	11.0%	7.4%	8.9%	13.1%	9.8%
More activities for teenagers	14.1%	11.6%	14.4%	12.6%	16.9%	15.3%	13.7%	14.9%
More activities for seniors	4.2%	5.8%	5.4%	5.1%	8.7%	7.5%	4.0%	7.0%
Improved access to local foods	16.9%	18.8%	15.3%	7.9%	10.4%	10.4%	15.4%	11.3%
Better management of growth	14.1%	10.1%	29.7%	37.8%	31.8%	33.6%	15.4%	30.2%
Maintaining the rural character of the County	11.3%	7.2%	12.6%	9.1%	20.1%	16.4%	8.0%	15.0%
New or expanded conference space	4.2%	0.0%	5.4%	3.9%	4.5%	4.6%	2.3%	4.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q4. Best Represent (Cont.)								
Multi-use neighborhoods	5.6%	7.2%	3.6%	3.9%	5.3%	5.0%	4.6%	5.0%
Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	31.0%	23.2%	21.6%	12.6%	14.4%	16.1%	18.9%	16.4%
More arts and cultural opportunities	12.7%	1.4%	11.7%	9.8%	8.3%	8.9%	9.1%	8.8%
Development of the communications network (fiber)	31.0%	34.8%	28.8%	25.6%	14.2%	20.9%	22.9%	20.9%
Stronger retirement community	8.5%	5.8%	4.5%	6.3%	11.0%	9.4%	5.1%	8.8%
Other	7.0%	4.3%	9.0%	7.1%	6.4%	6.1%	10.3%	6.9%
No response	1.4%	4.3%	6.3%	7.5%	8.1%	6.8%	7.4%	7.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5a. Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities								
Major strength	27.1%	36.2%	38.7%	32.9%	35.3%	35.5%	31.6%	35.0%
Strength	40.0%	44.9%	45.9%	54.6%	43.1%	45.3%	50.3%	45.9%
Neutral	28.6%	17.4%	10.8%	12.4%	18.8%	16.8%	16.4%	16.8%
Weakness	2.9%	1.4%	4.5%	0.0%	2.5%	2.3%	1.2%	2.1%
Major weakness	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.6%	0.2%
Q5b. Availability of retail choices								
Major strength	4.3%	13.2%	6.3%	5.2%	6.4%	5.2%	11.8%	6.5%
Strength	33.3%	41.2%	36.0%	40.6%	38.7%	38.7%	39.1%	38.8%
Neutral	33.3%	32.4%	24.3%	30.1%	29.8%	29.6%	30.2%	29.5%
Weakness	23.2%	13.2%	26.1%	19.3%	20.9%	21.9%	14.2%	20.7%
Major weakness	5.8%	0.0%	7.2%	4.8%	4.3%	4.5%	4.7%	4.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5c. Existing sidewalk network								
Major strength	5.7%	5.8%	3.6%	2.4%	4.2%	3.5%	5.8%	3.9%
Strength	42.9%	36.2%	30.0%	34.4%	27.4%	29.6%	39.2%	31.4%
Neutral	32.9%	46.4%	48.2%	40.9%	43.0%	43.6%	38.0%	42.4%
Weakness	17.1%	8.7%	14.5%	19.8%	22.2%	20.4%	15.2%	19.5%
Major weakness	1.4%	2.9%	3.6%	2.4%	3.3%	3.0%	1.8%	2.9%
Q5d. Protection of natural resources								
Major strength	4.3%	1.4%	0.9%	1.6%	5.0%	3.2%	4.7%	3.5%
Strength	28.6%	24.6%	21.8%	29.5%	24.8%	25.7%	26.9%	26.0%
Neutral	57.1%	63.8%	59.1%	52.0%	52.6%	54.7%	52.6%	54.1%
Weakness	10.0%	7.2%	16.4%	15.2%	15.3%	14.8%	12.3%	14.4%
Major weakness	0.0%	2.9%	1.8%	1.6%	2.3%	1.6%	3.5%	2.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5e. Public transportation								
Major strength	2.9%	7.2%	6.3%	2.4%	5.6%	4.1%	8.8%	4.9%
Strength	34.3%	33.3%	36.9%	35.7%	30.4%	31.1%	40.4%	33.0%
Neutral	48.6%	40.6%	36.9%	46.2%	44.5%	46.6%	32.2%	44.0%
Weakness	11.4%	17.4%	17.1%	12.9%	16.6%	15.5%	15.8%	15.5%
Major weakness	2.9%	1.4%	2.7%	2.8%	2.9%	2.7%	2.9%	2.7%
Q5f. Character of neighborhoods								
Major strength	7.1%	13.0%	7.3%	9.3%	9.1%	8.5%	12.3%	9.2%
Strength	40.0%	52.2%	50.0%	46.7%	43.2%	45.6%	43.9%	45.1%
Neutral	37.1%	21.7%	35.5%	31.7%	37.1%	34.8%	32.7%	34.4%
Weakness	14.3%	11.6%	6.4%	11.4%	10.2%	10.5%	9.9%	10.5%
Major weakness	1.4%	1.4%	0.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.6%	1.2%	0.8%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5g. Availability of housing choices								
Major strength	8.6%	5.8%	1.8%	4.0%	4.7%	4.4%	5.3%	4.7%
Strength	15.7%	36.2%	32.4%	31.5%	22.1%	27.0%	22.2%	26.2%
Neutral	54.3%	37.7%	36.9%	39.5%	40.6%	42.1%	33.3%	40.4%
Weakness	21.4%	20.3%	24.3%	19.4%	27.4%	22.9%	30.4%	24.1%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	5.6%	5.2%	3.6%	8.8%	4.6%
Q5h. Availability of parks and open space								
Major strength	14.3%	15.9%	13.6%	14.2%	12.5%	13.0%	15.2%	13.5%
Strength	52.9%	63.8%	55.5%	60.3%	53.1%	55.7%	57.3%	55.8%
Neutral	22.9%	18.8%	22.7%	18.6%	27.2%	24.5%	20.5%	23.8%
Weakness	10.0%	1.4%	8.2%	5.3%	6.6%	6.2%	5.8%	6.2%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.2%	0.7%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5i. Employment opportunities								
Major strength	0.0%	5.8%	0.9%	2.8%	5.6%	3.9%	4.1%	4.0%
Strength	8.6%	21.7%	9.9%	10.1%	7.1%	8.8%	11.7%	9.5%
Neutral	55.7%	37.7%	32.4%	35.2%	34.2%	35.7%	37.4%	35.9%
Weakness	27.1%	24.6%	39.6%	30.4%	35.0%	33.6%	31.6%	33.0%
Major weakness	8.6%	10.1%	17.1%	21.5%	18.1%	18.0%	15.2%	17.6%
Q5j. Historic buildings and areas								
Major strength	7.1%	15.9%	12.6%	14.5%	15.4%	14.4%	14.0%	14.5%
Strength	57.1%	43.5%	51.4%	52.2%	49.0%	50.4%	50.3%	50.3%
Neutral	34.3%	36.2%	31.5%	27.7%	31.5%	30.7%	32.7%	30.9%
Weakness	1.4%	2.9%	4.5%	5.6%	3.7%	4.3%	2.3%	4.0%
Major weakness	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.3%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5k. Rate of growth								
Major strength	1.4%	2.9%	0.9%	4.0%	3.7%	2.9%	4.7%	3.3%
Strength	18.6%	24.6%	18.9%	22.2%	23.2%	22.4%	22.2%	22.4%
Neutral	68.6%	56.5%	50.5%	43.1%	50.6%	48.5%	58.5%	50.4%
Weakness	10.0%	14.5%	23.4%	22.2%	17.4%	20.0%	11.7%	18.4%
Major weakness	1.4%	1.4%	6.3%	8.5%	5.1%	6.1%	2.9%	5.5%
Q5l. Unique local identity								
Major strength	32.9%	44.9%	37.8%	37.8%	29.0%	32.9%	36.8%	33.5%
Strength	40.0%	42.0%	37.8%	41.0%	42.0%	41.4%	40.4%	41.4%
Neutral	24.3%	13.0%	20.7%	18.1%	25.5%	22.2%	21.6%	22.0%
Weakness	2.9%	0.0%	3.6%	2.8%	3.3%	3.3%	1.2%	2.9%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5m. Opportunities for community involvement								
Major strength	10.0%	13.0%	23.4%	21.3%	18.2%	19.0%	17.5%	19.0%
Strength	51.4%	58.0%	36.0%	49.4%	45.3%	46.0%	48.5%	46.5%
Neutral	34.3%	29.0%	32.4%	23.7%	28.6%	28.0%	30.4%	28.0%
Weakness	4.3%	0.0%	8.1%	4.4%	7.0%	6.1%	3.5%	5.7%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Q5n. Attention to environmental issues								
Major strength	7.1%	10.3%	8.1%	14.8%	9.3%	10.1%	11.8%	10.5%
Strength	31.4%	41.2%	36.0%	35.2%	37.0%	37.0%	34.7%	36.4%
Neutral	51.4%	38.2%	38.7%	36.9%	38.0%	38.7%	40.0%	38.7%
Weakness	8.6%	7.4%	17.1%	11.5%	12.0%	11.9%	10.6%	11.8%
Major weakness	1.4%	2.9%	0.0%	1.6%	3.7%	2.4%	2.9%	2.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5o. Downtown								
Major strength	44.3%	49.3%	50.5%	53.8%	43.9%	47.9%	45.6%	47.7%
Strength	44.3%	43.5%	31.5%	37.8%	33.1%	34.0%	42.1%	35.1%
Neutral	8.6%	5.8%	12.6%	7.2%	14.1%	11.9%	8.8%	11.5%
Weakness	2.9%	1.4%	5.4%	0.8%	6.6%	4.8%	2.9%	4.5%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	2.3%	1.4%	0.6%	1.3%
Q5p. Population growth								
Major strength	1.4%	5.9%	2.7%	4.4%	4.5%	3.6%	5.9%	4.1%
Strength	18.8%	26.5%	16.4%	23.4%	23.2%	22.6%	22.9%	22.7%
Neutral	71.0%	57.4%	61.8%	54.8%	55.6%	56.6%	60.0%	57.1%
Weakness	7.2%	7.4%	12.7%	13.3%	12.6%	13.2%	6.5%	12.0%
Major weakness	1.4%	2.9%	6.4%	4.0%	4.1%	4.0%	4.7%	4.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5q. Presence of family farms								
Major strength	7.1%	15.9%	12.6%	8.9%	10.6%	10.4%	11.1%	10.5%
Strength	24.3%	34.8%	36.9%	36.7%	32.3%	33.8%	32.7%	33.6%
Neutral	62.9%	39.1%	35.1%	41.1%	36.6%	39.1%	41.5%	39.5%
Weakness	5.7%	7.2%	11.7%	8.9%	16.2%	12.9%	11.1%	12.6%
Major weakness	0.0%	2.9%	3.6%	4.4%	4.3%	3.8%	3.5%	3.8%
Q5r. Quality of life								
Major strength	21.4%	34.8%	21.6%	30.1%	29.5%	30.0%	22.2%	28.7%
Strength	48.6%	53.6%	64.9%	55.8%	50.0%	52.6%	57.3%	53.3%
Neutral	24.3%	10.1%	8.1%	12.0%	16.4%	13.9%	17.0%	14.5%
Weakness	5.7%	1.4%	3.6%	1.6%	2.9%	2.9%	2.3%	2.7%
Major weakness	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.4%	1.2%	0.7%	1.2%	0.9%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q5. Using a scale of "5 to "1" where "5" is a Major Strength and "1" is a Major Weakness, please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County. (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q5s. Existing roadway network								
Major strength	2.9%	4.3%	5.5%	3.2%	7.9%	6.2%	4.7%	5.8%
Strength	20.0%	27.5%	30.9%	29.1%	30.3%	30.3%	25.1%	29.6%
Neutral	48.6%	33.3%	29.1%	31.2%	30.1%	29.7%	40.9%	31.6%
Weakness	20.0%	29.0%	25.5%	27.5%	22.0%	24.5%	21.1%	24.0%
Major weakness	8.6%	5.8%	9.1%	8.9%	9.7%	9.2%	8.2%	9.0%
Q5t. Other								
Major strength	11.1%	33.3%	16.7%	13.6%	11.8%	9.0%	28.6%	14.0%
Strength	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	3.9%	6.4%	0.0%	5.0%
Neutral	44.4%	16.7%	25.0%	0.0%	5.9%	10.3%	14.3%	11.0%
Weakness	0.0%	16.7%	25.0%	9.1%	17.6%	16.7%	9.5%	15.0%
Major weakness	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	68.2%	60.8%	57.7%	47.6%	55.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. Most Important								
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	8.5%	4.3%	11.7%	8.3%	7.2%	8.0%	7.4%	7.9%
Availability of retail choices	5.6%	1.4%	0.0%	1.2%	1.7%	1.5%	2.3%	1.7%
Existing sidewalk network	0.0%	1.4%	0.9%	1.2%	0.6%	0.7%	1.1%	0.8%
Protection of natural resources	4.2%	1.4%	5.4%	3.9%	2.7%	3.4%	2.9%	3.3%
Public transportation	4.2%	1.4%	1.8%	2.8%	1.9%	1.6%	5.1%	2.2%
Character of neighborhoods	1.4%	1.4%	2.7%	0.8%	2.1%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%
Availability of housing choices	2.8%	0.0%	2.7%	3.5%	4.0%	2.9%	5.7%	3.3%
Availability of parks and open space	7.0%	4.3%	2.7%	1.6%	1.5%	1.6%	5.1%	2.2%
Employment opportunities	7.0%	10.1%	8.1%	12.2%	10.6%	10.3%	11.4%	10.4%
Historic buildings and areas	1.4%	4.3%	0.9%	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%	1.7%	1.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)								
Rate of growth	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	2.0%	0.6%	1.3%	0.0%	1.1%
Unique local identity	11.3%	18.8%	13.5%	13.4%	10.4%	12.1%	11.4%	12.1%
Opportunities for community involvement	2.8%	2.9%	2.7%	0.8%	1.3%	1.4%	2.3%	1.5%
Attention to environmental issues	2.8%	1.4%	3.6%	0.4%	1.5%	1.2%	2.9%	1.5%
Downtown	11.3%	10.1%	18.0%	17.3%	13.3%	15.4%	9.7%	14.2%
Population growth	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
Presence of family farms	1.4%	1.4%	1.8%	2.0%	2.3%	2.2%	0.6%	2.0%
Quality of life	8.5%	8.7%	8.1%	6.7%	14.6%	12.3%	5.1%	11.2%
Existing roadway network	5.6%	10.1%	4.5%	3.1%	4.0%	4.1%	5.7%	4.4%
Other	1.4%	1.4%	0.9%	2.0%	2.5%	1.6%	4.0%	2.0%
No response	12.7%	10.1%	9.9%	15.7%	15.7%	14.8%	13.7%	14.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. 2nd Important								
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	7.0%	5.8%	5.4%	4.7%	6.1%	6.1%	4.0%	5.8%
Availability of retail choices	1.4%	2.9%	4.5%	1.6%	3.0%	2.8%	1.7%	2.7%
Existing sidewalk network	1.4%	4.3%	3.6%	1.6%	0.9%	1.6%	1.7%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	2.8%	4.3%	1.8%	2.0%	2.5%	1.9%	4.0%	2.4%
Public transportation	1.4%	4.3%	1.8%	2.8%	2.5%	2.6%	2.3%	2.5%
Character of neighborhoods	7.0%	2.9%	4.5%	4.3%	2.5%	3.4%	4.0%	3.4%
Availability of housing choices	8.5%	0.0%	4.5%	5.1%	3.8%	3.2%	9.7%	4.3%
Availability of parks and open space	2.8%	4.3%	3.6%	4.7%	3.2%	3.6%	4.0%	3.7%
Employment opportunities	4.2%	13.0%	7.2%	5.9%	9.3%	7.9%	9.7%	8.1%
Historic buildings and areas	2.8%	2.9%	5.4%	2.4%	3.8%	3.3%	4.6%	3.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. 2nd Important (Cont.)								
Rate of growth	4.2%	0.0%	0.9%	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%	1.1%	1.4%
Unique local identity	5.6%	7.2%	10.8%	9.8%	7.2%	8.7%	5.7%	8.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	4.2%	7.2%	5.4%	2.4%	3.2%	3.5%	4.6%	3.6%
Attention to environmental issues	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	2.3%	1.6%	2.3%	1.7%
Downtown	14.1%	15.9%	17.1%	15.0%	13.3%	14.4%	14.3%	14.4%
Population growth	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
Presence of family farms	1.4%	1.4%	3.6%	2.0%	3.0%	2.7%	2.3%	2.6%
Quality of life	11.3%	8.7%	6.3%	10.6%	10.8%	10.7%	7.4%	10.1%
Existing roadway network	4.2%	1.4%	2.7%	2.0%	1.7%	2.1%	1.1%	2.0%
Other	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.5%
No response	14.1%	10.1%	10.8%	18.5%	18.0%	16.8%	14.9%	16.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. 3rd Important								
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	2.8%	10.1%	7.2%	13.0%	8.7%	9.6%	7.4%	9.4%
Availability of retail choices	2.8%	4.3%	4.5%	4.7%	3.6%	3.9%	4.6%	3.9%
Existing sidewalk network	2.8%	0.0%	1.8%	1.2%	2.3%	1.9%	1.1%	1.8%
Protection of natural resources	2.8%	4.3%	0.9%	1.2%	2.3%	1.8%	3.4%	2.1%
Public transportation	5.6%	4.3%	1.8%	1.2%	3.0%	2.2%	5.1%	2.7%
Character of neighborhoods	4.2%	5.8%	1.8%	1.2%	2.5%	2.6%	1.7%	2.5%
Availability of housing choices	4.2%	2.9%	5.4%	2.8%	3.4%	2.7%	7.4%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	14.1%	1.4%	8.1%	2.0%	5.3%	4.9%	6.3%	5.2%
Employment opportunities	5.6%	7.2%	2.7%	3.5%	3.4%	3.2%	6.3%	3.7%
Historic buildings and areas	4.2%	0.0%	6.3%	3.1%	3.4%	3.8%	2.3%	3.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. 3rd Important (Cont.)								
Rate of growth	0.0%	1.4%	7.2%	3.1%	1.3%	2.2%	2.9%	2.3%
Unique local identity	4.2%	7.2%	10.8%	5.9%	7.2%	7.4%	5.7%	7.0%
Opportunities for community involvement	2.8%	2.9%	3.6%	3.9%	3.8%	3.9%	2.9%	3.7%
Attention to environmental issues	0.0%	7.2%	4.5%	3.5%	2.1%	3.1%	1.7%	3.0%
Downtown	15.5%	11.6%	7.2%	9.4%	9.1%	8.9%	13.7%	9.6%
Population growth	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	2.0%	1.1%	1.6%	0.0%	1.3%
Presence of family farms	2.8%	5.8%	2.7%	1.6%	3.8%	3.5%	1.7%	3.2%
Quality of life	5.6%	8.7%	8.1%	13.4%	8.5%	10.0%	7.4%	9.6%
Existing roadway network	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	3.1%	3.4%	3.3%	0.6%	2.8%
Other	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	1.1%	0.5%
No response	18.3%	11.6%	11.7%	20.1%	21.0%	19.2%	16.6%	18.9%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. 4th Important								
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	7.0%	4.3%	7.2%	8.3%	9.1%	8.1%	9.7%	8.2%
Availability of retail choices	5.6%	1.4%	4.5%	3.9%	3.8%	3.9%	4.0%	3.8%
Existing sidewalk network	2.8%	1.4%	1.8%	2.0%	1.1%	1.8%	0.6%	1.6%
Protection of natural resources	5.6%	0.0%	1.8%	0.8%	2.3%	2.0%	1.7%	1.9%
Public transportation	1.4%	1.4%	1.8%	3.5%	2.1%	2.1%	3.4%	2.3%
Character of neighborhoods	2.8%	1.4%	5.4%	2.8%	3.4%	3.5%	2.3%	3.3%
Availability of housing choices	4.2%	5.8%	0.9%	2.8%	4.0%	3.5%	3.4%	3.4%
Availability of parks and open space	2.8%	2.9%	3.6%	6.7%	6.1%	5.6%	5.1%	5.7%
Employment opportunities	7.0%	1.4%	1.8%	2.4%	1.5%	1.9%	2.9%	2.1%
Historic buildings and areas	0.0%	5.8%	4.5%	2.4%	4.4%	3.8%	3.4%	3.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. 4th Important (Cont.)								
Rate of growth	0.0%	2.9%	2.7%	3.1%	2.5%	2.1%	4.6%	2.5%
Unique local identity	7.0%	4.3%	6.3%	5.5%	4.9%	5.4%	5.1%	5.5%
Opportunities for community involvement	1.4%	4.3%	6.3%	4.3%	4.0%	4.2%	4.0%	4.1%
Attention to environmental issues	2.8%	4.3%	3.6%	1.6%	2.8%	2.7%	2.9%	2.8%
Downtown	9.9%	10.1%	9.0%	6.3%	6.1%	7.3%	5.7%	7.0%
Population growth	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	2.4%	1.1%	1.4%	1.7%	1.4%
Presence of family farms	2.8%	4.3%	2.7%	3.5%	3.4%	3.1%	3.4%	3.3%
Quality of life	14.1%	18.8%	14.4%	9.4%	9.8%	10.4%	14.9%	11.0%
Existing roadway network	1.4%	4.3%	0.0%	3.1%	2.7%	2.9%	0.6%	2.6%
Other	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	2.0%	0.2%	0.9%	0.6%	0.9%
No response	21.1%	17.4%	18.0%	23.2%	24.8%	23.4%	20.0%	22.8%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. Most Important								
Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	25.4%	24.6%	31.5%	34.3%	31.1%	31.8%	28.6%	31.4%
Availability of retail choices	15.5%	10.1%	13.5%	11.4%	12.1%	12.1%	12.6%	12.1%
Existing sidewalk network	7.0%	7.2%	8.1%	5.9%	4.9%	6.0%	4.6%	5.8%
Protection of natural resources	15.5%	10.1%	9.9%	7.9%	9.7%	9.0%	12.0%	9.8%
Public transportation	12.7%	11.6%	7.2%	10.2%	9.5%	8.6%	16.0%	9.7%
Character of neighborhoods	15.5%	11.6%	14.4%	9.1%	10.4%	11.3%	9.7%	10.9%
Availability of housing choices	19.7%	8.7%	13.5%	14.2%	15.2%	12.3%	26.3%	14.5%
Availability of parks and open space	26.8%	13.0%	18.0%	15.0%	16.1%	15.8%	20.6%	16.8%
Employment opportunities	23.9%	31.9%	19.8%	24.0%	24.8%	23.2%	30.3%	24.4%
Historic buildings and areas	8.5%	13.0%	17.1%	9.1%	12.9%	12.2%	12.0%	12.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Top Four)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q6. Most Important (Cont.)								
Rate of growth	4.2%	8.7%	10.8%	9.4%	5.9%	7.2%	8.6%	7.4%
Unique local identity	28.2%	37.7%	41.4%	34.6%	29.7%	33.6%	28.0%	32.7%
Opportunities for community involvement	11.3%	17.4%	18.0%	11.4%	12.3%	13.0%	13.7%	13.0%
Attention to environmental issues	5.6%	13.0%	11.7%	7.9%	8.7%	8.6%	9.7%	9.0%
Downtown	50.7%	47.8%	51.4%	48.0%	41.7%	46.0%	43.4%	45.2%
Population growth	1.4%	4.3%	3.6%	5.1%	3.6%	4.2%	2.3%	3.8%
Presence of family farms	8.5%	13.0%	10.8%	9.1%	12.5%	11.5%	8.0%	11.1%
Quality of life	39.4%	44.9%	36.9%	40.2%	43.8%	43.4%	34.9%	41.9%
Existing roadway network	11.3%	17.4%	9.0%	11.4%	11.7%	12.4%	8.0%	11.8%
Other	2.8%	4.3%	2.7%	4.3%	4.0%	3.5%	5.7%	3.8%
No response	12.7%	10.1%	9.9%	15.7%	15.7%	14.8%	13.7%	14.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q7a. Ease of travel by car on highways								
Very satisfied	25.4%	17.6%	20.9%	25.6%	21.5%	21.8%	26.0%	22.5%
Satisfied	60.6%	55.9%	54.5%	50.0%	54.5%	55.2%	47.3%	53.9%
Neutral	5.6%	13.2%	10.9%	12.4%	10.1%	10.0%	13.6%	10.6%
Dissatisfied	4.2%	10.3%	11.8%	7.2%	9.9%	8.9%	10.1%	9.0%
Very dissatisfied	4.2%	2.9%	1.8%	4.8%	4.1%	4.2%	3.0%	4.0%
Q7b. Ease of travel by car on major streets								
Very satisfied	18.3%	7.2%	9.9%	12.0%	10.3%	11.1%	11.1%	10.9%
Satisfied	35.2%	34.8%	46.8%	28.9%	36.2%	35.9%	33.3%	35.8%
Neutral	22.5%	23.2%	13.5%	18.9%	16.7%	16.8%	22.2%	17.7%
Dissatisfied	11.3%	29.0%	21.6%	27.7%	27.0%	26.4%	21.1%	25.4%
Very dissatisfied	12.7%	5.8%	8.1%	12.4%	9.8%	9.8%	12.3%	10.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q7c. Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets								
Very satisfied	9.9%	4.3%	12.6%	11.6%	9.6%	10.4%	8.8%	10.1%
Satisfied	49.3%	47.8%	49.5%	51.0%	48.2%	50.0%	45.0%	49.3%
Neutral	29.6%	26.1%	19.8%	20.5%	25.0%	22.7%	27.5%	23.6%
Dissatisfied	7.0%	18.8%	15.3%	12.4%	12.9%	12.8%	14.0%	12.9%
Very dissatisfied	4.2%	2.9%	2.7%	4.4%	4.4%	4.0%	4.7%	4.2%
Q7d. Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods								
Very satisfied	12.9%	10.1%	12.8%	12.5%	10.6%	11.8%	9.9%	11.4%
Satisfied	47.1%	40.6%	48.6%	52.4%	45.9%	48.4%	43.3%	47.4%
Neutral	30.0%	27.5%	22.9%	20.6%	24.5%	23.5%	25.1%	24.0%
Dissatisfied	7.1%	17.4%	13.8%	9.3%	13.1%	11.3%	15.8%	12.2%
Very dissatisfied	2.9%	4.3%	1.8%	5.2%	6.0%	4.9%	5.8%	5.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q7e. Ease of walking in City of Lawrence								
Very satisfied	20.0%	11.8%	18.9%	14.5%	14.3%	14.8%	17.5%	15.1%
Satisfied	44.3%	52.9%	49.1%	53.7%	43.4%	46.9%	49.7%	47.4%
Neutral	20.0%	22.1%	20.8%	16.9%	26.3%	23.5%	18.7%	22.5%
Dissatisfied	14.3%	11.8%	9.4%	13.2%	13.4%	12.8%	12.3%	12.7%
Very dissatisfied	1.4%	1.5%	1.9%	1.7%	2.6%	2.1%	1.8%	2.2%
Q7f. Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence								
Very satisfied	5.5%	3.4%	5.6%	7.2%	7.7%	6.9%	6.7%	6.8%
Satisfied	32.7%	29.3%	30.3%	33.9%	24.5%	28.4%	29.3%	28.4%
Neutral	34.5%	32.8%	37.1%	31.2%	39.0%	36.4%	35.3%	36.2%
Dissatisfied	20.0%	27.6%	18.0%	21.7%	22.5%	21.8%	22.0%	22.0%
Very dissatisfied	7.3%	6.9%	9.0%	5.9%	6.3%	6.6%	6.7%	6.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q7g. Safety of walking in City of Lawrence								
Very satisfied	16.9%	9.0%	13.2%	13.3%	9.5%	11.3%	11.8%	11.2%
Satisfied	36.6%	44.8%	44.3%	44.8%	41.7%	42.6%	44.1%	42.9%
Neutral	25.4%	34.3%	20.8%	21.6%	26.7%	25.6%	24.1%	25.1%
Dissatisfied	18.3%	9.0%	17.9%	16.2%	17.6%	16.5%	15.9%	16.6%
Very dissatisfied	2.8%	3.0%	3.8%	4.1%	4.5%	3.9%	4.1%	4.2%
Q7h. Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence								
Very satisfied	5.2%	3.4%	5.6%	5.9%	5.8%	5.6%	5.3%	5.5%
Satisfied	27.6%	18.6%	14.6%	22.8%	18.2%	19.9%	19.7%	19.6%
Neutral	29.3%	28.8%	42.7%	32.9%	35.6%	35.8%	30.3%	34.8%
Dissatisfied	27.6%	33.9%	28.1%	29.7%	30.2%	28.7%	35.5%	29.9%
Very dissatisfied	10.3%	15.3%	9.0%	8.7%	10.2%	10.0%	9.2%	10.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q7i. Existing bicycle system throughout County								
Very satisfied	3.8%	5.2%	7.6%	5.2%	5.6%	5.9%	4.2%	5.5%
Satisfied	17.0%	12.1%	13.9%	23.3%	17.5%	18.0%	18.3%	18.5%
Neutral	50.9%	44.8%	46.8%	40.0%	40.3%	41.4%	45.8%	41.5%
Dissatisfied	18.9%	34.5%	21.5%	24.3%	24.9%	24.5%	25.4%	24.6%
Very dissatisfied	9.4%	3.4%	10.1%	7.1%	11.7%	10.2%	6.3%	9.9%
Q7j. Existing walking and hiking system throughout County								
Very satisfied	1.6%	6.7%	9.6%	7.0%	5.5%	6.0%	6.8%	6.0%
Satisfied	31.1%	30.0%	28.7%	40.2%	28.9%	32.4%	31.1%	32.0%
Neutral	49.2%	48.3%	40.4%	28.5%	41.9%	38.4%	44.6%	39.2%
Dissatisfied	11.5%	10.0%	18.1%	20.6%	17.3%	17.6%	14.9%	17.5%
Very dissatisfied	6.6%	5.0%	3.2%	3.7%	6.4%	5.7%	2.7%	5.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q7k. Existing road system in County								
Very satisfied	9.2%	1.5%	7.6%	6.9%	7.9%	7.3%	7.5%	7.3%
Satisfied	35.4%	40.9%	36.2%	45.7%	44.7%	44.9%	34.6%	43.5%
Neutral	40.0%	43.9%	37.1%	36.6%	35.8%	35.5%	43.4%	36.6%
Dissatisfied	15.4%	9.1%	14.3%	8.6%	8.9%	9.4%	12.6%	9.9%
Very dissatisfied	0.0%	4.5%	4.8%	2.2%	2.6%	2.9%	1.9%	2.7%
Q7l. Quality of public transportation (bus service)								
Very satisfied	6.0%	3.4%	6.0%	7.4%	7.6%	6.5%	9.5%	7.0%
Satisfied	36.0%	25.9%	31.0%	29.6%	29.3%	27.7%	37.8%	29.8%
Neutral	46.0%	51.7%	44.0%	42.9%	45.1%	47.3%	33.8%	45.0%
Dissatisfied	10.0%	15.5%	16.7%	12.8%	12.1%	12.8%	13.5%	12.8%
Very dissatisfied	2.0%	3.4%	2.4%	7.4%	5.9%	5.6%	5.4%	5.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q7m. Other								
Very satisfied	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	8.3%	9.5%	5.6%	20.0%	8.5%
Satisfied	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	3.7%	0.0%	4.2%
Neutral	33.3%	20.0%	20.0%	8.3%	4.8%	7.4%	20.0%	9.9%
Dissatisfied	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	8.3%	16.7%	16.7%	13.3%	16.9%
Very dissatisfied	66.7%	20.0%	20.0%	75.0%	66.7%	66.7%	46.7%	60.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q8. Most Important								
Ease of travel by car on highways	11.3%	7.2%	9.9%	5.1%	8.9%	8.5%	6.9%	8.0%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	25.4%	30.4%	23.4%	29.9%	25.6%	27.0%	25.1%	26.6%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	1.4%	2.9%	7.2%	3.5%	3.4%	3.5%	4.6%	3.6%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	2.8%	4.3%	1.8%	2.0%	2.3%	2.5%	1.7%	2.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	7.0%	4.3%	7.2%	6.3%	5.9%	5.8%	7.4%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	5.6%	10.1%	9.0%	6.3%	4.4%	5.8%	5.7%	5.9%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	4.2%	4.3%	5.4%	4.7%	6.6%	5.8%	6.3%	5.7%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	7.0%	11.6%	4.5%	7.1%	7.0%	6.9%	6.9%	7.0%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	4.2%	2.9%	3.6%	2.8%	1.1%	2.6%	0.0%	2.3%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)								
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	5.6%	0.0%	2.7%	1.6%	2.5%	2.1%	3.4%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	4.2%	2.9%	6.3%	2.4%	4.0%	4.2%	1.7%	3.7%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	7.0%	10.1%	3.6%	10.6%	10.2%	8.7%	13.1%	9.4%
Other	1.4%	1.4%	0.9%	2.8%	3.2%	2.7%	2.3%	2.6%
No response	12.7%	7.2%	14.4%	15.0%	15.0%	14.1%	14.9%	14.3%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q8. 2nd Important								
Ease of travel by car on highways	4.2%	5.8%	6.3%	6.7%	4.9%	6.0%	3.4%	5.5%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	11.3%	11.6%	15.3%	11.8%	12.5%	13.4%	8.6%	12.5%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	12.7%	10.1%	6.3%	7.5%	8.0%	7.6%	11.4%	8.2%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	1.4%	8.7%	1.8%	5.9%	5.3%	5.4%	3.4%	5.1%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	5.6%	7.2%	8.1%	6.3%	5.5%	5.8%	7.4%	6.0%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	5.6%	2.9%	4.5%	9.1%	7.0%	7.3%	4.6%	6.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	11.3%	10.1%	9.9%	7.5%	11.4%	10.0%	10.3%	10.1%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	12.7%	15.9%	11.7%	11.0%	10.2%	10.2%	16.6%	11.1%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	2.8%	1.4%	3.6%	3.1%	4.4%	3.9%	2.9%	3.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q8. 2nd Important (Cont.)								
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	5.6%	1.4%	4.5%	3.5%	0.9%	2.2%	2.3%	2.4%
Existing road system in County	2.8%	5.8%	3.6%	3.1%	4.4%	4.2%	2.9%	4.0%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	7.0%	7.2%	7.2%	2.8%	3.6%	3.6%	7.4%	4.2%
Other	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
No response	15.5%	10.1%	17.1%	20.9%	21.6%	19.8%	18.3%	19.8%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q8. 3rd Important								
Ease of travel by car on highways	2.8%	0.0%	1.8%	3.9%	2.8%	2.8%	2.3%	2.8%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	2.8%	11.6%	5.4%	5.5%	4.7%	5.8%	3.4%	5.3%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	9.9%	4.3%	10.8%	5.5%	6.4%	6.9%	6.3%	6.7%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	7.0%	8.7%	3.6%	5.9%	8.3%	7.0%	8.0%	7.4%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	11.3%	5.8%	7.2%	7.5%	6.8%	7.7%	4.6%	7.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	7.0%	7.2%	2.7%	7.9%	5.1%	5.2%	9.7%	5.8%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	4.2%	8.7%	9.9%	8.3%	6.8%	7.5%	7.4%	7.4%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	7.0%	8.7%	9.0%	7.9%	9.3%	8.6%	9.7%	8.6%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	8.5%	5.8%	6.3%	2.8%	4.9%	4.7%	5.7%	5.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q8. 3rd Important (Cont.)								
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	5.6%	7.2%	7.2%	5.5%	6.6%	6.3%	6.3%	6.4%
Existing road system in County	4.2%	8.7%	5.4%	3.5%	5.3%	5.2%	4.6%	5.2%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	11.3%	7.2%	9.9%	9.1%	4.4%	6.3%	8.6%	6.8%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
No response	18.3%	15.9%	20.7%	26.8%	27.3%	25.4%	22.9%	25.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q8. Most Important								
Ease of travel by car on highways	18.3%	13.0%	18.0%	15.7%	16.7%	17.3%	12.6%	16.3%
Ease of travel by car on major streets	39.4%	53.6%	44.1%	47.2%	42.8%	46.1%	37.1%	44.4%
Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	23.9%	17.4%	24.3%	16.5%	17.8%	18.1%	22.3%	18.5%
Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	11.3%	21.7%	7.2%	13.8%	15.9%	14.9%	13.1%	14.8%
Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	23.9%	17.4%	22.5%	20.1%	18.2%	19.2%	19.4%	19.2%
Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	18.3%	20.3%	16.2%	23.2%	16.5%	18.2%	20.0%	18.5%
Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	19.7%	23.2%	25.2%	20.5%	24.8%	23.2%	24.0%	23.2%
Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	26.8%	36.2%	25.2%	26.0%	26.5%	25.7%	33.1%	26.7%
Existing bicycle system throughout County	15.5%	10.1%	13.5%	8.7%	10.4%	11.2%	8.6%	10.9%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? (Totp Three)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q8. Most Important (Cont.)								
Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	16.9%	8.7%	14.4%	10.6%	10.0%	10.7%	12.0%	11.2%
Existing road system in County	11.3%	17.4%	15.3%	9.1%	13.6%	13.6%	9.1%	12.9%
Quality of public transportation (bus service)	25.4%	24.6%	20.7%	22.4%	18.2%	18.7%	29.1%	20.4%
Other	2.8%	2.9%	0.9%	3.5%	4.7%	3.9%	3.4%	3.7%
No response	12.7%	7.2%	14.4%	15.0%	15.0%	14.1%	14.9%	14.3%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q9. How satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?								
Very satisfied	5.6%	7.2%	7.2%	4.7%	5.5%	5.5%	6.3%	5.6%
Satisfied	35.2%	21.7%	30.6%	24.8%	23.7%	25.4%	26.9%	25.6%
Neutral	26.8%	31.9%	19.8%	31.1%	30.9%	30.8%	22.3%	29.5%
Dissatisfied	8.5%	8.7%	11.7%	10.6%	14.0%	12.6%	10.3%	12.0%
Very dissatisfied	2.8%	5.8%	4.5%	7.1%	4.5%	4.8%	5.7%	5.3%
Don't know	21.1%	24.6%	26.1%	21.7%	21.4%	21.0%	28.6%	21.9%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q11. How satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?								
Very satisfied	0.0%	4.3%	4.5%	2.8%	2.7%	2.3%	5.7%	2.9%
Satisfied	38.0%	31.9%	28.8%	28.7%	27.8%	28.8%	31.4%	29.2%
Neutral	29.6%	36.2%	37.8%	39.4%	33.1%	35.3%	34.9%	35.1%
Dissatisfied	5.6%	13.0%	14.4%	9.4%	17.8%	15.6%	6.9%	14.2%
Very dissatisfied	5.6%	2.9%	2.7%	3.1%	5.1%	4.2%	3.4%	4.2%
Don't know	21.1%	11.6%	11.7%	16.5%	13.4%	13.7%	17.7%	14.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q13. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?								
Very satisfied	0.0%	1.4%	4.5%	2.0%	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%	2.2%
Satisfied	21.1%	13.0%	19.8%	16.5%	21.4%	19.6%	20.0%	19.3%
Neutral	26.8%	36.2%	35.1%	39.4%	41.1%	40.0%	33.1%	38.3%
Dissatisfied	0.0%	1.4%	10.8%	5.1%	6.1%	6.1%	3.4%	5.5%
Very dissatisfied	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	1.6%	1.5%	1.4%	1.1%	1.5%
Don't know	52.1%	46.4%	27.9%	35.4%	27.7%	30.6%	40.0%	33.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q15a. The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area.								
Strongly agree	28.6%	30.9%	27.9%	33.5%	34.2%	34.1%	24.3%	32.7%
Agree	40.0%	41.2%	36.9%	34.7%	34.4%	35.6%	35.8%	35.6%
Neutral	18.6%	17.6%	18.9%	20.3%	16.4%	17.1%	23.1%	18.0%
Disagree	8.6%	8.8%	9.0%	8.4%	11.0%	9.3%	12.7%	9.8%
Strongly disagree	4.3%	1.5%	7.2%	3.2%	3.9%	3.9%	4.0%	3.9%
Q15b. Future retail development should primarily be located at the intersection of main streets.								
Strongly agree	7.1%	4.4%	6.4%	6.0%	6.1%	6.4%	4.7%	6.0%
Agree	32.9%	17.6%	22.9%	21.0%	19.8%	21.6%	18.6%	21.2%
Neutral	30.0%	42.6%	33.9%	47.2%	44.6%	43.3%	42.4%	43.1%
Disagree	22.9%	32.4%	33.9%	23.4%	25.5%	25.5%	29.1%	26.1%
Strongly disagree	7.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.4%	3.9%	3.3%	5.2%	3.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q15. Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q15c. Future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods.								
Strongly agree	18.6%	4.4%	8.3%	10.3%	8.8%	9.1%	10.4%	9.5%
Agree	41.4%	38.2%	37.6%	37.3%	30.0%	32.1%	43.4%	34.0%
Neutral	20.0%	35.3%	31.2%	29.4%	36.8%	33.9%	29.5%	33.1%
Disagree	14.3%	20.6%	19.3%	19.4%	18.3%	19.8%	12.1%	18.5%
Strongly disagree	5.7%	1.5%	3.7%	3.6%	6.2%	5.0%	4.6%	4.9%
Q15d. Available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings.								
Strongly agree	54.3%	61.8%	53.2%	55.5%	55.6%	55.0%	58.1%	55.6%
Agree	32.9%	26.5%	22.0%	25.6%	25.1%	25.9%	24.4%	25.6%
Neutral	8.6%	8.8%	11.9%	9.4%	10.3%	9.5%	12.2%	10.0%
Disagree	2.9%	1.5%	10.1%	6.3%	6.5%	6.7%	4.1%	6.2%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	1.5%	2.8%	3.1%	2.5%	2.8%	1.2%	2.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q16a. I would like to see agricultural uses maintained in the County.								
Strongly agree	41.4%	47.8%	40.9%	38.2%	47.6%	42.6%	49.4%	44.2%
Agree	25.7%	36.2%	38.2%	44.6%	32.4%	37.6%	28.8%	35.8%
Neutral	27.1%	11.6%	18.2%	13.5%	17.5%	16.8%	17.6%	16.8%
Disagree	4.3%	4.3%	2.7%	3.2%	1.9%	2.5%	3.5%	2.6%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%
Q16b. I would like to see major development directed inside the City limits.								
Strongly agree	20.0%	26.1%	20.9%	14.9%	22.5%	21.1%	16.6%	20.6%
Agree	37.1%	30.4%	35.5%	42.6%	35.5%	37.0%	36.7%	37.0%
Neutral	35.7%	30.4%	33.6%	32.9%	29.7%	30.9%	34.9%	31.4%
Disagree	4.3%	11.6%	7.3%	8.8%	10.2%	9.0%	10.7%	9.2%
Strongly disagree	2.9%	1.4%	2.7%	0.8%	2.1%	2.0%	1.2%	1.9%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q16c. I would like to see more shopping opportunities in or near my neighborhood.								
Strongly agree	20.0%	11.6%	10.8%	14.7%	10.2%	11.5%	15.2%	12.1%
Agree	31.4%	26.1%	35.1%	24.2%	26.0%	26.3%	29.8%	26.9%
Neutral	34.3%	37.7%	25.2%	36.9%	39.1%	36.6%	36.3%	36.7%
Disagree	12.9%	21.7%	20.7%	18.7%	17.7%	19.0%	15.2%	18.3%
Strongly disagree	1.4%	2.9%	8.1%	5.6%	6.9%	6.6%	3.5%	6.1%
Q16d. I would like to see more employment centers located near my home.								
Strongly agree	12.9%	11.6%	12.6%	12.4%	10.6%	10.4%	16.4%	11.4%
Agree	27.1%	30.4%	20.7%	22.3%	22.2%	21.6%	29.8%	23.0%
Neutral	44.3%	36.2%	41.4%	42.6%	43.5%	43.1%	40.4%	42.7%
Disagree	12.9%	18.8%	18.9%	17.5%	16.4%	18.1%	10.5%	16.8%
Strongly disagree	2.9%	2.9%	6.3%	5.2%	7.3%	6.8%	2.9%	6.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q16e. I would like to see a modest increase in height of development if it means less expansion of the city out into the County.								
Strongly agree	18.6%	14.5%	18.2%	15.3%	15.1%	15.3%	18.2%	15.8%
Agree	28.6%	40.6%	40.0%	35.5%	37.8%	37.1%	35.9%	36.9%
Neutral	41.4%	26.1%	25.5%	30.2%	31.0%	30.3%	32.9%	30.6%
Disagree	8.6%	13.0%	15.5%	14.9%	11.2%	13.1%	10.0%	12.5%
Strongly disagree	2.9%	5.8%	0.9%	4.0%	4.8%	4.2%	2.9%	4.1%
Q16f. I would like to see Downtown accommodate more development.								
Strongly agree	17.1%	17.4%	14.5%	15.1%	12.6%	14.4%	12.3%	14.0%
Agree	32.9%	34.8%	35.5%	35.9%	31.7%	33.6%	32.7%	33.4%
Neutral	38.6%	36.2%	25.5%	26.3%	34.8%	31.4%	35.1%	32.2%
Disagree	7.1%	7.2%	20.9%	18.7%	14.5%	15.2%	15.2%	15.2%
Strongly disagree	4.3%	4.3%	3.6%	4.0%	6.4%	5.4%	4.7%	5.2%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q16. Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from "1" to "5", where "1" means "Strongly AGREE" and "5" means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following: (Without "Don't Know")

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q16g. I would like to see development that includes a better mix of uses in order to live, work, and play in close proximity.								
Strongly agree	27.1%	40.6%	28.8%	29.8%	28.0%	27.4%	38.4%	29.3%
Agree	44.3%	37.7%	39.6%	42.1%	44.2%	43.9%	37.2%	42.8%
Neutral	24.3%	17.4%	26.1%	22.2%	22.8%	23.0%	21.5%	22.8%
Disagree	1.4%	4.3%	3.6%	4.4%	2.7%	3.3%	2.3%	3.2%
Strongly disagree	2.9%	0.0%	1.8%	1.6%	2.3%	2.3%	0.6%	2.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q17. From the following list, please check ALL the reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County. (Check all that apply)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q17a. The reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County.								
Not enough time	50.7%	58.0%	45.9%	53.5%	38.3%	44.1%	50.9%	44.6%
Difficult to travel to meetings	9.9%	10.1%	9.0%	9.1%	8.0%	7.9%	12.0%	8.5%
Not sure how to get involved	53.5%	49.3%	44.1%	35.0%	30.5%	33.2%	49.1%	35.6%
Don't believe I can make a difference	11.3%	31.9%	33.3%	32.3%	42.6%	37.4%	30.3%	35.8%
Don't have enough information	50.7%	49.3%	45.9%	39.8%	38.3%	38.6%	52.0%	40.7%
Other	4.2%	5.8%	9.9%	11.8%	14.6%	12.6%	9.7%	12.1%
None Chosen	2.8%	0.0%	2.7%	2.8%	4.7%	4.2%	0.6%	4.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?								
Very knowledgeable	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	2.4%	3.2%	2.8%	0.0%	2.3%
Somewhat knowledgeable	8.5%	4.3%	9.0%	23.6%	26.1%	22.3%	14.3%	20.8%
Not sure	7.0%	8.7%	12.6%	11.8%	15.0%	13.1%	12.0%	12.8%
Not knowledgeable	84.5%	87.0%	77.5%	61.4%	53.8%	60.4%	73.1%	62.0%
Don't Know	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.9%	1.3%	0.6%	2.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?								
0 - 2 years	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	23.7%	6.9%
3 - 5 years	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	19.7%	6.7%
6 - 10 years	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%	12.7%	10.7%
11 - 20 years	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	26.3%	16.8%	24.6%
21 years or more	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	55.8%	27.2%	51.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q21. What is your age?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q21. What is your age?								
Under 35 years	45.7%	49.3%	29.4%	14.6%	6.0%	9.5%	49.7%	16.3%
35 - 44 years	18.6%	17.4%	25.7%	33.9%	8.8%	18.5%	16.0%	18.1%
45 - 54 years	14.3%	14.5%	23.9%	28.0%	26.0%	26.4%	16.0%	24.6%
55 - 64 years	15.7%	11.6%	10.1%	14.6%	26.0%	21.4%	11.4%	19.8%
65 - 74 years	4.3%	5.8%	5.5%	6.3%	21.3%	16.1%	2.3%	13.7%
75+ years	1.4%	1.4%	5.5%	2.8%	11.9%	8.2%	4.6%	7.5%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q22. Do you own or rent your home?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q22. Do you own or rent your home?								
Own	41.4%	50.7%	80.2%	88.5%	91.0%	100.0%	0.0%	83.0%
Rent	58.6%	49.3%	19.8%	11.5%	9.0%	0.0%	100.0%	17.0%

Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q23. Which of the following best describes your home?								
Single family	55.7%	59.4%	80.2%	85.4%	89.1%	94.2%	28.6%	83.0%
Duplex/triplex	15.7%	15.9%	12.6%	7.5%	5.7%	3.7%	30.9%	8.3%
Apartment/condo	27.1%	24.6%	6.3%	6.3%	3.8%	1.4%	38.3%	7.7%
Mobile home	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%	1.3%	0.7%	2.3%	1.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q25. Would you say your total annual household income is:								
Under 25,000	19.1%	12.3%	10.7%	5.4%	8.0%	3.9%	29.5%	8.7%
$25,000 - $49,999	22.1%	33.8%	11.7%	13.8%	18.2%	13.8%	35.8%	17.8%
$50,000 - $74,999	20.6%	13.8%	17.5%	17.9%	19.6%	18.5%	19.7%	18.6%
$75,000 - $99,999	11.8%	15.4%	19.4%	19.2%	22.3%	22.3%	9.2%	20.0%
$100,000 - $149,999	16.2%	12.3%	23.3%	26.3%	20.4%	25.1%	4.6%	21.4%
$150,000 or more	10.3%	12.3%	17.5%	17.5%	11.5%	16.3%	1.2%	13.5%

Q26. Your gender:

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q26. Your gender:								
Male	50.0%	40.0%	59.6%	43.6%	49.1%	49.7%	42.4%	48.4%
Female	50.0%	60.0%	40.4%	56.4%	50.9%	50.3%	57.6%	51.6%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?								
Yes	7.1%	2.9%	7.3%	6.5%	2.7%	3.6%	8.6%	4.4%
No	92.9%	97.1%	92.7%	93.5%	97.3%	96.4%	91.4%	95.6%

Q28. Which of the following best describes your race? (Without "Not Provided)

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q28. Which of the following best describes your race?								
African American (Non-Hispanic)	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.4%	1.7%	0.9%	2.3%	1.2%
White (Non-Hispanic)	84.5%	85.5%	89.2%	91.3%	91.9%	91.9%	85.1%	90.4%
Native American	5.6%	1.4%	0.9%	2.8%	2.3%	1.9%	4.6%	2.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	8.5%	5.8%	3.6%	1.6%	0.4%	1.4%	4.6%	1.9%
Other	4.2%	4.3%	2.7%	3.1%	2.7%	2.3%	5.7%	3.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q29. What is your current employment status?

N=1046

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q29. What is your current employment status?								
Full time employment	61.4%	59.4%	72.5%	73.0%	55.2%	62.2%	62.4%	62.2%
Part time employment	8.6%	20.3%	7.3%	11.1%	10.3%	9.2%	17.3%	10.8%
Full-time student	5.7%	8.7%	0.0%	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	5.8%	1.3%
Full-time homemaker	7.1%	2.9%	1.8%	2.8%	2.7%	3.4%	0.6%	2.9%
Unemployed	7.1%	0.0%	3.7%	2.8%	2.5%	2.4%	5.2%	2.8%
Retired	10.0%	8.7%	14.7%	9.5%	29.1%	22.4%	8.7%	20.0%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q30. Where do you work?

N=756

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q30. Where do you work?								
City of Lawrence	61.2%	52.7%	52.9%	62.7%	66.1%	60.3%	68.8%	61.6%
Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence	0.0%	9.1%	5.7%	4.7%	10.5%	8.8%	2.2%	7.5%
KC Metro area	10.2%	5.5%	13.8%	15.1%	11.4%	13.4%	8.0%	12.7%
Topeka Metro area	16.3%	18.2%	14.9%	13.2%	7.6%	11.9%	9.4%	11.5%
Other	20.4%	18.2%	16.1%	9.9%	10.5%	12.3%	13.0%	12.4%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?								
Agriculture	0.0%	3.6%	2.3%	0.5%	3.5%	2.6%	0.7%	2.2%
Administrative or Support	2.0%	3.6%	6.9%	6.1%	6.7%	6.3%	5.1%	6.0%
Construction	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	2.4%	4.1%	3.3%	0.0%	2.6%
Manufacturing	6.1%	1.8%	3.4%	3.8%	5.0%	4.3%	4.3%	4.4%
Wholesale Trade	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%
Food, Hospitality, Entertainment	4.1%	5.5%	3.4%	2.4%	3.8%	1.8%	10.1%	3.4%
Retail	6.1%	9.1%	2.3%	2.8%	6.7%	4.6%	8.0%	5.3%
Health Services	10.2%	16.4%	16.1%	17.9%	10.5%	13.1%	16.7%	13.9%
Transportation and Warehousing	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	1.8%	1.5%	1.4%	1.5%
Finance, Insurance, or Real Estate	4.1%	1.8%	4.6%	8.5%	5.8%	6.8%	2.2%	6.0%
Professional Services	8.2%	3.6%	9.2%	9.4%	12.9%	11.3%	7.2%	10.3%
Scientific or Technical Services	8.2%	7.3%	13.8%	8.0%	5.0%	7.0%	8.7%	7.1%

Length of Residence and Whether Respondent Households Own or Rent their Home

Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do?

N=756

	Q19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?					Q22. Do you own or rent your home?		Total
	0 - 2 years	3 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 20 years	21 years or more	Own	Rent	
Q31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do? (Cont.)								
Educational Services (Pre-school-12th grade)	4.1%	7.3%	10.3%	8.5%	10.8%	9.8%	8.0%	9.4%
Educational Services (University/College)	30.6%	25.5%	13.8%	15.1%	9.9%	13.4%	18.1%	14.4%
Government	12.2%	3.6%	3.4%	5.7%	5.6%	6.1%	3.6%	5.7%
Armed Services	2.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%
Other	10.2%	18.2%	11.5%	11.3%	12.3%	12.4%	11.6%	12.3%

Section 10
Survey Instrument

City of Lawrence/Douglas County Comprehensive Plan Survey

The City of Lawrence and Douglas County would like your opinion regarding updating Horizon 2020, the comprehensive plan for the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County. This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete and your opinions are very important. YOUR RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL. When you are finished, please return your survey in the enclosed postage-paid, return-reply envelope. We greatly appreciate your time.

Do you live in the City of Lawrence or the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County?

____ (1) City of Lawrence [Please continue with the survey.]
____ (2) Unincorporated Area of Douglas County (Rural- Outside City Limits) [Please continue with the survey.]
____ (3) Neither [Please discontinue the survey. This survey is only for residents of the above areas.]

1. For each of the following issues in the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please rate whether you feel the issue is very important, somewhat important, not sure or not important by circling the number to the right of each issue:

	Issues	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Sure	Not Important
A.	Maintaining rural character	1	2	3	4
B.	Preserving historic buildings	1	2	3	4
C.	Revitalization of older city-center neighborhoods	1	2	3	4
D.	Development of the Clinton Lake Area	1	2	3	4
E.	Quality housing for all income groups	1	2	3	4
F.	Walking and biking trails	1	2	3	4
G.	Maintaining community identity	1	2	3	4
H.	Downtown stability	1	2	3	4
I.	Transportation alternatives to the car	1	2	3	4
J.	Availability of arts and cultural opportunities	1	2	3	4
K.	Appearance of multi-family residential developments	1	2	3	4
L.	Incorporating natural areas into development projects	1	2	3	4
M.	Creating employment opportunities	1	2	3	4
N.	Parks, recreation, open space	1	2	3	4
O.	Protecting high value farmland	1	2	3	4
P.	Appearance of commercial areas	1	2	3	4
Q.	Managing future growth	1	2	3	4
R.	Activities and housing for the Retirement Community	1	2	3	4
S.	Other: _____	1	2	3	4

2. Which FOUR of the issues from the list in Question #1 do you feel are most important to be addressed in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? [Using the letters above in Question #1, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th choices, or circle 'NONE'.]

1st: _____ 2nd: _____ 3rd: _____ 4th: _____ NONE

3. Community Vision. Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means "Strongly AGREE" and 5 means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

	The future should include the following:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A.	A stronger community identity	1	2	3	4	5
B.	More attractive city entrances	1	2	3	4	5
C.	More parks and open space	1	2	3	4	5
D.	More sidewalks, walking paths, and trails	1	2	3	4	5
E.	More bicycle paths and routes	1	2	3	4	5
F.	More restaurants, entertainment and cultural activities downtown	1	2	3	4	5
G.	More housing in and around downtown	1	2	3	4	5
H.	More affordable housing within the City	1	2	3	4	5
I.	More employment opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
J.	Better protection of natural resources	1	2	3	4	5
K.	Expanded public transportation	1	2	3	4	5
L.	More recreational opportunities around Clinton Lake	1	2	3	4	5
M.	More activities for teenagers	1	2	3	4	5
N.	More activities for seniors	1	2	3	4	5
O.	Improved access to local foods	1	2	3	4	5
P.	Better management of growth	1	2	3	4	5
Q.	Maintaining the rural character of the County	1	2	3	4	5
R.	New or expanded conference space	1	2	3	4	5
S.	Multi-use neighborhoods	1	2	3	4	5
T.	Riverfront development with a mix of uses, public-access and activities	1	2	3	4	5
U.	More arts and cultural opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
V.	Development of the communications network (fiber)	1	2	3	4	5
W.	Stronger retirement community	1	2	3	4	5
X.	Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5

4. Which FOUR of the statements from the list in Question #3 do you feel best represent YOUR VISION for the FUTURE of the City of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County? [Using the letters above in Question #3, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th choices, or circle 'NONE'.]

1st: _____ 2nd:_____ 3rd: _____ 4th: _____ NONE

5. Using a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 is a "Major Strength" and 1 is a "Major Weakness", please rate each of the following aspects of life in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County.

	How would you rate the following	Major Strength	Strength	Neutral	Weakness	Major Weakness
A.	Availability of arts, music and cultural amenities	5	4	3	2	1
B.	Availability of retail choices	5	4	3	2	1
C.	Existing sidewalk network	5	4	3	2	1
D.	Protection of natural resources	5	4	3	2	1
E.	Public transportation	5	4	3	2	1
F.	Character of neighborhoods	5	4	3	2	1
G.	Availability of housing choices	5	4	3	2	1
H.	Availability of parks and open space	5	4	3	2	1
I.	Employment opportunities	5	4	3	2	1
J.	Historic buildings and areas	5	4	3	2	1
K.	Rate of growth	5	4	3	2	1
L.	Unique local identity	5	4	3	2	1
M.	Opportunities for community involvement	5	4	3	2	1
N.	Attention to environmental issues	5	4	3	2	1
O.	Downtown	5	4	3	2	1
P.	Population growth	5	4	3	2	1
Q.	Presence of family farms	5	4	3	2	1
R.	Quality of life	5	4	3	2	1
S.	Existing roadway network	5	4	3	2	1
T.	Other: _____	5	4	3	2	1

6. Which FOUR of the items listed above in Question #5 do you feel are MOST IMPORTANT to be MAJOR STRENGTHS in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? [Using the letters above in Question #5, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th choices, or circle 'NONE'.]

1st: _____ 2nd:_____ 3rd: _____ 4th: _____ NONE

7. Several components of the City's and County's transportation system are listed below. Please rate your overall satisfaction with each component on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

How satisfied are you with:	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
(A) Ease of travel by car on highways	5	4	3	2	1	9
(B) Ease of travel by car on major streets	5	4	3	2	1	9
(C) Ease of travel by car on neighborhood streets	5	4	3	2	1	9
(D) Ease of access to major streets from neighborhoods	5	4	3	2	1	9
(E) Ease of walking in City of Lawrence	5	4	3	2	1	9
(F) Ease of bicycling in City of Lawrence	5	4	3	2	1	9
(G) Safety of walking in City of Lawrence	5	4	3	2	1	9
(H) Safety of bicycling in City of Lawrence	5	4	3	2	1	9
(I) Existing bicycle system throughout County	5	4	3	2	1	9
(J) Existing walking and hiking system throughout County	5	4	3	2	1	9
(K) Existing road system in County	5	4	3	2	1	9
(L) Quality of public transportation (bus service)	5	4	3	2	1	9
(M) Other: _____	5	4	3	2	1	9

8. Which THREE of the components of the City's and County's transportation system do you feel are most important to improve in the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Areas of Douglas County? [Using the letters above in Question #7, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices, or circle 'NONE'.]

1st: _____ 2nd:_____ 3rd: _____ NONE

9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of new residential subdivisions in the City of Lawrence?

____(5) Very satisfied
____(4) Satisfied
____(3) Neutral
____(2) Dissatisfied
____(1) Very dissatisfied
____(9) Don't know

10. What is the ONE most important action you feel should be taken to improve new residential development in the City of Lawrence? [Please write your recommended action in the space below.]

_____

11. Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new commercial development in the City of Lawrence?

____(5) Very satisfied
____(4) Satisfied
____(3) Neutral
____(2) Dissatisfied
____(1) Very dissatisfied
____(9) Don't know

12. What is the ONE most important action you feel should be done to improve new commercial development in the City of Lawrence? [Please write your recommended action in the space below.]

_____

13. **Overall, how satisfied are you with the site layout and architectural design of new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?**

____(5) Very satisfied ____(2) Dissatisfied
____(4) Satisfied ____(1) Very dissatisfied
____(3) Neutral ____(9) Don't know

14. **What is the ONE most important action you feel should be done to improve new industrial development in the City of Lawrence?** [Please write your recommended action in the space below.]

_____

15. **Retail Development: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means "Strongly AGREE" and 5 means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:**

	Retail Development	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A.	The expansion of retail development should be supported in the downtown area.	1	2	3	4	5
B.	Future retail development should primarily be located at the intersection of main streets.	1	2	3	4	5
C.	Future retail development should be located in small centers in new and existing neighborhoods.	1	2	3	4	5
D.	Available retail space should be utilized before building new retail buildings.	1	2	3	4	5

16. **Development Now and In the Future: Several statements about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County are listed below. Using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means "Strongly AGREE" and 5 means "Strongly DISAGREE", please indicate your level of agreement with the following:**

	Development	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A.	I would like to see agricultural uses maintained in the County.	1	2	3	4	5
B.	I would like to see major development directed inside the City limits.	1	2	3	4	5
C.	I would like to see more shopping opportunities in or near my neighborhood.	1	2	3	4	5
D.	I would like to see more employment centers located near my home.	1	2	3	4	5
E.	I would like to see a modest increase in height of development if it means less expansion of the City out into the County.	1	2	3	4	5
F.	I would like to see Downtown accommodate more development.	1	2	3	4	5
G.	I would like to see development that includes a better mix of uses in order to live, work, and play in close proximity.	1	2	3	4	5

17. From the following list, please check ALL the reasons that make it difficult for you to participate in public discussions about the future of Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County. (Check all that apply.)

___(1) Not enough time
___(2) Difficult to travel to meetings
___(3) Not sure how to get involved
___(4) Don't believe I can make a difference
___(5) Don't have enough information
___(6) Other (Please specify)_____

18. How knowledgeable do you feel you are with the Comprehensive Plan, Horizon 2020?

___(1) Very knowledgeable
___(2) Somewhat knowledgeable
___(3) Not sure
___(4) Not knowledgeable

DEMOGRAPHICS. The following information will help us better understand the needs of our community.

19. How long have you lived in Lawrence/Douglas County?

____(1) 0-2 years
____(2) 3-5 years
____(3) 6-10 years
____(4) 11-20 years
____(5) 21 years or more

20. How many persons living in your household (counting yourself), are?

Under age 10	____	Ages 25-34	____	Ages 55-64	____
Ages 10-19	____	Ages 35-44	____	Ages 65-74	____
Ages 20-24	____	Ages 45-54	____	Ages 75+	____

21. What is your age?

____(1) under 35 years
____(2) 35-44 years
____(3) 45-54 years
____(4) 55-64 years
____(5) 65-74 years
____(6) 75+ years

22. Do you own or rent your home?

____(1) Own ____(2) Rent

23. Which of the following best describes your home?

____(1) Single family
____(2) Duplex/triplex
____(3) Apartment/condo
____(4) Mobile home

24. What is your zip code? _____

25. Would you say your total annual household income is:

____(1) Under $25,000
____(2) $25,000 to $49,999
____(3) $50,000 to $74,999
____(4) $75,000 to $99,999
____(5) $100,000 to $149,999
____(6) $150,000 or more

26. Your gender: ____(1) Male ____(2) Female

27. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

28. Which of the following best describes your race? (Check all that apply.)

____(1) African American (Non-Hispanic)
____(2) White (Non-Hispanic)
____(3) Native American
____(4) Asian/Pacific Islander
____(5) Other: _____

29. What is your current employment status?

___(1) Full time employment
___(2) Part time employment
___(3) Full-time student [skip to Q31]
___(4) Full-time homemaker [skip to Q31]
___(5) Unemployed [skip to Q31]
___(6) Retired [skip to Q31]

30. Where do you work? *(if employed)*

___(1) City of Lawrence
___(2) Douglas County outside of the City of Lawrence
___(3) KC Metro Area
___(4) Topeka Metro Area
___(5) Other (Please specify)_____

31. Which of the following best fits the type of work you do? [Read list, check ONE]

__(01) Agriculture
__(02) Administrative or Support
__(03) Construction
__(04) Manufacturing
__(05) Wholesale Trade
__(06) Food, Hospitality, Entertainment
__(07) Retail
__(08) Health Services
__(09) Transportation and Warehousing
__(10) Finance, Insurance, or Real Estate
__(11) Professional Services
__(12) Scientific or Technical Services
__(13) Educational Services(Pre-school-12th grade)
__(14) Educational Services(University/College)
__(15) Government
__(16) Armed Services
__(17) Other: _____

The City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Area of Douglas County thank you for your time!

If you would like to be involved in public discussions about the future of the Lawrence and the Unincorporated Area of Douglas County, please sign up on the project website, http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/horizon-2020-update-process to receive email updates.

Please return your completed survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope addressed to: ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061

Your responses will remain completely confidential.
The address information printed to the right will ONLY
be used to help identify areas with special interests.

City *of* Lawrence
Douglas County

April 2014

Dear City of Lawrence or Unincorporated Douglas County Resident,

The City of Lawrence and Douglas County are currently updating *Horizon 2020*, the long range comprehensive plan for the area. A cornerstone of the planning effort is citizen input and involvement, including the enclosed survey. Your household was one of a limited number selected at random to receive this survey, therefore it is very important that you participate.

We appreciate your time. We realize that this survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete, but each question is important. The time you invest in completing this survey will aid the City of Lawrence and Douglas County in taking a resident-driven approach to making decisions that will enrich the future of our community and positively affect the lives of its residents.

Please return your completed survey within the next two weeks. We have selected ETC Institute, an independent consulting company, as our partner to administer this survey. They will compile the data received and present the results to the *Horizon 2020 Steering Committee*. **Your responses will remain confidential.** Please return your completed survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope addressed to ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061. If you prefer to take the survey over the web, the address is: www.Horizon2020survey.org.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jeff Crick, Planner II with the Lawrence/Douglas County Planning Office at 785-832-3163 or at CompPlanUpdate@lawrenceks.org. The survey is a tool that will benefit all residents. Please take this opportunity to let your voice be heard!

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely,

Mike Amyx, Mayor
Lawrence City Commission
Co-chair, *Horizon 2020 Steering Committee*

Nancy Thellman, Commissioner
Douglas County Commission
Co-chair, *Horizon 2020 Steering Committee*

To learn more about Horizon2020 visit:
http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/horizon-2020-update-process.

Open House Survey Results

Comprehensive Plan Update



Open House Survey Results

City *of* Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Locations

Lawrence High School
April 16, 2014

Lawrence City Hall
April 29, 2014

Lecompton Community Building
May 7, 2014

Lawrence Aquatics Center
May 29, 2014

Baldwin City: Lumberyard Arts Center
June 4, 2014

Eudora Recreation Center
June 19, 2014

Douglas County Courthouse
June 30, 2014

Douglas County Fairgrounds
July 16, 2014









Responses

Paper

89


Online

284

Executive Summary

Overview

From April to July 2014, the Horizon 2020 Steering Committee and the Lawrence – Douglas County Planning staff conducted a series of Open House forums throughout the county. Additionally, the survey that was provided at the Open House forums was made available online from May 28th to August 1st. This Open House Survey was not made available online at the same time as the ETC Survey to eliminate conflicts with obtaining responses for the ETC Survey.



The Open House Survey was designed to obtain more open-ended responses, and to provide the community a space to write-in their ideas, concepts, and thoughts about the future of Lawrence and Douglas County. An addendum was specifically added for meetings that were outside of the City of Lawrence to specifically gain deeper insights and comments about unincorporated Douglas County.

Major Findings

Overall, the results from the Open House Survey and the ETC Survey are very similar in their findings. Some of the major topics from the Open House Survey include:

- Jobs & creating employment opportunities
- Maintaining agriculture & farming in rural Douglas County
- Managing future urban growth
- Protection of natural resources
- Safety of Pedestrians and Bicyclists throughout the community
- Sidewalks & Walking Trails
- Stability of Downtown Lawrence


Appendix

1. Open House Results Graphs
2. Open House Survey Responses
3. Survey Instrument & Survey Boards


1. Open House Results Graphs

Graphs start on next page.


B. Are you satisfied with the character of Douglas county?




D. How important is it to maintain or expand agricultural uses in the county?




4. As Lawrence has grown over the last several decades, how satisfied are you with the type and quality of development?




5. I believe Lawrence should grow in a denser fashion to aid in growth management.




8. How important is it to mix housing types in neighborhoods (single-family, duplex, multi-family)?




9. Which of the following do you believe need to be improved as it relates to residential development? (Check as many as you like)




11. Which of the following types of commercial development would you prefer to see as the community grows? (Check as many as you like)




13. How Satisfied are you with the following as it relates to industrial development in the community




14. Which of the following do you believe will do the most to improve economic development opportunities? (Check as many as you like)




15. How important is it that development provide pedestrian, bicycle and transit options?





16. How important is it to be able to walk/bicycle to work?




18. How satisfied are you with vehicular roadway options when traveling across town?





19. How satisfied are you with the following types of parks:
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
a. Mini/Play-lots(e.g. Ludlam Park & Chaparral Park)
b. Neighborhood (e.g. Deerfield Park & Lyons Park)
c. Community (e.g. South Park & Watson Park)
d. Regional (e.g. Clinton Lake)
e. Linear (e.g. Burroughs's Creek Trail)
f. Dog Parks
g. Bike Trails/ Walking Paths
Not Satisfied
Satisfied



23. Rank the following in terms of importance:
250
200
150
100
50
0
a. Protecting historic & cultural resources in the city and county
b. Enhancing the cultural arts in Lawrence and Douglas County (e.g. integrating public art into projects, supporting cultural arts districts)
c. Appropriately integrating historic places into new development
Not Satisfied
Satisfied

25. How important is the protection of natural resources to our community?



26. How important are the following to you, as the city grows:




32. How satisfied were you with this public open house survey?
2%
7%
16%
56%
19%
Not Satisfied
Satisfied

2. Open House Survey Responses

	A. How would you describe the character of Douglas County?
1	college town
2	buckling under the fear caused by the City
3	
4	
5	rural and slowly urbanizing
6	Eclectic medium sized county.
7	Community Centered
8	nice county, although not enough jobs
9	Friendly
10	Reasonably good with a mix of urban, farms and open space.
11	The Ag Machine
12	Europeanized tallgrass prairie
13	suburban
14	Quirky
15	
16	very political
17	farm oriented
18	Fair minded, interested in equality without sacrifice.
19	open
20	
21	Meets government definition of rural area, except for Lawence; has a rural (small town/agricultural feel in most areas with a metropolitan feel and governement designation in Lawrence.
22	
23	Douglas County doesn't have an identifiable character. It is simply a composit of the cities and rural areas therein.
24	Douglas County is a diverse county with a mix of agricultural, rural and urban land uses. However, Lawrence must continue to grow as we are lagging on economic development and job growth.
25	Small town surrounded by open space.
26	
27	eclectic, smart and friendly - An open and engaged community
28	Fair
29	Douglas County is a great place to live, but it is overshadowed by the city and KU.
30	Transitional
31	Historic, many generations of families still living here from settlement days, farm oriented, 20th century appearance
32	Much more rural and conservative than the city of Lawrence, typical small towns and farm families mixed with people that are really city people wanting to live the country experience.
33	Green rolling hills interspersed with farm land and riparian areas. Primarily rural.
34	Suburban Agriculture
35	Clean, natural
36	forward thinking, the diamond of Kansas
37	Domiated by a government that tries to be all things to all people, and which therefore fails at most.
38	Douglas County has a diverse population that celebrates that diversity. We have strong

neighborhoods and strong communities of all kinds.
39 Cars/trucks, guns, farm chemicals rule.
40
41
42 Good mix of rural and recreational opportunities
43 Spots of rural beauty gradually being consumed by urban sprawl.
44
45 A unique mix of rural and urban influences.
46 Too much sprawl. Attractive mix of ag, woodland/brush, ravine, Historic significance.
47 Liveable.
48 Rural / City
49 Clannish
50
51
52 Rural county with a moderately large city.
53 Outside Lawrence it is a bit thin.
54
55 Irresponsible growth
56
57 Beautiful and diverse
58 Typical rural America
59 Douglas County has a balance of rural and urban elements. It's largest city and county seat, Lawrence, is a college town with many unique qualities. It is also increasingly a bedroom county, with many citizens commuting for work to nearby KC and Topeka.
60 Incestuous, good-ol-boy, inbred, developer, realtor & chambercrat driven, controlled by the "12 families who really run Lawrence"
61 Generally supportive
62 Clean, safe, friendly
63
64 Rural
65 Rural with strong small cities.
66
67 It is a place that includes Lawrence. It seems nice that it's not overrun with large agriculture operations.
68
69
70 Typical Kansas
71 rural, pastoral, beautiful
72 Rural traditional but appealing to no traditional residents
73
74
75 Too many people. (Doesn't "character" usually refer to people's personality and values?)
76 mixture of rural and suburban; the suburban part is getting too much like Johnson County--too many strip malls, malls.
77 Expensive
78 Beautiful rolling hills, many trees, and still a good amount of agriculture.
79 A beautiful place to live with wonderful people.
80 Mostly rural with three small towns

81 Smart Bohemians who like alternative music, food, and lifestyles
82 Friendly
83 Northeast and East of Iowa St. need's reviving with the city's help. Those resident's deserve to have nieghborhoods that are up to par with the west side of town. West side is thriving.
84 anti growth gives in to special interest
85 Socialist
86 the kingdom of heaven shrouded in pollution, fluoride, pesticides, and genetecially engineered foods.
87 Liberal, tax and spend, taxation and spending out of control
88 Eclectic
89 Politically Democratic. We have a great manager and the board is well balanced and sensitive to social needs and ecology as well as careful with spending tax payer money. Roads are will maintained and the county and city cooperate well.
90
91 Progressive, inclusive and caring
92 Good mix between rural and urban
93 The county that Lawrence is in. Ex-hippies in the country.
94 Driven by developers
95
96 Diverse, very Midwestern, stalwart
97 Liberal. A little stunted in growth. Lots of dissention toward change.
98 Good mix of rural, suburban, town. Progressive, attractive, broad minded, everyone can find their place. Living in rural areas can feel disconnected with Lawrence, which is in many ways the center of Douglas County.
99 A good place to live
100
101
102 Open to new ideas that seem to fit the needs and priorities of the county at large.
103 Unique, a bit dirty and unkept, a little too proud of its Liberal reputation, struggling economically
104 Douglas county has a lot of community cooperation and independence through agriculture.
105 Just as it should be..rural. Hard working farmers making the most of it.
106 I don't leave the city of Lawrence often. And when I do it is usually to go to another county or state, not to the rest of Douglas County. This is probably my loss. I did go once or twice on the farm tour and that was great.
107 Welcoming, with diversity including arts, music, reading, and country
108
109
110 Suburban
111 Hugely independent, strongly connected to the land, the earth and the elements; strong sense of ethics and loyalty to family
112 good blend of rural & urban development
113 Pastoral with limited commercial use and proper mix of residential areas
114 semi-urban
115 Douglas County is a unique community, serving as both a "bedroom" community to Kansas City and Topeka, acting as a university town, and preserving a substantial amount of "small town" character.
116 evolving to address urban sprawl, highway expansion, suburban development and agricultural diversity

117 Diverse
118
119 Family friendly & conservation minded
120
121
122 It is a rural-suburban mix
123 Laid back, attractive, sufficiently commercial, nice communities, accessible services
124
125 Unique; progressive
126
127 Fresh
128 agricultural, 4H focused beautiful (Vinland Valley)
129 A suburban and ag mixture
130 Vibrant
131 Eclectic - mix of college, elderly, urban hipster, rural conservative.
132 It has a wide variety of activities and kind people
133 Rural with one "large" town -
134 Changing and not necessarily for the good.
135
136 constantly in state of cover up, catering to ku
137 Small town feel, nostalgic
138 Unsure
139 Interested in intelligent and creative pursuits and as well as offerings to that end. Preservation of the past.
140 It is better maintained than some places in this state.
141 Don't know
142 Nice combination urban and rural with excellent soil for food production
143 Fragmented, not unified in purpose. Driven by the development community.
144 Politically and morally corrupt
145 Largely rural except for the Lawrence metropolitan area and growing smaller towns
146 influenced by bio-region historically and by Lawrence as the primary urban center...strong contrast of Lawrence/Baldwin City with smaller towns in income/political perspective..
147 Rustic Kansas
148 good cultural quality of life with rural nature
149
150
151 Pretty good but could be better.
152 eclectic community
153 Douglas County consists of the vibrant City of Lawrence, and a few smaller towns, surrounded by primarily open spaces dedicated mostly to agricultural practices. I think it's unfortuate that the ECO-squared process did not succeed in identifying critica
154
155 o.k.
156
157 Douglas County has become very urbanized.
158 Vibrant, cultural, traditional
159 Slowly but surely become the all star cookie cutter bedroom community.
160 Less and less farming and more rural residental

161 Beautiful, tree covered hills and valleys; unlike what most of the rest of the country when they think of Kansas.
162 Community-oriented
163 excellent
164 mix of urban and rural.
165
166 unsure/no opinion
167 Peaceful.
168 Warm, open and inviting
169 Average Americana
170 Dynamic
171 Too busy for a country setting.
172
173 very good
174 A nice place to live but not really offering worthwhile employment opportunities
175 Dependent on academic agenda.
176
177 It is a community-centered area, even outside the city limits.
178 vibrant
179
180 a nice mix of ag and commercial
181 decent
182 behind on park and nature area improvement
183 Define your terms in describing Douglas County. Is it just the unincorporated areas of the county or does it include the city of Lawrence? By itself Douglas County does not come across as progressive and seems to lack leadership.
184 A county consisting of very diverse populations
185 rural with some eyesores
186 Mix of small town and rural
187 Number of small farms with no long range planning
188 I am not as familiar with the county overall, but it includes a mix of developed areas, farming, and parks/recreational areas
189 Rural, but not too rural. Accessible. Friendly (for the most part). I like the agrarian feel of Douglas County.
190 clean, friendly open spaces
191 I am not sure how to describe the character of the county. I do like that the county seems to be cleaner than others.
192 I would not describe it as unique, it is like other incorporated parts of the region.
193
194 rural small-town mix
195 Pleasant
196 Caring
197 Playful, energetic, preparing for the future
198 A semi-rural county anchored by a major institution of higher learning
199 Community
200 Progressive heart in Lawrence but still retaining a solid rural feel outside Lawrence.
201 Bedroom communities with some agriculture
202 Beautiful rolling hills and some useful agricultural ground, but not a major producer (compared to

other Kansas counties) of crops.
203 Beautiful village, with much going on.
204 Accepting of all.
205 small town charm that is getting to big
206 A community responsive to critical thinking and new ideas., willing to act on progressive proposals tht will serve the most vulnerable as well as those of means.
207 familial
208 Small town community feel with progessive views.
209
210 As with many counties there often seems to be divergent goals for the primary population center and the unincoporated areas. I believe outsiders often think of Lawrence/KU when they think of DGCO, but this is not entirely accurate.
211 Unique
212 A progressive mecca in a state drowning in tea.
213
214
215 happy open minded community
216 I think of as semi-rural -- rural enough for those who want to free of the bothers of living in a densely populated area while retaining easy access to the benefits of a densely populated area. I think of most such residents as comparatively affluent.
217 A medium size city in a rural county that is becomins suburbanized
218 Laid back
219
220 Rural, small towns scattered in
221 diverse
222 eastern side could use quite a lot of paint
223
224 eclectic
225
226 Not much of an identity, defined solely by the presence of the city of Lawrence.
227 Our county's character is shifting rapidly, primarily urban now and confused about embracing the safe, cloned character of Johnson County while wanting to hold onto the historic places and landscapes we have here.
228
229 I feel that Lawrence is Douglas County and recieves the most attention and growth (although I'm not necessarily interested in growth in Lecompton)
230
231
232 Diverse insofar as housing an dproperty values. Growing at a moderate pace except for road/highway development
233 Very diverse and possalove
234 A unique mixture of rural and urban and interestingly culturally diverse, but slow to deal with issues of poverty.
235
236 Douglas County is a geographical location that is important because of its history, physical beauty and commitment to diversity and education.
237 a good mix of rural and urban areas
238

239 Liberal and open minded.
240 Highly attractive to educated, cultured persons
241 families that want more space around them
242
243
244 Liberal, diverse, small town, college town, open-minded, tolerant (when I think of Douglas County I only think of Lawrence)
245 small town, local
246 Vibrant, creative, diverse, progressive for Kansas
247 Struggling to compete with other communities for industries, which employ a number of people in the long-term/not just temp jobs.
248 Rural w/ Lawrence @ its core
249 Diverse community of people for all walks of life who care about the future of this area. A bit of everything.
250 Mixed, rural, urban-lite, politicall and socially moderate, rich in resources - agricultural, historical, waterways
251 Lawrence has a small town feel but has many amnities of a larger community
252 Mix of suburban & ag land
253 Mix of urban and rural. City has a small-town feel. Vigoroous exchange of people and ideas 2 location between KC & Topeka & KU.
254 An eclertic mix of rural and urban structures, people, and ideas
255
256 Active, Festive, Awesome
257
258 Probably same as Lawrence - Blue dot in red state - cares about the people and the environment
259 Progressive, pragmatic, mixed (politically)
260
261 Dominated by Lawrence. the smaller communities need to market tourism to Lawrencians
262 Rural surrounding small town America
263
264 Less Portlandic than I would like - too Midwestern for my taste (I'm from and have always live in Lawrence)
265
266
267 Friendly but with everything offered in bigger cities. Open-minded to all people (agricultural with a big city flair)
268 Finally progressive with traffic problem and bypass
269 Basically rural/urban with one metro area (Lawrence)
270 Rural, quaint, lacking good paying jobs
271 A nice mixture of urban and rural with the urban increasingly encroaching on the rural with sad results
272 A growing community that many would like to live
273 Combination of farming/rural communities and businesses
274 nice mix of urban and rural areas. Recreational area could be better developed. Sometimes we feel like an after thought in Lecompton. River and Lake Development
275
276 Mix between farming, college and city
277 Bipolar. It is a county where I can live on my quiet private farm at night, work in a research

university during the day, and then dine in a main-street setting

Way better than Johnson County!

Progressive, forward looking, livable.

Fun, Adventurous, Open Minded

Active, Athelitic, Fun
Great, swell


Progressive Kansas college with rural aspects

Once you get past the gentrification and sprawl the county is a remarkably nice rural farmland.

not sure

325
326
327 Liberal, open minded, accepting. Intellectual, stimulating, worldly. Diverse, but with a strong sense of community.
328 diverse
329 Unfortunately, sprawling with development.
330 Rural but becoming more urbanized.
331
332
333
334 overbuilt, too little environmental protection, too little concern for quality of life issues and food security
335
336 Friendly. I love the neighborhoods. I'd like them to continue to grow in walkability and bike-ability.
337
338
339
340 Progressive, community oriented, historical
341
342 rural, agricultural
343 rural, agricultural
344 a blue dot in a red sea
345
346
347
348 A good blend of rural and urban.
349
350 Lawrence-centric? Highly taxed property relative to surrounding areas?
351 A virbrant environment for physical and intellectual growth.
352 Interesting and Varied
353
354
355 Mixture of rural and urban
356 rural / farmland / local / sustainable
357 rural and academic
358 Can't put it into words but it isn't negative.
359
360 hip and fun with a mix of country
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368 Rural diversity with good infrastructure.
369

370
371
372
373



	C. If you are not satisfied with the character, how would you want to change it?
1	
2	Return more of its independence
3	
4	
5	Scale back the future urban growth area
6	Ensure that the growth is done in a planned manner that includes the input of all fellow residents.
7	Difficult to find good paying jobs and as a homeowner, difficult paying such high taxes
8	better wages so people can live comfortably
9	
10	Satisfied, but concerned about the lose of farm land and open space to creaping sprawal and farmetts.
11	See smaller farms that raise produce for local consumption as opposed to large scale corn

manufacturing.

create more walking and bicycle connectivity county wide. Concentrate building in city limits. Preserve green areas. Encourage forestation and small scale agriculture.

improve voting persentages
less crime
More collective actions, less big development leading the way.

Offset change in unincorporated development/emphasis on subsidized gentrified amenity development with emphasiis on better basic infrastructure development, affordable housing for the majority of working households who cannot afford current development.

I'd like to see it as a connected whole, presenting itself in a way that unifies the towns and unincorporatied areas in a way that people can identify with.
Lawrence must continue to work to shed the image that we are hostile to new commercial and residential growth. This misperception is very harmful to our job growth and economic development efforts.

Better street maintanance (for older areas) and create sidewalks on each street that are well maintained (to encourage bike riding and walking within the community).
Focus on working together as a community to better ourselves mentally and physically.

Batter balance
Update, get into the 21st century as far as ideas, improvements and presentation
There has been a good balance between pro- and no-growth factions for many years, but the pro-development faction seems to have taken over to the point where quality of life and environmental concerns are simply discounted. This trend worries me.

I would prefer more agriculture built toward serving the needs of our local population and surrounding areas with more produce.

Less security theater, fewer police armored vehicles, fewer police with machine guns, more volunteer opportunites without invasive financial background investigations.

Increased organic farming practices, more respect and appreciation for bikers and walkers/runners, and diversity of crops.

nothing at this time
Limit or eliminate the development of residential property on small acreages, e.g. 5-acre, subdivisions.

don't know; just try to maintain.

46 Define wild corridors, network of trails, create wild erosion barriers along all streams.
47
48
49 Add some better paying jobs. KU jobs only go to insiders.
50
51
52
53 More farm stands, more park/prarie/wetland/wildlife-preserve
54
55 Stop destroying the natural environment
56
57
58
59
60 It can't be changed, the 'people who run Lawrence & by default Douglas county' wouldn't allow change to upset their $cheme$ & dream$. Been that way since the 1960s
61 Inclusive of more diverse voices
62 Be know for embracing holistic medicinal healing and well-being
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71 I would like to see more open space or public space with trails
72
73
74
75 Nomore urban spread.
76 less focus on strip malls and big box stores, more focus on and support for family owned businesses, local businesses, local farms, parks, infrastructure that promotes walking and biking
77 I would stop raising property taxes on the people that actually live here and charge a tax on tenants of all the apartments in this town.
78 Stop the spread of non-agricultural residences outside of the city limits. Stop city sprawl.
79 Less sprawl.
80 I would prefer the county to assist more in reducing the sprawl of housing on the outskirts of Lawrence
81
82
83 Revamp the older or rundown parts of the city.
84 expand more growth for industrial
85 Removing fluoride from the water supply. I, and several others, do not like forced medication.
86 Remove fluoride. Label genetically engineered foods - better yet - ban them state wide. If you really wanted to help with dental hygene, you would add iodine to the water supply. Not a neuro-toxic carcinogen. There are no "acceptable levels" for my kids.
87 Stop tax increases and live on a balanced budget.

88
89
90
91
92 Do not want to see Douglas County or Lawrence as extension of Johnson County.
93
94
95
96 If anything, I would want to broaden our horizons of what is or is not acceptable in our community. At the same time, part of our charm is our small-town feel and I worry that over-expansion threatens that ideology.
97 See a more positive and cooperative attitude within the community.
98 Better fire protection in rural areas, ability to vote in Lawrence City elections if you have a rural Lawrence address.
99
100
101
102 I like the openness, but believe our county is inclined to expect centralized answers to needs at the expense of personal initiatives.
103 I wish people would take better care of their properties in Lawrence. It seems that many homeowners and landlords are negligent with the upkeep and appearance of their properties. I would also like the see our economy begin to thrive one day.
104 I hope to see increased small farms and local producers
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114 awareness of both the agriculture importance of the county as well as the urban; ag often is considered to be secondary in decisions
115
116 have a creeping feeling that Douglas County is becoming Johnson County with a large lake and that is the last thing I want. Better development constraints that work to deliver progress but not "same as" Johnson County
117
118
119
120
121
122 Preserve wildlands and farm land
123
124
125
126

127
128
129
130
131
132
133 Less focus on Lawrence as "Douglas County" and ensure that resources are channeled towards the rural as well. Less development and sprawl in Lawrence would be smart.
134 Try to think out side the box when it comes to construction and the impact on the traffic, stores and more
135
136 less catering to ku and more to the residents mire job opportunity with higher pay, less crime, less hiding the crime
137
138 More focus on job creation and less focused on incidental details.
139 Less interest on sprawl, more interest on renewable resources. Better planning and adherence to H2020.
140 Move it out of Kansas
141
142
143 Blend rather than compete community mission, goals, and objectives.
144 Remove the city manager
145 Limit the establishment of rural residences that require public safety and utility services
146 increase support of land owners on conservation, increase opportunities for county residents to have access to resources of KU and HINU
147
148
149
150 No genuine planning. The current 20/20 is ignored more than followers . Either follow the plan or do not spend the time to rewrite it.
151
152 Address the recent increase in crime and homelessness
153 The ECO-squared process did not succeed in identifying critical open spaces that deserve permanent protection.
154
155
156
157
158 Be more open to growth
159 Restore the downtown to its' once strong economic stature with fewer drinking establishments and more family oriented
160 Fewer homes per acre and ex[panded farmland
161 I would like to see it attract more residents who want to start and grow businesses here.
162
163
164
165
166 unsure

167 We need more commercial, retail, and industrial growth to rebalance the disproportion of taxes from homeowners to commercial, at least in the city. We need more options here so that residents don't have to drive out of county to spend their money.
168
169 More growth re industry. More retail - more choices
170
171 Put food store north of river and a hardware store.
172
173
174 I want to see the county, city and private sector develop an honest plan with metrics for attracting quality jobs to the area. Everything done to this point is essentially a joke. Lawrence is the most educated community in Kansas. It should be leverage
175 No comment.
176
177
178
179
180
181 business zoning within neighborhoods
182
183 Perhap merge city of Lawrence and Douglas County into one operating form of government.
184 Both city and county elected individuals, including staffs, need to work better together for the good of the entire county.
185 Protect greenspace and require industrial projects to incorporate greenspace into their plans
186
187 Less government in private issues on the farm property
188
189
190
191
192 I do not want to necessarily change it or leave it the same, I believe that specific uses should be evaluated on a case by case basis.
193 historic sites cleaned up, more outdoor activities
194 more full wage jobs outside of KU
195 I would like for its programs to be more progressive so that they live up to the progressive reputation of the county.
196
197 More bike paths, less homeless bums
198 Denser commercial development and an end to sprawl - urban growth boundary.
199
200
201 More jobs in Douglas Co., so fewer people would commute to Shawnee, Johnson, and Wyandotte
202
203 See "F"
204 Maintain existing infrastructure
205 less development
206 Not fully satisfied. Need to continue to provide sound reliable informtiwiht a focus on the needs of the broader population over the profit oriented developers who, too often determine

directions, in projecting the future

Too many condos, high rise apartments now that are taking away from the community feel.

We need consistent and clear communication between the various public bodies on goals (i.e., this update to Horizon 2020).

More environmentalism, less commercialism. People come to Lawrence because it is unique and different. If we put a Starbucks, Applebee's, and cookie cutter apartment buildings on every corner then we look just like Johnson County. No thank you.

Fewer Mexican restaurants downtown. There are more than enough already.

Halt the conversion of prime farm land to other uses and restrict the suburbanization

Give back to the common people. Stop building things we don't need (Rec center, Parking Garages, etc)

The numbering of roads outside the city are incomprehensible!

More family oriented as opposed to student oriented - cost of living, local businesses, crime prevention, etc.

We must do the difficult work of looking far ahead and planning for all the incremental shifts from climate change. This will only happen with political pressure from concerned, engaged citizens since the short election cycles do not reward our elected le

I would like to see more activites for young adults/young people in the nature of dirt bike parks, drag strip and other alternative activites - unless you like to drink or hang-out at establishments for small children, what is there to do?

There needs to be less focus on drawing and pleasing people who contribute more economically (the wealthy, students, big businesses) and more on including and supporting those who lose out to economic interests (the inadequately housed, the poor).

I would love to see more public parks and bicycle paths


less restrictive development in the rural areas

243 Require larger minimum-acreage requirements for the building of houses.
244 Overall, its ok for Kansas. However, have traveled to other places and lived elsewhere it would be nice to have more things to do in the county, while still keeping Lawrence's small town charm
245
246 More affordable housing, less sprawl/less density unless it is infill, more bicycles and pedestrians improvements- dedicated funding
247 I am concerned for public debt -whys the debt load totally unmanagable?
248 More opportunities for open partnership, not having Lawrence be in a bubble within the county, ex- more county-wide community events
249 Although I'm satisfied w/ most aspects of the character I believe there are several opportunities to work together to enhance and sustain the character of Douglas County
250 Pay more attention to resources - uses and preservation
251 I like the character, I just we can sustain it.
252
253
254
255
256 Less road construction
257
258
259 It would be nice to be more egalitarian, sensitive to the poor and lower class
260
261 More pedestrian/bike trails, green space, affordable housing
262 Incorporate more connectivity for bicycles and pedestrians
263
264 More open ideas to change the status quo of a Midwestern city. Install more bike lanes, change traffic laws to encourage bikers. Give incentives to live in and around downtown - develop in East Lawrence. Stop sprawl
265
266
267
268 Be more open to the needs of east side Lawrence
269 More emphasis on Lecompton, Eudora, and Baldwin areas. Recognition as important communities in their own right - not just appendages of Lawrence.
270 Want to see more opportunities for good paying employment for 20-30 year olds
271 less encroachment of the urban into the rural, less agribusiness, more small scale farm food production, more public land in the county
272
273 More emphasis on small communities and their values.
274 More acknowldgement/attention to rural communities
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282

283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298 I love it! That's why I live here!
299
300 More bike trails, bike parking, bike lanes
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314 I'm not satisfied with the gentrification and sprawl. There appears to be no planning when building in the county, especially south of town.
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324 Community dialogue places are needed. So many people are thinking about work, their home life, that we are disconnected from our neighbors. From the time we leave school until we can go to the senior center, we get isolated in our homes.
325
326
327 I worry that the close mindedness of other parts of Kansas may be seeping into the county.

328 less crime
329 More vigorous preservation of open space, prime farmland, and rivers and streams.
330
331
332
333
334 protect areas not yet developed; stop building and attend to questions of water quality and quantity for the future
335
336 I'd like to slow the traffic within the neighborhoods and increase walking/bike riding infrastructure.
337
338
339
340
341
342 Build a stronger, healthier food and agri-biz economy as well as recreational -river rec., bike/hike paths, while preserving native prairie, woodland areas
343 Build a stronger, healthier food and agri-biz economy as well as recreational -river rec., bike/hike paths, while preserving native prairie, woodland areas
344
345
346
347
348 I would like a comprehensive plan to stay in place or be improved for a good mix of cultural, historical, green, and human uses for county.
349
350 ?
351
352
353
354
355
356 N/A
357
358
359 Less chamber of commerce more humanitarian
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368 Be more business friendly
369
370

371
372
373



	E. Why is it important to not important to maintain or expand agricultural uses in the county?
1	
2	Forced uses of land results in bad outcomes. If it remains feasible, it will happen. If burdens or incentives are artificially placed on the land you are not smart enough to know the concommitants from such actions and it will necessitate further failures
3	
4	
5	once land goes out of agricultural use it never goes back into agricultural use
6	The city has been growing and its usage needs to reflect that urban enviroment.
7	Economic growth
8	If we lose all of our farm ground, what are people going to eat?
9	Sustainable organic farming is an asset to the community, but not farming that uses too many chemicals and depletes the water supply.
10	If current level of agriculture is not maintained, the rural nature of the county will slowly erode.

11 Expansion is unsustainable given current and future drought conditions, farms need to rely on smaller and more diverse crops that are less water intensive.
12 agriculture is no longer the highest and best use of all rural land.
13 Increases chances for survival during disruptions and anticipates decreases in global food availability in the future
14 Local food
15 This question is poorly written. Free market should dictate land use, not regulation.
16 Determine the best use of the land for all residents
17 it's an important food supply
18 The farther distance we are from food sources, the worse off our community is. We need sustainable agrigculture available to everyone.
19
20
21 Land, especially arable land, is a nonrenewable commodity. Agricultrue can be a marketed product and agritourism has grown in Douglas County
22
23 To protect our ability to grow our own food to the extent possible, to maintain economic diversification, and to maintain open green areas.
24 I think there are already adequate resources and emphasis being placed on agricultural uses in the county. Any further efforts would most likely involve placing artificial constraints on land use.
25 Because local growers spend money in the local economy. Also, with future scarcity of fossil fuels, maintaining a healthy, sustainable local food supply will add to the county's food security.
26 Douglas County has agricultural land of great quality; it should not be destroyed
27 Maintaining agricultural uses IS important, but expansion should only occur if the land was previously used inefficiently.
28
29 Agricultural use is important for the farmers in the county.
30 Create a comprehensive and enforecable plan and follow it. Agriculture fits within that plann not in isolation
31 It's the Heartland...it's what is done here
32 This area of the state has growth potential for locally grown produce and other food and fiber production. Paving over highly productive agricultural land is a sure route to eventual starvation.
33 We need to create and foster a local food economy and reduce dependence on foods that have to travel a long way to the plate. Sustainability is very important and will be moreso as time goes by.
34 It is very important for economic development to increase agricultural uses.
35
36
37 You can't grow enough food on parking lots and shopping malls.
38 Fresh, locally grown food is important, and so is supporting family farmers vs corporate farming.
39 Important to continue to grow healthy, local food.
40
41
42 With Global Warming upon us, we need to be able to sustain life in a 'local' sense and giving attention to agricultural usage in rural areas is a must
43 Eliminate any tax concessions and discourage the use of prime agricultural land for crops such as corn, soybeans; and give tax concessions and encourage a return to truck farming. Supply our food needs locally, not fuel ethanol.

44
45 So we don't become Johnson County; strip malls and box stores take away from the reason people move here in the first place. Once you lose that rural feel you can't get it back. I wish the sale barn was still in town.
46 Ag uses bring in more money and provide more jobs and do a better job of conserving the environment than residential or commercial uses.
47 People need to make a living.
48 Maintain the quality and character of the County
49 Never thought about it
50
51
52 Since about 70% of the county is rural and already agricultural as well as a lot of fertile soils, it would seem to be the most beneficial use of the land.
53 It is important to have small farms, slow food, more farm to town, market, plate ... etc
54
55 We need farm land
56
57 To provide food for people
58 Keeping good agricultural soils productive will be increasingly important with rising fuel costs and population growth. Locally sourced food will be increasingly important.
59
60 Because the county needs higher paying manufacturing jobs that would allow a family to LIVE here.
61
62 It's important cause we have good soil-we should use it to grow not build
63
64 It's good to have local food to eat
65 Because we need to sustain our local food production, keep a healthy habitat for creatures great and small and for the development of recreational venues that enhance our environment.
66
67 I would like the general plan to encourage small, local agriculture, but discourage factory farming or large agricultural operations that would have more pronounced environmental impacts.
68
69
70 People are always going to need to eat, and the more local products we have the better for us, the environment and the farmer.
71 We want to encourage local farming as more responsible farming than relying on corporate farming
72
73
74
75 Food is more imporant than gentleman farmers and their 5-acre plots.
76 It is important to maintain/expand ag uses to provide food and local agricultural goods for residents rather than relying on imported or out of state goods. We have excellent fertile ground in many parts of the county--it should be used for food prod.
77
78 Local foods reflect a big part of the character of Douglas County. I want to have more access to healthy local foods.

79 Access to healthy local foods is becoming more important.
80 To avoid sprawl of residential and commercial uses that could be located in Lawrence.
81 I don't know much about agricultural uses, but I think the farmers market and restaurants who serve local food is an important part of any community -- whether in Douglas County or in Cook County (Chicago)
82 Local food is good for the planet and its inhabitants.
83 It is important to expand to be better in the future thru agricultural awareness, increased profit's for farmer/ranchers and the city.
84
85 Farmers do a great job of self management. Plus it seems like our government favors big corporations such as Monsanto, Bayer, etc.
86 Looks like a typo. haha... Agriculture has been hijacked by Monsanto. We don't want their poison any more. Food and seed sovereignty must be ubiquitious across the NATION.
87 The county is divided between urban and rural, agriculture seems to be thriving.
88 Unsure
89 We are a rural state with a rural culture which we treasure while we become more urbanized.
90
91 It is important to sustain the availability of fresh, healthy foods at affordable prices.
92
93 Agriculture is the lifeblood of humanity. Globalization may not last forever. Have a strong agricultural industry means we can better feed our citizens.
94
95
96 A large part of our county depends on agricultural resources to exist and/or make a living. It would be negligent of us to ignore that population.
97
98 Open spaces and agriculture help define us, important to be able to produce more of our own food, tired of developers gobbling up land to make $.
99 Keep healthy food close
100
101
102 The agricultural community provides a balance to the city and university's influence.
103 It is a resource that should be maximized.
104 Because we are unique in that way that many peole here value local and organic. We can be an example to surrounding areas as how to expand local small economies
105 Unless there is a decline in the present use of the counties agricultural resources I don't see a need for change.
106 Small farms selling locally is part of what makes Douglas County special.
107
108
109
110 It provides diversity in population and job creation.
111
112 Existing AG areas are adequate.
113 Not possible near obvious metropolitan area
114 economic considerations makes it very important to acknowledge the agricultural uses and how they integrate into the whole county plan
115

116 Because that's what keeps the green space
117 It is important to expand agricultural use to give people the option of buying local foods and also exporting those food and animal feeds.
118 We need to ensure that Douglas County has a sustainable and local food system. It is important to avoid giant, monocropped, industrial farms.
119 Buying & eating local is by far the healthiest option, and keeping our community healthy benefits everyone
120
121
122 It is important to maintain local farms to assure quality and support wildlife
123 this is an agricultural area and should be kept as natural as possible
124
125
126
127
128 focus on locally grown food
129 Ag uses in county important for economy and tourism
130
131
132 Loss of green space is not healthy.
133
134 If you use agricultural for the good. I just saw them destroy a field for the progress of the city. Saw a small woodland destroyed with no thought of the aftermath.
135
136
137 I believe local agriculture and local food are very important and that we need to expand wisely, i.e. avoid expansion into the wetlands or other culturally significant areas.
138
139 It isn't. Our land used for growing food is a valuable resource.
140 Food is expensive. Excellent agricultural opportunities here.
141
142 Expanding agricultural uses but not monoculture uses promotes food secu;rity in our communities.
143 Diversity provides strength and understanding.
144 We are surround by plush farm land
145 Agriculture is the linchpin of Kansas. Douglas Co. has many areas where soils are excellent for growing crops
146 Very important to consider "food hub" and other ways to increase/support local accessibility to local food whilc supporting growers - increase awareness historically of region's diverse agricutlure and build on that
147 Local Food, and a prime part of our rural economy.
148 locally grown, preferably organic, food is crucial for our local community
149
150
151 If "agricultural uses" means family CSA farms, fine. No corporate farms, however.
152 local food should be subsidised so the average Lawrencian can afford to eat local
153 For the most part ag uses help keep our air clean and with proper land-conservation practices, they also prevent pollution of lakes, rivers and streams. This is especially important to prevent

siltation of Clinton Lake, which provides drinking water.

154

155 people need to eat

156

157 It is no longer economically feasably for FULL-TIME farmers to purchase additional land due to the urbanization of Douglas County. Agriculture production needs smaller acerage to produce higher yields with advances in farming technology.

158 As agricultural business grow outside of traditional farming, Douglas County has the opportunity to attract new business ventures that would fall into this category.

159 Promoting local "farming" over corporate farms is and will become a major economic factor as "Local" becomes the driving factor.

160 Better use of public infrastructure in more densely populated areas

161 Agriculture, while important to the state of Kansas, is not necessarily the highest and best use of ground around a research university with our geographic advantages for shipping and travel.

162 We need to pay respect to the farmers who grow non-GMO food.

163

164 Douglas County has incredible soil, so it's a waste of a valuable local resouruce to reduce agricultural uses. Urban gardens (like Lawrence's Common Ground) and retaining some land for agricultural uses in DougCo will help support local food initiatives.

165

166 It is important to at least maintain the agricultural aspects of our county to maintain prosperity for local farmers and encourage a better relationship between citizens and food.

167 Ag should be maintained, but not neccesarily expanded. It is a big part of our history though, but it doesn't provide the resources that our communities most need.

168

169 Kansas has plenty of farm land and douglas county needs a bigger tax base via retail, manufacturing and residential. Taxes are too high - commercial rates are obscene

170 One must eat and I would prefer to eat locally produced foods.

171 It's our history, and a bases for our income.

172

173 it is important to keep a good balance with agriculture and development

174 We need to face the reality of Lawrence's proximity to Kansas City/Topeka and the growth headed this way. I love farm to table and local produce, but this may not be the best use for the property.

175 No opinion.

176

177

178

179

180 i just want to limit sprawl

181 to maintain, as an important part of the economy

182 for us it brings in money and services and i would like to see more improvements

183 Agricultural provides a reliable, consistent economic basis to support county endeavors.

184 First determine whether agricultural uses or commercial uses are in the best interests of the citizens, to include the business community.

185 Agriculture currently drives much of the economy. Haphazard zoning changes are not smart in the long run.

186 Other areas are more likely to be future agricultural centers, while Douglas County becomes

more developed as a bedroom community for KC
187 expanding agr in the county is not important to the betterment of Kansas
188 I'm not sure what you mean by "expand agricultural uses" -- but to me, climate change is a huge unknown and sustaining land for small farms close to cities, growing food to sell at farmer's markets and the like are important for a sustainable future
189 The agricultural aspect of the region contributes to the county's "small town", friendly aspect. On a more serious note, access to locally produced food is important for our community.
190 It is somewhat important, but not the top priority
191 I think using green space for expanding agricultural use is important. I am against the use of GMO and chemicals.
192 Agriculture is an important part of our community, but it is not the only part. It should not be needlessly destroyed, but nor should it be blindly used to stop future development. Balance is required.
193 more small, multiple use farms.
194 expansion of town centres is not the answer when trying to maintain character, but employment is more important in general
195 The people in this county appreciate buying locally produced food, and it reduces our city's carbon footprint to grow our food locally.
196 Jobs, tourism, land use
197
198 Lawrence is a better place when the rural landscape is preserved and/or used for high-quality local agriculture, while the city of Lawrence can maintain its current borders as it grows and prospers.
199
200 It's some of the best farmland in the world so any other use must be a damned good one.
201 Nice to see sustainable farm practices develop in DG Co--this could set us apart & on the vanguard
202 Inside the UGA, the priority should be to bring agricultural properties to a higher and more productive use, consistent with objectives to add jobs and diversity the tax base
203 Plants and ag. enhance the characters of residents
204 support local growers
205 keeping good mix is healthy for all
206 Increasingly we are seeing the value of maximizing the potential for food grown locally. This saves on the costs of nutritional food, reduces trnsportation costs and delays in delivery affecting the quality of food, makes us more aware of the importnance
207
208
209 I think it's very important to protect prime farmland from development and to support local and sustainable agriculture.
210 I'm not sure it's realistic to expand agricultural uses, but we should make every effort to maintain/preserve the prime agricultural land in the county.
211 Without agriculture, we cannot eat. However, the agriculture that we need should be diverse and take into consideration the ecosystems that it impacts. We can't grow 1 crop on acre upon acre and pump the soil full of chemicals - this is not sustainable.
212 I like the idea of community gardens all over the county. Small farms are few and far between and I like to support them over Monsanto.
213 Quality farming soil is a strong asset for Douglas County and we should be focusing on our strengths through sustainable farming

214
215
216 I see it as of dwindling importance to the economy.
217 Protect prime farm land and make rural products convenient to the city as people become more environmentally aware. Also protect rural recreation options.
218 Expanding agricultural is a great idea
219
220 I could write a paper on this. In sum, we really need to localize food production all over--not just the county, but the country. We're not investing enough in alternative fuels, and we're going to pay for it with the food supply unless more people growit
221 maintain, especially those who use less chemicals, aids in healthy air quality and options to buy locally grown food
222
223
224 local food production, green areas, sense of ballance
225
226
227 Feed ourselves, save and enrich the soils, open land filters water, healthy foods, employment, etc. Very important.
228
229 Home grown foods for a local & natural resource - Ag business is importantn and large ag farms can employ decent amounts of poeple. Jobs=People=for the county
230
231
232 The individual farmer should be encouraged and allowed to produce crops without being over regulated by the Federal government, specifically the EPA
233 Let the free market take care of itelf. Don't be restrictive on expansion
234 Agriculture is part of the county's economy, and some people depend on it.
235
236 Local farmers have helped to shape this community, and residents are able to consume products that are grown and developed in the immediate area.
237 I believe that the interest in locally grown food will grow - adds to the economy and the vitality of the community
238
239 It is important to assist local farmers and the farmer's markets, buying locally and eating locally grow produce helps small farmers with sustainability.
240 The soil is productive and local produce is the wave of the future.
241 We need to be careful not to use agriculture as an "excess" to keep improvements/developments from happening at the airport area.
242
243 Population will continue to grow for the foreseeable future; unchecked conversion of food-production land to residential/commercial development is a long-term dead end.
244 I spend most of my time in Lawrence so I am not sure what agricultural benefits Douglas County has
245 People enjoy local produce but it should not come at the cost of limiting the city's commercial growth
246 Ag is important part of the local. Economy- local foods - open & green space are also important
247 Important- once farmland is "developed"- it become unavailable for agriculture. With local

agriculture thre is less need to depend on other communities and transportation // we become less dependent on others
248 Encourage and expand agriculture uses, local food production and access
249 The agricultural uses w/in the county are part of its history and my concern is if we don't make intentional efforts to maintain/expand it could be lost.
250 Let the market decide, if the demand is there, especially on local food, then expand.
251 I think it is important to have a relationship with land and food sources, but the agricultural way of life and economies is not sustainable on a large scale.
252 Plenty of ag land in surrounding area
253 More need for locally-sourced food and economic value of prime farmland
254 To maintain balance referred to in "A" above
255 Its important because large part of population and the community rely on our agriculture as a mean of living such as income and/or eating healthy and organic and/or "local"
256
257
258 Don't know - like to keep some land natural
259 We have tremendous resources in our land that stand to serve us well into the future. Development will not necessarily give us the long term benefits
260
261 We need to be able to feed ourselves rather than importing our food
262 A part of the fabric of the county thats important to maintain
263
264 We need to lead the state in urban agriculture
265
266
267 we need our natural resources of food and trees to sustain life and a healty ecosystem
268 It is a vital part of our health and our input to this community and outside of here
269 There is a need for fresh meat & veggies. Children need exposure to rural life to gain a more complete education.
270 Local food production is important because purchasing products in our community helps keep money in our community.
271 because food produced via corporate agriculture is not healthy on people or the environment. because we have such good soil. because shipping food is hard on the environment
272 Agriculture is important but especially if not more so is economic development. There is agriculture land that becasue of its location would be great industrial sites. Agriculture alone cannot support the township
273 Farming is important to everyone who uses the products and we all do.
274 We need to value our agricultural areas
275
276 To protect our character
277 The local population appreciates the mix of pastoral and urban opportunities
278
279
280
281
282
283
284

285
286
287 Too much concrete makes for a crappy city - no wildlife, parks, local produce, etc
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298 More people moving in - We need more food and better healthier food. Non GMO is great! We need to sustain ourselves!
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314 Agriculture, especially small family farms, is what makes this part of the country livable. Note, I said small family farms, not big agribusiness corporate farms whose owners have no ties to the county and community.
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324 Economic development, food sources, life and vitality.
325
326
327 The Farmers Market and local farmers are a critical element of what makes Douglas County unique.
328

329 It will become vital to be able to produce food locally.
330 It's part of our identity & economy. That said, I'd like to see family farms being maintained & expanded. Not so much the out-of-town corporations.
331
332
333
334 food security will ultimately be a local or, at best, regional matter.
335
336 I'd like more agriculture within the city on small scale. Cooperative plots or smaller operations. I'd like to see the nursery on 15th street be revitalized in some way.
337
338
339
340 locally grown food is an important part of what makes the county a nice blend of urban and rural.
341
342 We've got the best soil in the world here and the best people to care for it and use it to feed the local community. With the hosting of events like the Mother Earth News fair, we are poised to become a center of progressive growing technology/practices
343 We've got the best soil in the world here and the best people to care for it and use it to feed the local community. With the hosting of events like the Mother Earth News fair, we are poised to become a center of progressive growing technology/practices
344 maintain natural habitat and agricultural use, development with less impervious surfaces, local mitigation when necessary (not elsewhere in the state)
345
346
347
348 It is part of the cultural heritage of this place. Also, we have a good local food base here, and this must be supported and improved.
349
350 In order to foster food sovereignty, ag use - including small-scale - should be promoted.
351
352
353
354
355 It IS very important!
356 for sustainable living
357 great soil - natural rainfall - do NOT need more ticky-tacky residential or commercial development!
358 To provide more organic fruits and vegetables for resturants and schools, farmers markets.
359 Times change, the status quo may or may not be appropriate
360 need to maintain it for food.
361
362
363
364
365
366
367

368	A good rural mix is important.....Family farms are a stabilizing factor to the surrounding insanity.
369	
370	
371	
372	
373	

	F. What are two issues facing Douglas County that should be addressed in the updated comprehensive plan?
1	sprawl and the growing socio-economic divide between east and west
2	The concept of infill in a County
3	
4	
5	the unchecked growth of Lawrence into agricultural areas, and the threat of island annexation into areas closes to Lawrence
6	Growth areas of the county and proper determination of how that growth should be guided.
7	taxes taxes taxes. Not enough of a tax base so homeowners get hit hard. Employment opportunities. Too much Welfare
8	1. seniors: better transportation to Dr's appts, etc. and housing aimed at seniors 2. education other than KU - technical schools and expanded community college classes. KU isn't oriented for the non-traditional student
9	
10	Ex-urban spawal from Johnson County and fragmentation of farmland and open space.
11	Drought warning, cost of living
12	Identify major vehicle transportation routes and then upgrade the cross sections to for more forgiving cross sections. Second is maintaining stream flow water quality.
13	Preservation of agricultural land (especially type one and two soils in the flood planes.) Focus on water conservation, reuse, etc.
14	
15	Regulatory burden
16	improve relations between City and County. One of the two are wrong about the unequal support...
17	loss of agricultural land, water issues
18	Commercial Growth; Water availability.
19	
20	
21	Affordable housing (also transitional housing) & a mechanism for offsetting large commercial & housing development that receive zoning/infrastructure/financial benefits with a mandatory amount of affordable housing or contributions affordable housing fund
22	
23	Over-reliance on fossil fuels and its cousin, sprawl.
24	Lack of primary jobs in Lawrence and encouragement of increased commercial and retain development in Lawrence.
25	
26	avoidance of development not close to existing developed areas
27	1. Developing infrastructure for growing community while maintaining current resources and structures 2. Creating opportunities for local businesses and farms and marketing the benefits of

supporting the local community (with students).
28
29
30 A comporehensive traffic plan matched to a comnprehensive and enforcable growth plan.
31 Allow wanted businesses to build here and listen to the people who have good ideas, although, mostly, contrary to what the leaders want to hear or try
32 1) Balanced growth: rational approaches to economic development that include quality of life issues like clean water, healthy food, arts and culture, educational opportunities, and community relationships as well as jobs. 2) Cost of living.
33 We need to avoid over-suburbanization and focus on creating more density in the already developed areas. Avoid excessive subdivision sprawl which destroys farm land and requires new roads and infrastructure that we can't affort to maintain.
34
35
36
37 water, and jobs (not service sector jobs either).
38 Our 125 bed homeless shelter is full, and there's no transportation from there to the center of town, where jobs are.
39 Crop diversity and organic practices.
40
41
42 traffic and reduction of taxes
43 Zoning - discourage urban sprawl with restrictive zoning. Prohibit the use of prime agricultural land for industrial development. Encourage historic preservation.
44
45 buying local and independent farms; small agricultural businesses.
46 sprawl. ag runoff.
47 NA
48 Appropriate land use
49 The rental inspections and adding better paying jobs,
50
51
52 Wide spread housing developments.
53
54
55 Stop the paving and growth in Northwest Lawrence
56
57 Sediment filling of Clinton lake and low water level (lack of control over water level)
58 Overdevelopment of prime agricultural land and better integration of county and city govt.
59
60 Taking care of existing infrastructure & getting the city of Lawrence to go to an independently elected mayor & a ward system instead of an antiquated 100 year old popularity contest of an at-large elected city commission
61 Protection of rich agricultural ground
62 The lack of community colleges / vocational schools for certificaton - thanks for the new bus system but our kids shouldn't have to go JCCC
63
64 Resources should be used to promote less development, and add more support and depth to

current uses
65
66
67
68
69
70 Potholes in roads and uneven roads
71
72 Preservation of our precious farmland, sustainable energy use
73
74
75 Water policy and development beyond the current city limits of Lawrence and Baldwin City.
76 1-Increasing/maintaining agricultural use, 2-supporting local, family owned businesses
77
78 1. Keep the environmental chapter from being watered down. Douglas County needs to protect its natural environment. 2. Stop allowing exceptions to zoning.
79 Better city planning, and keeping to our environmental values.
80 Sprawl and Sprawl
81 Availability of mental health resources. A food store in North Lawrence.
82
83 What will the city do for the less fortunate area's of town. What will the city do to bring more job's to Lawrence.
84 industrial zoning more ammenities for industrial growth
85 Fluoridated water and cease all activity related to UN Agenda 21. It's un-American.
86 Fluoride in the water supply. Pesticides causing colony collapse disorder of our honey bees.
87 Taxation. Balanced budget.
88 More affordable housing options for middle income seniors, sidewalks, making the community age friendly so older adults can live in their homes as long as possible.
89 Bridges in need of improvement and maintenance. Limit tax increases with more taxable business development.
90
91 Universal design for new homes and more low to middle income housing
92 1- Unsightly entrances to Lawrence (K-10 East and North 2nd are nasty looking and give bad first impression). 2 - Poor and neglected street surfaces, curbs and sidewalks in older areas of Lawrence (east of Iowa) St.
93 Water use and Engery production
94
95
96 Access to human resources (food, shelter, healthcare of all kinds) for those in need and preservation of the quality of life for everyone in our community, not just those who can afford to pay for it.
97 Reasonable, thoughtful growth, with an idea to look at other areas besides the Western part of town; research other ways to increase revenue without increasing taxes on the community
98 Help local growers protect and develop prime growing land. Be thoughtful about how we're growing so that we don't erode from the inside out as we keep developing outward.
99 Increased bicycle infrastructures.
100
101

102 Traffic flow, and planning to enhance economic opportunity throughout the county.
103
104 Un-necessary business expansion (specifically over the wetlands) which is opposed by many including those who should have rights to that land.new development when there are so many empty business buildings throughout town.
105
106 Development on the west side of Lawrence. Over-dependence on cars due to lack of safe bike lanes , poorly maintained sidewalks, and lack of benches or shade/shelter at most bus stops.
107 Not allowing unlimited growth of urban, industrial complexes, and encouraging more leisure use of existing waterways, etc.
108
109
110
111 maintain and expand agricultural ues in the county, balancing these interests with development.
112 Balance preserving the character of thwe county with urban needs.
113 Water,sewage as inevitable city expansion occurs
114 encroaching of urban uses into the county; water rights
115
116 urban/suburban sprawl and expansion of agriculture that supports sustainability and small farm success
117 Dealing with the drought and the use and conservation of water resources.
118 Long-term sustainability (as opposed to short-term profits) and maintaining the wild areas.
119
120
121
122 Preservation of wildlands and farms, and transportation
123 the destruction of the south east wetlands is a travesty which has brought shame to our community. Green preservation should supersede development.
124
125 Poverty & job creation; Access to healhy, affordable food
126
127 Land is being taken away from wildlife/farmers to make a highway. That is an issue in my book.
128 not sure
129 Infrastructure. Services
130 Neighborhood schools need to be protected from state decisions to cut education.
131 Road expansion - especially 23rd Street (access to KC) and improve access points to I-70 (access to Topeka) AND encouraging more business to be based in Lawrence.
132 The Senior Center is not user friendly and/or accessible. The infrastructure is changing to a less friendly environment.
133 Containment of "growth" in Lawrence into the rural / undeveloped land. Need to preserve green space!
134 Think about the construction! Rome was not built in a day but they think if they change every street at the same time, the town will appreciate it, NOT!
135
136
137 Wetlands conservation; drinking water security
138 Overgrowth of mulit-residential housing and housing prices.
139 Access to outdoor exercise and indoor activity close to all neighborhoods. Less tax relief for

private developers.
140 Affordability for all.
141 Don't know
142 Food security and public and pedestrian transportation
143 1. There is no mention of the quality of life, blending of goals and objectives. 2. How will the plan strengthen our sense of community!
144
145 Preserving prime agricultural lands. Limiting the expansion of rural residences not associated with farming.
146 support/increase "infill" of Lawrence to suspend outward growth and increase use of alternative energy in businesses and homes, etc.throughout county
147 Farmland conservation and water resource management
148 1. Stop urban sprawl by corporate developers (e.g., Rock Chalk Park that voters should have decided). 2. Investigate EMF radiation harm caused by "smart" utility meters.
149
150 Roads and residential controls.
151 Maintaining or increasing undeveloped land and restricting five acre exemptions.
152
153 Maintaining class one soils in North Lawrence for agricultural use. Preventing blight in older areas that must compete with new apartment complexes.
154
155 extreme low income housing is virtually non-existant
156
157 The comprehensive plan is too restrictive in it's preservation of privately held property.
158 The process for which to start and expand a business (too cumbersome), and making resources and funds availalbe for start ups
159 Restoring the sidewalks throughout and incorporating additional shared use paths throughout. People are seeking high paying healthy communities. Shopping is not near as important as outdoor neighborhood exercise opportunities.
160 20 acre minimum resident requrement and allowing the farmers to farm with out EPA restrictions
161 Increase our commercial tax base so we can continue to enjoy the amenities we all love. Attract and inspire entrepreneurs and business leaders to locate and grow their businesses here.
162 Lack of sidewalks & effective crosswalks on busy streets.
163
164 preserving native landscapes on the south end of Douglas County, and river access/crossings.
165
166 roads, several roads are in need of repair.
167 We need better transportation options, and I believe the completion of the SLT will help this greatly.
168 Water quality and quantity and incentives for further economic development
169 Escalating taxes. Eliminate the excessive regulations and hoops one needs to locate build, or rebuild something in Douglas county
170 Better roads and better jobs.
171 The old policy's stationS, parking
172
173 less ugly development
174 Zoning must be addressed that doesn't introduce additional risk, but encourages, rather than

detracts from business that might want to move here. Ecodevo activities need to have real metrics like job creation after five years to earn an incentive

175 Fiber Optic Connection Infrastructure

176

177 the planning for growth so that it is in line with values of the community and dg co moves forward in synch with the city of lawrence

178 economic growth and education

179

180 empty office buildings , city water supply

181

182 create a nature and education park out of the pickney swamp

183 Lack of economic growth opportunities and limited opportunities to raise revenue to support county services.

184 1. Too much commercial zoning going on, spreading out the uses of property throughout - not good. 2. Government officials are spending too much time looking at ways to spend money rather than looking out for the financial interests of all citizens

185

186 Responsiveness to new business/jobs opportunities. University/community connections, more than just sports

187 development of single family in the county without being 20 acres minimum requirement building permits easier to get and more friendly to the private individual

188 first and foremost is global warming, also water

189

190 the "feel" of being in the country is greatly diminished by the encroaching highway system--growth and expansion need to be strictly regulated.

191 Polarization of the poor and the well off. Developers being allowed to control the growth of the city, receiving large incentives, and using tax payers funds to do so.

192 Soil protection trumping other agricultural land use and the rigidness of the comprehensive plan during the planning process.

193

194 traffic (integrated car, public transport, bicycle and pedestrian uses) and employment (boosting technology sector)

195 Renewable energy expansion and better care of animal issues (such as implementing trap-neuter-return for feral and stray cats, which is a humane and effective cat colony management method in use in many counties in the United States).

196 Tourism, downtown expansion

197 Travelable infrastructure, get rid of the city buses

198 How to maintain the unique qualities that Lawrence possesses without slipping into the culture of mediocrity that plagues most small towns in the American Midwest (i.e. value local businesses over national and international businesses, etc).

199 City growth into the county. Consider city+county funding for the public library.

200 Non-existant or myopic "planning," perhaps best exemplified by the row of driveways (some not yet installed) on the east side of E 1600 Rd just south of N 1000 Rd. These homes (most yet to be built) should share ONE entrance to E 1600 Rd.

201 Nurture sustainable farming and attract complementary industry for increased economic growth

202 Establishing reliable and well defined areas for commercial, industrial and residential growth; ensuring that development in the county is not unreasonably hindered by "environmental" policies, which policies should be minimal inside the UGA

203 Please fence off part of Burcham or Veteran's park for a dog park. Animals roam, owners chat. Look at photos of Sept. "Pet Plunge" if you need
204 Keeping Douglas County separate in vision from Johnson & Shawnee
205 ugly development and take over of established neighbor by developers
206 1) The value of "intergenerational" development and making the community "affordable" for all.
207 Transportation and senior activity
208 Leave family neighborhoods the way they are for those that want that type of living area
209
210 Rate and importance of incorporation; development and appropriateness of wind power expansion.
211 1. Unwanted urban/commercial sprawl 2. Sustainable agriculture (this affects everything from the quality of Douglas County's air, soil, water, etc.)
212 I like the direction we are going in, but the expansion of Lawrence westward is getting out of hand. So much beige.
213 Focus on sustainable local farming and food production and the smart development of the Urban core of lawrence through added density.
214 affordable houseing and gentrification
215 roads. development
216 Coordination with the municipalities. Encroaching suburbanization.
217 Restrain sprawl. Conserve water resources.
218
219
220 Ban the sale of fireworks county-wide, more transportation options between smaller towns like Eudora and Lawrence or Overland Park
221
222 Better bike routes, east-west -----
223
224 forward looking to curb excessive development, environmental pollution
225
226 Crime prevention (especially theft/robbery and drunk driving), affordable housing
227 Preservation of historic structures, viewscapes, stories of all-rich and poor and recognising that this work brings jobs, education and pride to our community. Second, making community decisions based on more than economic gain.
228
229 Over population/too many apartment buildings/rentals, not enough jobs that are long-term sustainable employers
230
231
232 Continue increase in population. Increase in the desire for water meters when building homesites in the county
233 Wastewater and drinking water so that Lawrence can grow south of the Wakarusa River
234 Affordable, quality housing and community building
235
236 Better roadways for cyclists and motorists to share. Specifically HWY 1055 between Baldwin and Lawrence. At time this area becomes unsafe for both to share. Douglas Co. Lake could be improved with a park and sidewalks connecting to Baldwin City
237 Maintain the historic character of downtown and original townsite neighborhoods, preserving agricultural lands

238
239 Maintaining downtown's viability and regulating sustainable growth for local businesses.
240 encourage safe and sustainable development of apartment complexes; ensure adequate public parking in univerisity neighborhood
241 How jobs fit into the counties devel. plan
242
243 Expansion of city borders; failure to zone for greater residential density within the city, esp. around the KU campus; too many KU students have to live far from campus.
244 recycling (doot-to-door would be nice to have), more streetlights in Lawrence
245 Emmissions from future major roadways and industrial facilities, limiting effects of urban sprawl around parks and lakes.
246 Promoting biking and walking for transportation- better integration of transportation planning and site design
247 Residential Development in the rural areas of the county- removing ground for agricultural uses as well as the demands of residential use for services. Expansion or development of public transportation between the cities of the county.
248 Expansion of Lawrence, comprehensive/connected nature of county as a whole community. Demand for local products/food
249 1. Having appropriate and well planned land for business to come to Douglas County (Industrial). 2. Balance of protecting the history & cultural aspects of our community while working hard to create opportunities for the future.
250 Preserve open space, attract business
251 Access to technology - wireless infrastructure. Local centers for personal improvement, for example wellness centers, educational centers,
252 Increased sprawl in rural areas
253 Regional transit, esp. KU traffic: less trips and VMT. Alternative transportation.
254 Make Lawrence more attractive to business. Maintain rural character or unincorporated area
255 As always - commercial development - where guidelines, as well as being open to new developments. As expansion/population is moving out west, trying to control sprawl. Preserving agricultural land as community develops to west and south.
256 Bike access, traffic flow
257
258 Don't know
259 Green space & environmental impact
260
261 Aging infrastructure, enhance tourism of local history, increase public land for increased natural areas
262 Bicycle & pedestrian lanes connectivity
263
264 Our economy should not be foused on growth, it should focus on sustained profit. Focus on the building of a long term infrastructure - 80 years - rather than economy of housing construction cheap
265
266
267 The K-10 bypass and how it will change the traffic and economy and the need for afforable housing for young families & students
268 East side needs shopping and grocery stores
269 Expansion of industry into outlying area to enable more even tax base.

270 Lack of jobs for 20-30 year olds
271 1. water, both quality and quantity. 2. limiting both retail and housing projects. We do not have the population growth to meet the # of projects proposed.
272 Economic development which grows jobs and helps provide revenues.
273
274 Preparing and planning for Rock Chalk Park development - keeping key folks invloved such as school districts
275
276 More industry
277 Border creep. Major facilities developed outside of walking distance of central resources - necessity for long-term, high-cost public transportation operations.
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287 More bike lanes/paths. Block Mass. from 6th to 11th to cars - make it totally pedestrian (like Pearl St. in Boulder)
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296 We need to be proactive about designing infrastructure in preparation for less availability of fossil fuel. We need to be very wary of the lure of homogenizing, pell mell growth and development which destroys both the character and health.
297
298 More bike lanes! Coordinated construction on roads, so we always have a decent alternate route - Not all construction at the same time!
299
300 More jobs
301 City should consider removing all cars from Mass St. Walkin mall with more parking on New Hampshire & Vermont. Also way more liquor. More bars and restaurants on Mass St
302
303
304
305 Sustainable growth
306
307
308
309

310
311
312
313
314 Sprawl and sprawl.
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324 Neighorhood centers and schools, safety and health.
325
326
327 Retaining the historic uniqueness that draws people here. Avoiding a West vs East divide in Lawrence.
328 improved walkability and biking ability for everyday life and better pedestrian area crime prevention
329 Climate change, water supply.
330 Am not sure.
331
332
333
334
335
336 Walkability and creating sense of community within the neighborhoods.
337
338
339
340 1. The county that holds the state's largest university doesn't have the best public schools? Why not? 2. Facilitate growth in a sustainable way that retains the character and values of the area.
341
342 A GREEN BELT around the city. We should not be putting major industrial/retail developments south of the S.Law. Trafficway or North of I70 in river floodplains
343 A GREEN BELT around the city. We should not be putting major industrial/retail developments south of the S.Law. Trafficway or North of I70 in river floodplains
344 limit retail and residential growth in an effort to maintain natural habitats and agricultural use; school system and budget per child
345
346
347
348 Balance in supporting current uses in sustainable way, maintaining sensible infrastructure and mixed uses.
349
350 Mill-levy?

351 Maintain sustainable environment through water (wetlands, natural growth) and pollution management.
352 Affordable housing, transportation
353
354
355
356 locations of future agricultural land / locations of future farmer's markets and educational events and tours
357 better pay at jobs that are here. Preserving rural characteristics of county.
358
359 Development, residential and industrial
360 green space in the city, safer bike lanes
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368 No growth movement and inflated tax and land prices
369
370
371
372
373

1. How would you describe the character of Lawrence?

1
2 overbearing incompetence that lacks vision. Every "laterst" program is implements without any long term vision. Vision such as 20/20 is routinely ignored or exempted.
3
4
5 bi-polar: a worldly atmosphere surrounding KU, and Johnson County like with unchecked housing development
6 Eclectic medium sized city.
7
8 very liberal
9 Open minded
10 Unique with something for everyone.
11 The Gentrified Hipsters and the Middle Class
12 A college town with a solid business community
13 College town/ increasingly a bedroom community.
14
15
16 extremely political
17 liberal, youthful, vibrant
18 Liberal and independent minded, but with too much big development leading the way

19 growth averse
20
21 part metropolitan, part smaller community, part larger suburban style sprawl; an artsy community
22
23 A progressive university community that aspires to offer above-average quality of life, but can't always deliver on that aspiration.
24 University-centered, growing and diverse community.
25
26 eclectic
27 Exciting and excepting
28 Finicky
29 Lawrence is wonderful city inspite of high taxes and a city commission that is controlled by a few developers.
30 Hopelessly muddled
31 Riding on KU's tail. Presented as a welcoming, safe community but is not and tries too hard to retain downtown, ignoring profitable businesses that have expressed interest in expanding here
32 Quirky, fun, lively, more liberal than the rest of the state, but still surprisingly conservative, combative in ways that may be frustrating for some but often result in good balance between quality of life concerns and strictly financial/econom concerns.
33 Strong in history and character. Unique, well-defined older neighborhoods surrounding a great downtown and university. Other, outlying new subdivisions with good roads and pedestrian infrastructure.
34
35
36 fun, active, atristic, musical, educated, ecentric, community driven, a place to spend my silver and golden years
37 A city of environmental extremists which goes out of its way to wage war on motorists, for revenue enhancement, and undue spying (LPR).
38 Lawrence is a friendly, open community, full of creative, kind, compassionate people.
39 Healthy community wannabe crossed with "don't tell me what to do, who cares if we're well."
40
41
42 Backwards
43 A liveable small town threatened with the loss of the qualities that have made it such by the constant drumbeat of Chamber-types for life-quality defeating growth.
44
45 Diverse, unique, exciting, active, family oriented.....
46 progressive, historic, diverse, educated, tolerant, but overdeveloped and unwalkable and otherwise somewhat poorly planned, land use largely controlled by the development community. The university administration is a largely unreachable power unto itself.
47 Getting to be like a large city.
48 Vibrant/history/character
49 A bunch of angry people.
50
51
52 Moderate sized community heavily influenced by a large university.
53 nice, energetic

54 small town, lacking services and retail options but with unique college influences
55 Irresponsible growth
56
57 Caring and supportive of schools, arts and library
58 Still somewhat unique, but trending in a bad way toward becoming more like a KC suburb.
59
60 Shallow & uppity
61 Artistic, inclusive, but too expensive.
62 Educated / Open to new ideas and cultures but yet rooted in Kansas and all that; that entiles-The history / Jayhawks / FreeState
63
64 Interesting
65
66
67 Great
68
69
70 Liberal and Home
71 unique, quasi-urban, vital, progressive (except for lack of bike paths and walk ways)
72 Attractive place for a diverse population
73
74
75 Busy but with many many opportunities for enjoyment.
76 Changing from quirky, unique, a place where people want to visit, shop, live to a cookie cutter version of a suburb like parts of Johnson County.
77 Accepting
78 I like the parts of the city that are built on the grid, with sidewalks on both sides of the street. It has a real home feel to it. The "Johnson County" part of the city and its ubiquitous franchises is boring and wasteful.
79 Nice downtown with great historic neighborhoods, bordered on the west by typical sprawl, cup-de-sacs, and franchises.
80 Slowly growing college town
81 Typical College Town
82 Fun, quirky, intelligent, liberal, progressive, culturally diverse, tolerant, friendly, proud of its history, and crazy about KU and basketball.
83 Lawrence is one of a kind and a great place to live.
84 anti growth dont do enough to encourge more business
85 Welcoming
86 Lively, friendly, and
87 Liberal, tax and spend, taxation and spending out of control
88 eclectic
89 Vibrant and culturall with an excellent university and a strong downtown area inthe face of periferal shopping centers. Downtown residential development should help anchor the downtown.
90
91 Progressive, caring, and inclusive
92 college-oriented (which is good).
93 Generally known as the liberal, progressive community in Kansas

94
95 Open minded and accepting.
96 Small-town charm with big city dreams
97 Liberal and laid back
98 Open to new ideas, attractive, progressive, focus on the environment, fitness, and the outdoors, commitment to sustainability, good place for families, the arts, music, fun!
99 Awesome
100 Vibrant, independent, colorful
101
102 Quirky. A bit eccentric. Not certain whether to embrace change or hold to tradition.
103
104 Liberal, inclusive, diverse
105 Lots of fluff and not much substance.
106 Offbeat, artsy, lots of cultural opportunities, but not nearly as bike or pedestrian friendly as it could be.
107 Diverse, tolerant, rich in culture. Too allowing of development by realtors, builders
108
109
110 Eclectic yet stagnant and intolerant of growth for new business.
111 short-sighted
112 Progressive
113 Beauty and people friendly
114 often times, arrogant in its view of itself as an enlightened city; progressive in its attitude toward different ideas
115
116 It's becoming Johnson County except in a city setting
117 A combination of liberal and conservatives with very few moderates.
118 Independent, creative, and a little bit rebellious and rough around the edges
119 Energetic, Artistic, & Friendly
120
121
122 It is a commuter town.
123 A great funky town with a unique character, where individuality is accepted and preservation of both the environment and a suburban life style is prized.
124
125 Caring, educated, progressive, a thriving community
126
127 Funky
128 anti-economic development friendly, quirky, interesting, artsy, intelligent, liberal
129 Quirky mix of old and new.
130 Unique.
131 Helpful, Hardworking, Hippie
132 There are many kind, caring people who misunderstand the needs of their disabled persons.
133 Paving over all green space, ruled by rich developers with a beautiful vibrant downtown
134 Selfish, don't think of the people that pay the taxes!
135
136 small town
137 Diverse weird small town urban awesomeness

138
139 Forward thinking in education, health and environment.
140 We are more open than a lot of communities to different lifestyles & ideas.
141 Eclectic
142 Formerly funky and now getting over corporatized
143 Fragmented by competing interests.
144 Politically and morally corrupt
145 Older neighborhoods, especially those near the KU campus, are becoming slums through the dramatic increase in rental properties.
146 politically "progressive" in relation to state political stance, majority educated (but, not aware of positive aspects of rural Douglas county or rest of state) tendency to be "self righteous" in relation to rest of state
147 Uniquely itself
148 Mid-sized cultural university town that offers good quality of life
149
150 Owned by a few developer family's.
151 Funkiness resisting idiotic development.
152
153 A vibrant, friendlly and caring community, with a very special downtown area. It also reflects having KU in its midst which provides not only educational opportunities, but also cultural as well. Lawrence is one of the best places we have ever lived.
154
155 too much sports and not enough employment opportunities
156
157 There are natural geographic features that play a strong role is determing where growth occurs. It has been orderly.
158 Vibrant, cultural, open minded
159 Friendly yet the crime rate is moving higher which comes with growth. Larger cities are the perfect example.
160 Aloof. the vocal minority feels like they should run the city. There is a big difference between smart growth and no growth.
161 Lawrence is a progressive, cosmopolitan and intellectual community with a proud history and a thriving culture.
162 Community- oriented
163
164 small town with big city amenities.
165
166 welcoming, progressive, attractive, supportive
167 For the most part, splendid, although stressed. While there are many wonderful services we enjoy here, many are concerned with the sustainability of them without putting more and more pressure on homeowners.
168 Diverse, artsy and alive
169 It's not as special as you like to think
170 Quirky
171 Too busy
172
173 very good
174 Lawrence is of an evolving character right now. There are parts of it that are quaint, and other

parts that need serious redevelopment.
175 Robust
176
177 friendly, concerned about citizens, looking for growth but not at the expense of the college town closeness and character.
178 unique
179
180 typical midwest college town
181
182 charming
183 Active, semi-progressive but catering to many special interest groups.
184 A community spreading out too far in all directions, rather than supporting and protecting the downtown district.
185
186 A teenager with lots promise for a successful life
187 lot of people packed in small spaces. No good tranportation plan for the number of people in the town
188
189 A small town without being too small. A good community. Somewhat progressive.
190 it has many amenities of a big city, but has mostly maintained its small-town feel.
191 Unique, a destination for culture, art and a little peace and quiet.
192 As a very culturally alive place to live, but stagnant in that certain elements in town do not want any growth and fight against all types.
193
194 small-town friendly with a strong college twist
195 Unique and pleasant
196 Unique
197 Active, progressive
198 A high-quality small town
199 Vibrant-Active
200 An oasis of reason in a desert of willful myopia
201 Half funky, half "suburban" or manicured. Getting more and more car-centric (hence suburban feel)
202 I choose to live here because it offers the perfect mix of quality of life and business opportunity, but that opportunity is not made available to everyone who seeks it. Not everyone's children will be able to live and work here when they grow up, sadly
203
204 Accepting of all
205 good
206 A fairly progressive community that has too often been directed to the advantage of the "advantaged" residents
207 snooty
208 Family community --- Natural, healthy focus
209
210 Lawrence is a very UNIQUE community and provides many opportunities for both natives and visitors that do not exist in the immediate area.
211 Please see answer to A above.
212 A progressive mecca in a state drowning in tea.

213
214
215 welcoming
216 Quirky and comfortable.
217 A university city too obsessed with growth.
218 College town. Underpaid and overpriced.
219
220 Small-town but growing, a little spot of blue-purple in a sea of red
221 very diverse
222 really great small town!
223
224 diversified
225
226 Friendly, welcoming, relatively diverse- student centric- heavy emphasis on local business
227 Struggling
228 Small town feel with the vibrant downtown. (too much sprawl far east and west) university feeling with the ebb and flow traffic during winter/summer
229 Fun town - kind of conceided - a nice community to visit-definitely built around KU - expensive, terrible drivers and horrible consturction projects that impede driving. Getting through town sucks!!
230 Young, liberal and open
231 Progressive and tolerant. Concerned about education
232 Diverse and welcoming!
233 Very diverse, just like the county.
234 Complex
235
236 Lawrence is a wonderful place that promotes diverse thought and local business.
237 great downtown and good neighborhoods... sprawl on the edges
238
239 Open minded and liberal
240 Highly attractive to educated, cultured persons
241 Divers & a bedroom community
242
243 Confused and dated.
244 See Part A. The one thing I don't like is the sprawl in West Lawrence. It seems very segregrated (gated/fenced in housing communities next to strip malls & plazas). It breaks up the community feeling you get from downtown and I don't like to travel toit
245 college town, liberal for the midwest
246 The best place in Kansas.
247 A very attractive place- many programs and opportunities to be involved and participate
248 Liberal, community minded, fairly accepting, fairly diverse racially and very diverse economically
249 Small town feel w/ urban characteristics, resistent to change, diverse perspectives
250 Urban-lite, mixed urban/suburban, excellent attention to historical
251 Lawrence has the feel of a small town with many of the amenities of a larger community
252 Suburban college town with character combined with Johnson Co. suburban
253 Small town w/ dreams of growing up, but not too fast
254 Upscale, liberal minded college community
255 Historical, Artistic, Unique, Community

256 Active, proud
257 Diverse, bedroom community
258 Cares about its people and the environment
259 Forward thinking
260 Quirky, eclectic, unique, interesting- you have old mixed with new, and while some of the new could have been incorporated in a better manner it is light years ahead of other places I've lived or been.
261 Economically rich but wealth and power concentrated with few people. Too much new building instead of reuse or renovation
262 Small town America with strong influance from major university
263 Very creative diverse community that is reflected in the character of Lawrence
264 See page 1
265 Downtown and north Lawrence have a neighborhood feel, but much of the city feels sprawled and suburbian
266 Little big town. Value history and culture of community.
267 Open-minded, global view, friendly and festive, people take pride in their homes & hometown sports
268 It seems people in trailers are being pushed out. Maybe approach landlords with better upkeep instead of displacing tenants
269 Progressive, cultural, business and educulturally-oriented - (keeping away from balance of county)
270 Cultural, interesting, full of good products to purchase
271 University town with liberal thinking. There is diversity and tolerance for all lifestyles. There is a social conscience that embraces the "common good". Diversity and creativity are especially encouraged. However, there is a greedy tendency to overbuild.
272 A city that has protected its identity which many people are jealous
273 A college town catering to students.
274 Diverse, well-educated
275
276 college town
277 Urban in the east and cookie-cutter suburban in the west
278 Small own feel in a University Community
279 engaging
280 Small town quality east of Iowa, relative ease in getting places not during rush hour, great diversity of people
281 Small city that tries (kinda)
282 Academic, liberal politically, interested in the arts. Pride in community, its history, contrations the majority however are rather detatched from the community
283 The feel of a welcoming and inclusive small city with ample opportunities for art, theatre, music, public forums, educational programs. The quirkiness and uniqueness of Lawrence is a major factor in its charm.
284 An diverse Midwestern university town that is "full of itself" with elected officials that consistently cave in to "developers"
285 Very diverse @ all level's. Most unusual
286 Lacks confidence and vision. Not equipped with skill and toolsto make projects work. Especially mixed use. Land use policies are very conservative. Development opportunities are overly mananged, studied and delayed. population growth rate from 2000-13 ave
287 Funky & awesome!

288 We are fortunate to have a vibrant downtown, which we must ensure continues that way. We show clear signs of sprawl - not all of it seems to have been thought out.
289 Rowdy
290 divided, almost like two city
291 Divided - inegu table; too commercial. Fiesty - spirited
292 Small town feel
293 Progressive/diversified
294 A town that wants to grow - but doesn't capitalize on the opportunities
295 A unique community based town. Emphesis on local community and experences available. Lawrence is loved for it's uniqueness, not its convenience.
296 Progressive, forward looking, livable.
297 Still retaining some of the rural agriculture/charm of Kansas while being a metropolitan area that has had a unique identity fueld by the university and arts community
298 Fun, Adventurous, Ourdoorsy, Open Minded
299 Smart, vibrant, tolerant of all life-styles, very little violent crime
300 Young artsy & athelitic educate
301 Very nice
302 Lawrence is parochially-minded; wanna be big city and wanna be small town; Lawrence is ideally situated to have a picturesque urban core and cultural center (downtown) and maintain major education/research/athletic university.
303 Quirky - charming - unique - accepting - liberal
304 Eclectic
305 Progressive Kansas college
306
307 Unique, diverse, creative; however, needs to address needs of low to moderate income housing needs
308 eclectric, liberal
309 Friendly, creative, safe, interesting
310 Vibrant, but mostly a car oriented city.
311
312 Diverse, liberal, progressive, expressive, artistic, green-focused
313 College town atmosphere with pressure to develop in ways that potentially conflict with the historical character.
314 Lawrence is ideologically and monitarily split east / west starting between Meadowbrook apartments and Kasold drive. This needs to change as it leads to improvements out west at the expense of improvements in East Lawrence.
315
316 Unique, vibrant college town
317 Suburban for large part, but some close neighborhoods in places. City full of interested people doing a lot of projects (eg art, music, politics, etc)
318 I believe we still have a vibrant down town. I would hate that to be destroyed. I would like to make Lawrence more bikeable and pedestrian friendly.
319 It seems that Lawrence is moving more and more towards being a city of automobiles, wide roads and parking lots
320 Interesting and funky. Do feel that some small group of people have more power than other small groups. But that is everywhere.
321 Unique for the state of Kansas, similar to other college towns. Urban sprawl detracting from Lawrence's best qualities. Getting to be a bit to big for optimal livability. Arts a strength.

322 Fairly progressive in regard to political thinking compared to the rest of the nation; very progressive politically compared to the rest of Kansas communities. Lawrence is a community of activist-minded individuals.
323 livable, stimulating, enlightened
324 liberal and inviting, having great schools, with great public servants
325
326
327 See above
328 diverse
329 Still with a cohesive city-center but losing it to outside development, both in the suburbs and downtown.
330 Trying to become a combination of Boulder, Colorado & Lenexa, KS. Sold it's soul to KU sports programs.
331
332
333 Eclectic. Land/ED related. Limited development opportunity although that is changing with Venture Park. Still battling to be viewed as business-friendly but I think that has improved some.
334
335 Similar to other college towns. Unique from the rest of the state. Fueled by the arts and the sustainability movement.
336 Family friendly, positive community.
337 Progressive in the arts culture environment and healthy life style
338 Lawrence is a warm inviting community of a mix of rich artsy, historical and entertaiment opportunities to get involved, raise children, work and live
339 Diverse, vibrant, health-oriented, arts-oriented, college town with a healthy downtown
340 Progressive and community oriented. Historical.
341
342 Progressive, cultured and diverse, artsy and liveable!! Let's keep it that way!
343 Progressive, cultured and diverse, artsy and liveable!! Let's keep it that way!
344 nice college town in the midwest
345 Funky and progressive college town with a vital downtown and essential green belt. A healthy and vibrant place to live.
346 Lawrence has a unique character and strong sense of place in part of the city. It is also diverse. It is growing to be a generic town that works and feels the same as any suburb in Kansas City (ie Lenexa, OP, Olathe)
347 Sprawled, excessively dependent on single occupancy autos, on fossil fuel energy, and on most food being from 1500 miles or more, but willing to consider alternatives.
348 A unique regional blend of art and culture in a livable city with a vibrant downtown and great neighborhoods. A wonderful community.
349
350 KU-centric, tax incentives for developers are the norm :(
351 Quintessentially American with international flavors, old time values and global perspectives through the University, Schools, international students and citizens.
352 Diverse and interesting
353 There are really 3 Lawrence's. Remains of the rural town, the new settlers from 1970's-1990, and suburbia from 1990 to present.
354 Lawrence is diverse, from eccentric to homogenized depending on where you are.
355 Collegiate, arts-oriented, liberal, creative

356 unique - in that we have some big city amenities, with a highly educated and cultured population, and yet still maintain a small town local community feel
357 academic, forward-thinking, preserving good things, liberal-thinking
358 Cultural, however Need more positive venues/activities geared towards teenagers.
359 Arts great downtown
360 progressive with encroaching sprawl
361 Charming, friendly, somewhat eccentric, socially liberal, tolerant, very smart/educated, almost cosmopolitan w/ small town feel
362 Lawrence is a bedroom community with a split personality. It contains a mix of walkable neighborhoods and auto-oriented sprawl.
363 It is vibrant, local, conscious of social and environmental issues, and growing. A large player in the community is KU & students.
364 Sprawled, excessively dependent on single-occupany autos, on fossil fuel energy, and on most food beingrom 1500 miles or more, but willing to consider alternatives.
365 College community small commercial/industrial transportation & distribution beginning interconnective transportation
366 A city that is "owned" by developers, landlords, non-resident residential property owners, and the Chamber of Commerce.
367 Down to earth/friendly/liberal town. Just the right size
368 Liberal /
369 Progressive, rooted in its rich history. Culturally diverse, university town, intellectually & culturally vibrant. Ties to farming community.
370 Vibrant, artful, respectful of divergent points of view, relaxed, liveable, friendly, looking to the past while looking to the future.
371 VIbrant community with a diversity of commercial and residential developments. Ranges from downtown in an urban core to quality suburbs. Provides a suitable living environment for all types of residents.
372 Vibrant community with diversity of commercial and residential developments. Ranges from downtown in an urban core to quality suburns. Provides a suitable living environment for all types of residents.
373 Proud, college graduate out in the real world, seeking its place, trusting some of the wrong people and trying desperately to appear confident.

	2. Would you like that character to change, and if so, how?
1	
2	Start by making government employees get a job and stop pretending they know what "business" is like.
3	
4	
5	limit the number of houses being built on the fringes of the city
6	Ensure the tax money is spent on necessities rather than on unneeded wants.
7	
8	
9	
10	Would not like the character to change.
11	More understanding of the diversity of each part of Lawrence
12	No change

13 More fully developed local economy, diversified businesses, small scale fruit and vegetable farms, more downtown residential development, less suburban sprawl.
14
15
16 Improve voter turnout.
17 maybe a little more oriented to older people - more bike friendly, better public transportation
18 Yes. Less developers dictating what we need
19 I would like to see the city be more acceptive of commercial growth
20
21 Only iin ways that encourage the residing homegrown businesses & artists, to continue to make Lawrence a unique draw
22
23 The character is fine as is. We just need to deliver on our aspiration to offer high quality of life to more citizens.
24 Lawrence needs to encourage the growth of primary jobs and encourage the growth of commercial, industrial and retail development. We are falling behind our rival cities (KCK, Olathe, Lenexa, etc.) because we have failed to encourage and welcome growth.
25
26 No--it is what makes Lawrence a delightful place to live
27 Yes, it would be great if we could market our ideas to the surrounding areas. It currently feels very isolated (within Kansas) and if people can't find an opportunity in Lawrence they often leave the state.
28 Somewhat. Continue to work together for the good of the community, not just that in the small bubble of a neighborhood that you live in. Get acclimated with others in Lawrence, not just your area.
29 The city commission needs to be more responsive to the concerns of citizens who live east of Iowa Street.
30 Develope a focus, a plan (enforcable) and an achyievable, affordable schedule to implement it
31 Let KU be KU and focus on attracting better business for the city revenue, jobs and progression. Be known for something else besides KU
32 Not really, although I hope never again to see what gives every appearance of under-the-table dealings resulting in no-bid contracts and questionable work as has been the case with the bypass/6th street debacle. It looks like City corruption.
33 Yes, I would like to change the character to add a cohesive network of urban trail and other pedestrian infrastructure. I would change the character by adding a layer of walkability and bikeabiltiy that we currently lack.
34
35
36 would like for drug houses and gangs to be non-existant in Lawrence...
37 Fewer speed traps, fewer roundabouts, speed bumps, more parking, more road lanes, timed traffic lights. less "art", less arrogant commissioners smoking bongs.
38 only to increase compassion
39 I would like the desire for a focus on well-being to be the norm.
40
41
42 Have the commission not be geared towards giving tax breaks to developers who have the money to pay taxes!
43 Yes, Quit subsidizing commercial real estate development. Turn economic development over to

someone with some common sense and just a small amount of talent (something the Chamber clearly lacks).
44
45 More pedestrian friendly; less emphases on growth and more emphasis on maintaining our unique character.
46 Walkable, rideable, sustainable city. reputation for energy efficiency and environmental sensitivity. Attractive location for retirees.
47 Keep the good that we have
48 No
49 Bring better jobs here so they don't have to drive so far to make a decent wage.
50
51
52 no
53 more downtown parking, more connection to North Lawrence, more riverfront activity
54
55 Save the natural environment
56
57 Get stronger... Be a leader
58 More infill development with consideration for existing housing stock in the infill. Study what draws and keeps people in Lawrence and reinforce that.
59
60 Taking care of existing infrastructure & getting the city of Lawrence to go to an independently elected mayor & a ward system instead of an antiquated 100 year old popularity contest of an at-large elected city commission
61 I would like to see a better living wage.
62 Embrace new medicinal research regarding all kinds of herbs-Let the Holistic well-being approach be supported-whereby supporting our local farmers more.
63
64 In general, no, but it's getting way too big
65
66
67
68
69
70 Have even more young people involved in the town so they can feel like they have something to do and that it's their home.
71 more transportation options such as bike paths and walking paths
72 No!
73
74
75 no
76 Yes, to promote the things that make this place unique; not necessarily the same as the past, but unique in a current way.
77 No
78
79 Get back to square blocks with alleys.
80 Become a communnity more focused on pretecting and preserving the economic health of its existing neighborhoods

81 No!
82 More cow bell.
83
84 more anixation of industrial land and block special interest groups from preventing that
85 No
86
87 If you want to attract people and business, the growing taxation has to stop.
88 No
89 We are on the right tract with downtown development and the likelihood of new companies locating in the east side business park where Farmland Industries used to be.
90
91
92 Less big box crap. Less national chains. More local business. Neighborhood, walkable commercial areas.
93 I would like the character of Lawrence/Douglas County to be more true in practice than in the abstract.
94
95 I'd like it to stay that way.
96 I appreciate the small-town mindset of Lawrence, as well as some of its more urban sensibilities. I would love to see more city resources directed towards equalizing the quality of life for everyone, instead of polarizing it.
97 NO
98 Feels sometimes like developers run this town but don't give back what they should. More thought given to equality across the whole town to help ease the east/west divide that is both real and perceived.
99 Keep it going.
100 There has been a trend in Lawrence where a lot of corporate businesses are coming in and pushing out the local businesses. I do not like this.
101
102 I would like to see a more stable community with planned growth for residential and economic interests.
103
104 No, I would like to see more inclusion of diversity and less large development
105 The city needs to be more ballanced. There needs to be something the city can hang it's hat on besides the university and the home/apt. construction industry.
106 Stronger public transportation, dedicated bike paths separate from traffic, well-maintained sidewalks and trails for pedestrians.
107 Thoughtful development, with \limits on folks like Compton, who has taken over Vt. for his development of another tall building in downtown.
108
109
110 A fair and balanced decision -making group that will consider the needs of the majority and not the few with narrow and specialized desires
111 Longer term goals and vision for the beauty and value offered by the unique character of the county
112 no change needed
113 No
114 a more realistic view of what is needed for all aspects of the city instead of following trends

without clear visioning of this community
115
116 the disparities in income are becoming more and more apparent, thus the Johnson County descriptor. More affordable across incomes housing options that aren't all apartment complexes, better in fill of all neighborhoods.
117 More moderates.
118 I don't particularly want that to change.
119 No, I love the character of Lawrence
120
121
122 Build better sidewalks and bike lanes; connect walkways and bike lanes; Add SAFE crossings across the SLT
123 Restrict development, continue to restore and revitalize downtown, limit urban sprawl, maintain green and natural areas for our children's future.
124
125 No
126
127
128 move a bit more moderate, not quite so liberal---be more econ devo friendly
129 No
130 No.
131
132 I want to see more safe housing for people who are aging and/or disabled. I would like to see patio homes with yards.
133 Stop developing! Incorporate beautiful green space into planning. Expand public transportation
134 First, when someone calls, actually take the time to listen and answer the questions. Treat our citizens of Lawrence with respect. We do pay the taxes around here.
135
136 better jobs, better wages
137 I would like to avoid excessive urban expansion
138
139 Better and more thoughtful planning.
140 Not at all--have traveled the world prefer it here.
141 No!
142 I would like to see better infrastructure for local commerce and community building
143 Various interests supporting each other.
144 Absolutely! Remove the city manager and stop the corruption within the city
145 Lawrence should adopt City Codes that closely regulate rental properties in the city, particularly those in neighborhoods close to the KU campus.
146 Increase openness of KU and HINU to residents (KU/HINU go out to residents in presentations/hospitality (examples: open HINU mueseum for special presentations and have faculty go out - KU become more welcoming to residents, i.e. parking for Spencer/Spoone
147 No.
148 Stop suburban sprawl and maintain unique character (vs. imitating Johnson County). Stop giving away tax abatements and enforce those that haven't met their side of bargains.
149
150 Redevelop the inner core.
151 Hell, yes. Wiser elected officials and a less pro-development staff would be a start.

152
153 It would be great if more local jobs would be available that pay more than minimun wages.
154
155 more living wage jobs
156
157 No.
158 Be more open to growth in untraditional ways
159 No matter how many law officers a community has criminal activity is impossible to manage because crime must take place first.
160 The greater population and majority should be asked how they feel.
161 I love our character, but am concerned that we must grow by 30 - 50,000 employed citizens over the next 20 years to remain vital. A stagnant bedroom community won't be able to sustain itself.
162
163
164 no changes.
165
166 I would not like the character to change unless it's expanded on. Increasing accessibility to transport, the bus should run on Sun and should run longer hours to accommodate those who rely on it to get to and from work, and more access to community gard
167 We need to be more open for economic development, not just locally, but nationally. I'm concerned that our image is permanently damaged nationally.
168 No...Lawrence is great as it is
169 more choice of retail. With choice I do not have to go to Topeka or KC. Mass st retail is a total waste of space for the average person/family that calls Lawrence. Mass st is geared towards KU students
170 No.
171
172
173 no
174 Violent crime needs to be reduced. The City and County need to make it easier to rebuild the eastern half of the city, perhaps as an affordable housing initiative.
175 No
176
177 I'd like a focus on preserving a college town feel with a vibrant downtown and less expansion to the west
178
179
180 i like Lawrence
181
182 no!!
183 Less catering to special interest groups and listen to the mainstream residents - many of which do not work in this community.
184 Quit zoning properties in all directions for the benefit of special interests, rather than maintaining what currently exists.
185
186 Accept the chain stores and restaurants but keep them in design and outskirts, like the northwest Walmart.
187 better transportation on other roads beside mass , 23rd street, 6th and Iowa

188
189 I wish our community was more progressive, more accepting of "new" - but proven - ideas for infrastructure and cultural development.
190 it is, unfortunately, changing somewhat already--I find that bothersome. I would rather see it keep the small-town feel, as that is what has set Lawrence apart from other cities its size.
191 Providing more incentives for artists to live and work here. Providing more art and cultural emphasis. Providing more art and cultural funding. Providing art and cultural tourism.
192 Yes, I would like to see the various cultural life of the city stay vibrant, but still allow the city to grow.
193
194 no
195 It needs to actually meet the progressive reputation that it has in the Midwest.
196 No.
197 no
198 Denser commercial development, better public transit, and less big box development
199 No
200
201 More walkability, more community public spaces
202 Job creation leading to robust geographic expansion to the borders of the UGA and population growth
203
204 Better Infrastructure in older parts of Lawrence
205 no
206 A community that responds to the needs of its broad intergenerational diverse population in terms of income, age, ability etc.
207 more inclusive of outlying communities within the county
208 NO --- Too many large scale stores and apt building are strangling the small business and farmland
209
210 I think we need to prioritize how we allocate funding (and in many cases IF we allocate funding) to preserve Lawrence's unique character.
211 Please see answer to C above.
212 Fewer Mexican restaurants downtown. There are more than enough already.
213
214
215 no.
216 I'd like the community's aesthetic to bend toward modernism over ersatz historicity. New library (good) vs. Oread Hotel (bad).
217 Stop struggling induce faster growth.
218 Yes. I'd like it to be run FOR the people, not the developers
219
220
221 better education for those choosing crime or those struggling with homelessness to live a less stressful life
222
223
224 no
225

226 More family oriented as opposed to student oriented - cost of living, local businesses, crime prevention, etc.
227 More voices in decision making: i.e. women, people of color, all ages, blue collar & under/unemployed. 5 white men on City Commission reflects the power base. At least there is a woman on Cty. Commission.
228 less "cookie cutter housing tracts
229 Just like Lawrence to be more mindful of surrounding communities, more green lights - Yes I would like the character to change - less snobby people, just becasue there is $ available, doesn't mean you should spend it (too many roundabouts)
230 It is becoming more corporate and less oriented to quality of life
231 Would like to see more investments in sidewalks and bicycle lanes, building and maintenance.
232 Not sure.
233
234 It seems like the focus has been on drawing more money and recognition to Lawrence (Rock Chalk Park, SLT development, building projects at KU), but we need to be better stewards of what we have, including the people who fall through the cracks.
235
236 No
237 less sprawl
238
239 More local businesses, increase in the use of alternative energy sources
240 More hiking and biking paths.
241 I would like to create jobs for those who work outside of Lawrence so they can work here.
242
243
244 It would be nice to have more things to do n town. Example: shopping malls, family fun center. I think these might add to the city's shopping/entrtainment options.
245
246 Iproved options for transportation, less cars. More local jobs- living wage
247 Less emphasis on liquor
248 Making housing, services more accessable to lower income individuals- less handouts, more handups! Programming geared towards KU term change
249 I would like to see a more unified vision of Lawrence. A place for people to live, work, and play
250 Maintain urban, downtown, historical aspects
251 I am not sure this character is sustainable. The desire for additional amenities contune to grow while the tax base seems to shrink
252 1. Fix deteriorating infrastructure of old parts. 2. Increase downtown high density development
253 Lawrence should embrace its role and place at the center of a large metro area, not a bedroom community between two cities.
254 no
255 No changes - just expand character throughout new developments in city areas. Should keep Lawrence feel not look like Anytown, USA. Improve gateways to city to "look" like Lawrence.
256 More activities to choose from
257 No
258 Nothing
259 Less concerned with short term gains by developers promising economic benefits that don't actually help anyone but the wealthy
260 No. I love Lawrence's character- it's part of whhy I was so keen to move here when the

opportunity arose.
261 Yes, less unemployment, more jobs in local infrastructure improvements. Renovate existing buildings instead of building new
262 No
263 No
264 See page 1
265 More neighbor stores and less large shopping centers
266 No
267
268 I like the fact landlords will be regulated by the city
269 Recognition and inclusion of other cities and townships
270 I would not like to see anymore expansion westward towards Clinton Lake
271 no, however, I think growth for the sake of growth threatens the character of Lawrence. We should be able to prosper better if we love what we have rather than having what we love. Wanting more and more and bigger and better will doom us.
272 no
273 no
274 no
275
276 no
277 Housing development should not look like storage units for humans. Have some character.
278
279 None
280 I have few complaints execpt for the growth particulary west of Iowa which reminds me of Johnson County
281 I would like for Lawrence to be more inclusive, not just focused on the needs of the wealthier citizens
282
283 NO!
284 We must put sustainability first in all decisions. We must not give tax abatements to firms that abandon the city. We must rejuvenate East Lawrence housing.
285 NO
286 Change "no growth policy character" of the city and county. Make policies innovative, flexibile, & inviting. Evaluate a projetc's density, intensity, and compatability by site design policies and standards.
287 No. It's a great mix of weird & fun & caring & friendly.
288 A unified vision for supporting arts and urban culture downtown, with apprecication for own classic midwest style. Controlled growth along corridors where infrastructure can support
289 Yes!! more respect
290 yes. It would be nice to work on a plan to unite East and West Lawrence a bit more and provide more equity. Plan parks west, better businesses east. Work to integrate the city better
291 Less divisiveness - less cookie-cutter development
292 Innovative detination to live and work and open a business
293 No
294 more growth oriented - but smart growth
295 It is critical for this character to remain - becoming another Johnson County suburb is a community killer.
296 More green space; transportation infrastructure which includes bicycles and foot traffic, similar

to Portland, OR.

297 It already is; the cultural arts plan is a good idea but as expressed in documents and executed thus far gentrification is occuring. There has been loss of agricultural land and density that is evolvoing - accommodating traffic

298 No - except if we could help the homeless people into jobs and homes

299 Our leadership is too regressive, especially in terms of development and economic policy, they need to stop gentrifying neighborhoods

300 More bike lanes, bike paths, more bike parking downtown

301 Nope

302 No- the above described character should be preserved, maintained, enhanced

303 Absolutely not!

304 Nah - that's why some people live here

305 No

306

307 explore and address needs for safe, efficient, affordable housing

308 no

309 not really. except affordability

310 I would like to see people able to walk/bike more safely.

311 NO

312 More focus on the centralization of the downtown retail district. Also, more focus on bicycle and pedestrian accessibility throughout Lawrence.

313 Not substantially but development and growth will occur regardless. It needs to be measured and thoughtful.

314 Remove the ideological split and make people understand that someone isn't an untermensch just because they live in a 100 y/o stick built home and not a tickie-tack McMansion.

315

316

317 Create a more neighborhood feel in each part of town. Especially through walking, biking, connected park system, smaller neighborhood markets

318 I would like to see more infill. I am disappointed at seeing vacant buildings on Iowa near corner of Clinton Parkway. This is happening while we are still spreading west. Why?

319 I would like to see a city that focuses on all citizens, and enhances their transportation options, including walking and biking as well as their recreational experiences.

320 I would like it to keep its character but allow for growth without sprawl

321

322 Would like to see city & county commissioners listen to & respond to voters when an expensive &/or important decision is made that potentially effects the entire community, ie: Rock Chalk Park, theproposed police headquarters

323

324 no.

325

326

327 No changes beyond ensuring that it is sustainable and protected.

328 less crime

329 Emphasis on locally owned businesses; public entities such as schools and library.

330 The character I'd like to see (small family businesses) seems to be a done deal. Downtown has more and more chains replacing mom & pop businesses & the west and south are primarily big box / chains.

331
332
333 Improved infrastructure, particularly w/ technology - high speed fiber - not sold on Wicked though. More interested in Google. Need that infrastructure to attract tech sector.
334
335 No
336 I'd like some areas to feel safer, especially in the evenings. The walking trail just that goes through the East side could feel safer. Some of the streets are not well lit or really lit at all.
337 No
338
339 More local employment opportunities, more bike/ped facilities like a connected trail loop with spoked to major destinations
340
341
342 I would only want Lawrence to increasingly value and put money into what we already have - soil, native prairies, a great river, history, culture, the arts!!
343 I would only want Lawrence to increasingly value and put money into what we already have - soil, native prairies, a great river, history, culture, the arts!!
344 would like lawrence to gain some independence from KU, not keep school and other activities/events tied to KU's academic year and athletic activities
345 No
346 I would like Lawrence to stop growing as a KC suburb and start growing as a unique community that has a sense of place. A feel that you know you are not in Overland Park.
347 We need to build our strength on community resource and skill sharinf rather than consumption-driven unsustainable economic growth. We need to power down.
348 I want to see development and change and growth done with better consideration for the unique culture and history and community we have.
349
350 Promote in-fill, downtown growth, reduce instances of incentives for developers and shift these resources toward small business.
351 No: Lawrence has grown beautifully in the 45 years we have lived here and we hope to watch it grow in the years ahead.
352 I like it as it is but would like to see even more programs for people who cannot afford food and shelter
353 You can't change the past. What I'd like to see is more integration and understanding and interactions so we understand each other better.
354 Accentuate that diversity - what it cannot be is a new Johnson County, but that is the direction west Lawrence is heading.
355 I like it the way it is.
356 no, I think it's great
357 No.
358 Not really, just evolve in a more positive way.
359 Expand the arts and walk ability of neighborhoods
360 built up, not out
361 Do not want it to change to auto-dominated suburbia dystopia, big box hell
362 All residents should have access to services and opportunities via bicycle/walking, good jobs, and housing options.
363 No

364 We need to build our strength on community resources and skill sharing rather than consumption-driven unsustainable economic growth. We need to power down.
365 More emphasis on pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to entire county and surrounding communities
366 The City Commission should protect and enhance the quality of life of neighborhoods instead of turning them into "student slums" for the benefit of rental property owners.
367 No change, we don't want or need to become Topeka or Kansas City
368
369 Preserving the character of Lawrence as described above, is vital to the uniqueness of Lawrence.
370 Lawrence is exceptional as a small-ish, midwestern town- but as we continue to grow (and we could be accepting of growth, because that perpetuates vibrancy) we need to be more open to trying new things, thinking bigger and broader.
371 I want to avoid a top-down management of growth and development. There is no one size fits all method for commercial and residential growth and development. I think we are on the right path.
372 I want to avoid a top-down management of growth and development. There is no one size fits all method for commercial and residential growth and development. I think we are on the right path.
373 Relax, look around & learn, be open to ways of growing & maturing that don't harm you or others, realize that the old models of government will not work for the environmental & cultural shifts that are upon us.

3. Describe your vision for Lawrence and Douglas County in 20 years.

1
2 A City that stops wasting my time seeking input it will ignore and is only sought so it can check a box.
3
4
5 Respectful of our agricultural heritage and resources, and more white collar jobs so that we're not a bedroom community.
6 A continued growth that ensures the residential aspect of the city is maintained. A growth of business areas that compliment residential growth of the city with proper limitation/slowing upon the development of additional multi-family living units and apartments.
7 A lake resort would be great for tourism
8 Better suited for seniors; housing, transportation. More jobs that pay a decent wage.
9 More affordable housing in the older West Lawrence type style. Green space and unique options so all the houses are not the same. Less like the developments in the new expanding west Lawrence. More regulation of student and low income housing landlords. A continuing emphasis on affordable public transportation and accessible arts and culture programs. Many art, theatre and music events are too expensive for the average person or family.
10
11 The governments of the City of Lawrence and Douglas County need to take effective steps at working together and minimize the inefficiencies present within both organizations. Whether it be unnecessary employees pulling substantial salaries while delivering little to no value in their work output, or the archaic methods of conducting government business while ignoring the technological advances of the 21st century. We need to get with the program to make Lawrence and Douglas County a hub for creative and tech oriented young people to want to stay. A place is

only as good as the young adults who wish to contribute to its future.....and now they are dropping like flies out of here.

12 About the same as now. Lawrence will be larger due to private sector growth. Douglas County will be more suburban. Plenty of opportunities for conflicts between city folks that have relocated to rural Douglas County and their agricultural producer neighbors.

13 I would like to see a community on the forefront of sustainable development. Aspects include land and water conservation, wise use of high quality soils for small scale agriculture, fully developed pedestrian/bicycle connectivity including pathways that do not share space with cars and trucks, more downtown diversity in businesses (not just bars and restaurants). More quality residential opportunities downtown, less suburban development (sprawl), integrated public transportation, development of commuter rail between Topeka, Lawrence, Kansas City and perhaps other cities, high(er) rise apartments downtown with rooftop gardens, permeable sidewalks and parking lots, more diversified water retention infrastructure including canals and urban ponds, increased efforts to plant trees of all kinds while discouraging suburban style fescue lawns. I could go on.

14

15

16 Unhampered growth. Ease restrictions. Make it attractive for development and treat all developers equal

17

18 A continued, sustainable big-picture viewing area. Leading the state in terms of progressive actions to better all citizens and provide access to services and aid for all.

19 A large, modern metropolitan area with easy access to neighboring cities. Large recreation areas with adequate commercialization to invigorate the city's economy and attract area residents to recreational activities.

20

21 Better cooperation between institutional, public and private entities to encourage enhanced educational opportunities, a plan for award better consideration to local entrepreneurs (such as Free State Brewing) with products that put Lawrence in the public eye, rather than spending on speculative projects that often do not meet income, IRB/TIFF, or job/job wage projections. Developing any proposed district to balance current neighborhood/residential use with proposed redevelopment.

22

23 I would like to see a city with mixed use developments that allow us to build vertically instead of sprawling outward. The city/county should have an active transportation network that allows folks to get to jobs, school and other everyday destinations by bike, on foot, or with assistive devices. Builders should be required to use universal design that supports people of all ages and abilities.

24 In 20 years, I would like to see a cluster of new retail options in northwest Lawrence near Highway 40 and K-10 along with a continued expansion of the retail hub at 33rd and Iowa. This will increase our community's retail pull factor and consequently our sales tax and property tax revenues. In addition, we should continue to encourage denser development in the downtown area to encourage more residents to move downtown, which will gradually bring about a higher level of diversity in the downtown retail options. Finally, we should avoid top-down efforts to manage or control growth and instead embrace the commercial and residential growth that will naturally occur through the market. It is no secret that Lawrence is continuing to grow west with new neighborhoods being built in the area along K-10 from Highway 40 up to Bob Billings Parkway. This is an attractive area for new residents and any efforts to control "sprawl" will only

end up making land more expensive in Lawrence and will discourage families from locating here. The leaders of our community should embrace the diversity of our housing stock and not discourage growth at the fringe of our community because this growth will help increase the economic vitality of our community.

25

26 Thoughtful downtown development and careful expansion into the county.

27 As the university is such a major employer and provides a large part of the population, it would be great if students were more involved in the community (besides restaurants, bars and shopping). They should be active in the community: create businesses, volunteer and purchase property (pay taxes and get a Kansas driver's license, etc.). I see more involvement in the community and more opportunities for local businesses and farmers. I really like the ways the community is growing the past few years... more parks, community events, volunteer opportunities and class/educational opportunities. Keep going in that direction - don't go the generic community route with big restaurants and box stores where no one knows each other and there is no loyalty or understanding of the community and it's history.

28 I see Lawrence as a community that people continue to desire to live in. Walking trails, parks and more throughout the city connecting us all!

29 I hope the city does not put the bus hub at 21st and Iowa. There has to be another location that is not near neighborhoods. My vision for the city would include dog parks in the city limits. There should be an outdoor pool on the west side of Lawrence. It is ridiculous that a town this size has only one outdoor pool. There should be a street east of the city limits on K-10 that connects to downtown. 23rd and Massachusetts should not be the main southeastern entrance into Lawrence. This should have been years ago. Brian Jimenez needs to be replaced as Code Enforcement director. He is ineffective and inconsistent in monitoring and enforcing city code. I hope before the next 20 years, that the City of Lawrence uses contractors who put in better streets. The streets in Lawrence have been bad for several years. Thank you.

30 Living clusters connected by good roads (and bike trails and poublic transportation to shopping and civic clusters. I see us moving away from the "downtown" centric notion to include all citizens in a comprehensive concept.

31 Folksy is cute if there is something behind it. The majority of the downtown, that seems utmost to the city leaders, can survive on it's own and prosper if the businesses are sustainable and worthwhile in the first place. Grow the city and county by bringing in businesses that will serve the communities, bring in needed jobs and bring it all into the 21st century. More focus on what the people that pay for the county and city want and need.

32 A thriving mixed community that has good outdoor recreation opportunities, including biking/hiking trails and good sidewalks everywhere, good public transportation, arts and culture opportunities for all ages, and enough affordable housing that people do not have to live in Topeka and commute to work in Lawrence. Agricultural land uses need to be protected from city sprawl, especially our most productive land, the cities should build up instead of out, which is a positive aspect of current downtown Lawrence developments. Growth needs to be controlled and aimed at smart growth instead of profit taking by unscrupulous developers who may build inferior structures that simply do not last. Housing needs to be affordable, public transportation is critical, light rail between KC and Topeka and the Douglas county communities would be ideal. Accessibility to clean water and healthy locally grown food is important. We need to consider whether growing ever larger and sprawling all over our good rich earth is actually sustainable.

33 Lawrence's downtown and older neighborhoods will be stable and thriving with a good mix of affordable and market rate housing, groceries, retail, restaurants and business. Mixed uses will rule the day to allow live/work/shop/play in close proximity. The city will be ringed with a fully

connected bicycle loop. The neighborhoods will all be linked to the loop with an off-street pedestrian and bicycle greenway network. The community will be healthier and happier. Newer commercial areas (i.e. south Iowa) will begin to include better mixed-income residential amenities in near proximity and will also be more pedestrian/bicycle friendly.

34

35

36 I would like to see more county financial support for children, aging/elderly, disabled and mentally ill programs and providers of care. I see a need to continue to adequately fund the Douglas County Extension office- so many great programs- there needs to be a set budget.

37 A functioning 4-lane divided bypass, efficient motorways, absence of artificial "traffic calming", moving beyond the myth of "speed kills". A government that actually listens to constituents and hears constituents, instead of merely tolerating everyone's two minutes. A city which perhaps finds no compelling reason to fluoridate the water supply if the constituents don't want it. A city with regulations that address risks which cannot be managed any other way, but does not regulate in a way that creates barriers to free enterprise. A city with a fire department that does not think extension cords in good repair are an unacceptable risk, and does not think that a fire extinguisher that is 13 months old is a public hazard. A city that, if it must issue building permits for replacement water heaters, actually goes and inspects afterward, without being hounded into it. A city and county that lets Ham Radio Operators do their thing, without arbitrary and capricious height restrictions, and which does not seek to outlaw mobile use of radio while outlawing cell-phone-texting. Not MORE government, but rather BETTER government.

38 I'd like Lawrence to be a place where all people earn a living wage if they work full time. I'd like there to be health care available to all citizens of Douglas County. I'd like to see an increase in services to low income people and people with physical and mental disabilities, I'd like Lawrence to be more inclusive of these people, with more free activities. I'd like to see the Arts Center grow and for their classes to be more affordable - I've been priced out of Jewelry class, and I make a decent living. I'd like to see more funding for local social service agencies like Van Go and the Social Service League. I'd like Lawrence to grow up and not out, perhaps using some sort of urban growth boundary. I'd like there to be more low income housing, and I'd like the bus system to become more efficient and effective so that people with cars will want to use the bus system to get to work because it's actually easier. I think giving giant tax breaks to big corporations to move here is a big mistake, they just move away when someone else offers them a better deal. I think the idea that people are going to come to Lawrence for conventions or for giant sporting events is ridiculous, and I think we need to focus on making the city more livable for the people who live here, rather than building things like the Riverfront Mall - total failure, big expense, environmental degradation, now houses a hotel and a low income health care facility - or that strip mall that was supposed to be an "outlet mall" and such a big deal in North Lawrence, which now houses the DMV, a church, and quite a few empty storefronts. These things were expensive follies, and I think we should not follow them with more expensive follies. I love the landscaping along second street, it looks great next to the motorcycle stores, tattoo shops, and car part stores. And hey, I'm a North Lawrencian, so fancy it up. But the idea that people were going to WALK from downtown to that mall by I-70 to shop was preposterous. Why? We've got a great downtown, let's focus on expanding that up and around on New Hampshire and Vermont Streets. I'd like to see us preserve our historic buildings and the charming character of Lawrence, rather than focus on making rich people richer when we make policy.

39 That all laws, practices, events, etc., are designed with the well-being of citizens in mind.

40

41

42 I think that there will be some growth in the area, but to the detriment of residents. The need for jobs is very high on the list. Not just jobs for highly educated researchers, but low income people to - on a living wage! If taxes keep increasing, it will make it even more difficult than it is now to survive on a minimum wage job.

43 Growth does not pay it costs - poorer quality of life, higher taxes. KU will continue to decrease in enrollment (unless it can convince the other universities in the state to close) as this world moves away from campus-based education. Hopefully Lawrence will do no more than maintain its present population. Few can honestly deny that Lawrence was a better place to live when it was big enough for one high school, but not two. Once it tips over the 100,000 mark, it will differ very little from Johnson County. A good argument can be made that the failure of Lawrence to attract new industry (in addition to the ineptness of the Chamber) is the "Johnsonification" of it. The more we become like Johnson County, the less reason there is for businesses wanting that environment to move here.

44

45 More public transportation, bike lanes, safe pedestrian sidewalks, no development along the new SLT; safer 6th street and 23rd street; more forethought on road construction scheduling.

46 Design for walk and roll. no new cul-de-sacs. sidewalks everywhere. places to sit down every three blocks. wildlife corridors. no more downtown highrises. No more sprawl. No more overdevelopment leading to stressed shopping centers and decaying rental housing. Planning staff that makes independent, professional, incisive recommendations. Continuing East side improvement. New Kaw bridge between Lawrence and Eudora. Merger of city-county government leading to lower taxes.

47

48 Preserve the history and the personality, particularly Downtown

49 Better jobs. Make the roads wider so that you don't have to sit behind someone at a light if you want to make a right turn. Also spread your retail outlets out to other places besides South Iowa and West 6th street.

50

51

52 A healthy economy with industrial and white collar jobs available not only in Lawrence but also in Lecompton, Eudora, and Baldwin. Continued effort to protect agricultural resources.

53 expansion north and south, expanded riverfront park, more festivals & markets

54 A clean and beautiful community with care of its green space and expanded retail services to attract more shopping and tax dollars to be spent in our community

55 Sad for the land

56

57 Continued support of schools. Innovative replacement of infrastructure. Expansion of sidewalks and bike paths in order to support bike commuting and close knit neighborhoods.

58 A city and county where everyone pays their way, not just the powerless taxpayers who can't swing sweetheart deals with the commissions. Realize people still want to move here, we don't have to give the world away to promote development.

59

60 I'm getting out of the city of Lawrence, the county of Douglas & the state of Kansas as fast as possible due to the aforementioned answers plus the fact that the state of Kansas is so far conservative republican right that there's no hope of a working person's family being able to afford to live in Lawrence Kansas anymore.

61 More jobs, better living wage. More support for local nonprofits that are working toward these goals.

62 More health clinics , massages , herb shops , focus on exercise but yet open to the sophisticated world of technology-Something like S.F. - Berkeley without all the political BS. Build a Community College PLEASE-coming from CA I can't believe this little wonderful town does not have one-JCCC is so far away. KU should have a community college to support there college like UCB they opened Berkeley Community College about 4 yrs ago and it's blowin up !! this would give the kids something to look forward to in terms of education-sports, jobs, somewhere to hang out, dances etc. - Everyone can't afford KU now do they qualify. Meanwhile these kids are left behind with the only option JCCC and 40 min ride and some can't afford this. This is Douglas county's only downfall - no community college - Ban PIT BULLS - its not the dogs but the types of owners they have that make them have a bad rep, but one all it takes is one mistake and more damage can be done as oppose to a German Shepherd getting lose.

63

64 We support with our time and resources the good things to promote quality in our lives and we stop expanding which dilutes our resources.

65

66

67 I would like to see Lawrence continue to develop its independent, creative, self-motivated attitude. We moved to Lawrence because of its local, thriving community - it's a place that doesn't need to copy other cities or become more cookie-cutter.

68

69

70 More places and locations where teenagers and college kids can have fun. Make Lawrence more young people friendly.

71 I would try to halt urban growth or urban sprawl. More apartments in the central area would be great.

72 A place that uses its resources wisely to balance growth and preservation of our natural endowments. A place where diverse people can earn a living wage and live the lives they choose. A place that does not tolerate the current "food desert" that is eastern Lawrence while allowing overlapping grocery stores in the west.

73

74

75 I like Lawrence as it is. So, minimal change and no tax increases. It is a great place to retire, but retirement often means fixed income. I hope KU will become a quality institution, and get back to providing a quality general education, as opposed to this KU Core. Traffic patterns are a problem, so public transportation is important. Urban sprawl must be stopped. If there is not one already, a water line link between the two water plants is needed. Clinton Lake may well be dry by 2034.

76 I would love to see Lawrence be known as a progressive, unique, "hip" Midwestern town that promotes and fosters local businesses, makers, artists, growers, agricultural producers, and other "off the beaten trail" aspects of a town. I would also like to see better relations with the KU community including educating students on basic etiquette of being a good neighbor--simple things such as not trashing yards and picking up after dogs. I would also like to see more police enforcement of DUI and other simple things that make a civilized community. I would love to see the parks and recreation activities such as band concerts, classes, and festivals continue or expand. More bike paths and better enforcement of driving to make cycling safer. I'd also like to see a continued and expanded focus on historic preservation in town.

77 I would like to see other areas of the town being treated better. West Lawrence is where all my tax dollars go and I don't live on that side of town. I live in North Lawrence and it is really hard to walk my dogs safely due to insufficient sidewalks. Many times I have to walk in the middle of the

street and put myself and my pets in danger. It would be nice if there was a closer grocery store for us and for the East Siders. I have many friends that live on the far east side of town and have quite the drive just to go to the grocery store. Maybe stop making so many damn grocery stores in one area (6th and Wakarusa) and put them where they are really needed. I know that I am just a lowly NoLaw resident but I would like to see my tax dollars spent on something that actually benefits me and the other Sandrats.

78

79 The same physical foot print that has increased in density and walkability.

80 I would like to see the City adopt growth management strategies that would help to restore the balance between the pace of growth of real estate supply and the pace of growth of demand for that real estate. If the city continues to allow real estate supply to grow faster than demand for that real estate is will continue to harm older neighborhoods as older properties suffer from declining values, to harm older commercial districts as older properties will be unable to successfully compete for tenants, and to harm the downtown as it competes with sprawling new commercial centers on the perimeter of the city.

81 Same character but with enhanced human services, more environmentally sustainable practices, and a commitment to keeping downtown vibrant. Public transportation to Kansas City and Johnson County will be critical. Availability of mulch-generational housing (nursing homes connected to day care center would be a start) for those who are permanent residents.

82 I hope it doesn't change very much. I hope it doesn't grow much bigger. I hope it continues to embrace and encourage sustainability, green living, healthy lifestyles, and value locally produced products. I hope it remains a great place to raise children. I hope it will be a great place to live in retirement too.

83 A thriving town were people flock because of equality and opportunity. Business is good and people are happy and recreation is abundant. Lawrence will be a model for how other city would like to be. A place with low crime and hard working people who are proud to reside in this great place.

84

85 Civil unrest and depression if UN Agenda 21 is furthered in Lawrence.

86

87

88 Economic development in this community is driven by an exclusive few who hold the power and the purse strings. While it is exciting that this group is growing this community and making it better for everyone, I would like to see in the future a broader involvement from entrepreneurs.

89 We will be even more vibrant with an active business community but balanced with improved residential areas designed to meet the expectations of the Baby Boomers. Hopefully the University will grow but there will be a better balance with other business sources and broadened tax base to support our desires. There needs to be more opportunities for good income employment.

90

91 Strong business development in business parks. Strong retail on Massachusetts Street. Senior Center to take a leadership role in making Lawrence a retirement destination as well as a portal of information for access to senior services.

92 Improved infrastructure (streets, curbs, sidewalks, utilities). Local owned businesses intact and thriving. Lawrence and Douglas County a unigue and self-contained community and not an extension or bedroom-community for Johnson County or KC. KU and KU campus growing and thriving. If national chains move in they are forced to be build thoughtfully and appropriately.

93 I would like Lawrence to become a tech hub for the midwest with 100s of entrepreneurs making

use of the smart and talented people that pass through KU. I would like Douglas County to become known for smart agricultural practices and to have specific agricultural resources that are done better here; this would be akin to Napa Valley or Kobe Beef, but something distinctly Douglas County.

94

95 More focus on decreasing the ever widening gap between East and West Lawrence. It's like having two different towns in one and they both have very different agendas and goals. Plus PLEASE STOP building huge buildings downtown. It's ruining the feel of Mass. Street. Now instead of seeing the sky or sun, it's just giant shadows from these mamoth buildings that people don't really use. And while they try to "match" with the asthetic of downtown, it all starts to look so cookie cutter and lacking any thing diversity.

96 A town that has maintained its dedication to taking care of its own, whether that be a multi-million dollar investor or the recovering addict sleeping in South Park. A town that has increased its support of its resources and developed a well-respected shelter for those experiencing homelessness, facilities equipped to deal with a variety of mental illnesses, adequate low-income housing, etc.

97 I would like to see the City maintain the quality of downtown, and work toward more walkable neighborhoods. Quit creating roundabouts as the end to every issue. Maintained vibrancy of the artistic community and positive relations with both KU and Haskell.

98 More bike, pedestrian, public transportation friendly. More underpinning and support for local food systems. Recycling and composting made so easy and common place that's it's easier to do this rather than make garbage. Incentivize recycling by charging people for trash pick up based on how much trash they put out. Closed pedestrian areas (like downtown). School gardens totally supported by Lawrence business partners. Enclosed Farmers Market. Lawrence would be recognized nationally for its sustainability practices and policies.

99 I want to see increased emphasis on cycling, pedestrian and public transport. More money needs to go to each of these areas.

100 Revert back to more local-based businesses, restaurants. Make it harder for corporations, big box stores, etc. to come in, and if they do, don't give them tax breaks.

101

102 A place to raise stable families who are inclined to stay in the area once they mature. This requires a balance of schools, services, shopping, entertainment, and economic growth that will attract others and retain those who live here.

103

104 I see a community that could be more self-sufficient through local agriculture and expanding local markets. I would like to see more organic agriculture and more environmental protections. Improvement of water supply. I would like to see continued expansions of school programs and after-school programs. More bike routes. More buses.

105 Far more middle class job opportunity.

106 Continue doing what Lawrence and Douglas County do well. Limit big box stores. Support local businesses and local farmers. Become more sustainable through increased support of walking, biking, and taking the bus. Consider closing part of Mass St. to become a pedestrian mall (as in Boulder or Iowa City). Pay teachers more to attract the best.

107 Selective growth, maintenance of existing structures, ways of incorporating outer development with the richness of downtown and KU

108

109

110 Healthy blend of business growth in all areas. Friendly to businesses that will provide jobs for the

people of Lawrence.

111 Balancing growth while maintaining the character and centralized character of the area. Lawrence is not Kansas City nor Overland Park and shouldn't try to be. Lawrence can and should increase its focus on green technology, use of parks and recreation areas to increase participation in outdoor activities, more bike lanes and recreational parks for multi-use. The DANGER is turning Lawrence's future over to developers who have short-sighted interests that are not in the best interest of the community nor the county. Keep Lawrence (aka Larry-ville) from becoming Compton-ville.

112

113 More of same but better infrastructure investment and apartment controls

114 Lawrence: Good infrastructure with streets that are maintained well and with clear thought of usage; "affordable" housing with variety of options beyond apartments and larger houses; increase in public transportation; variety of options in stores, including grocery stores and daily living services in all areas of the city; County: farmland usage encouraged by water rights and pesticide limitations (not completely removed, just better plan); development not taking high quality farmland; smaller cities/towns enhanced by good transportation and infrastructure; daily living services plus extras encouraged to open in these locations

115

116 This is the place I came to retire...from 30 miles away in Topeka. I want a smaller town that has vibrancy, represents all segments of society, and doesn't become Johnson County.

117 More emphasis on attracting new business and jobs and persuading people who live in Lawrence and Douglas County to shop and spend their money in those places. There should be much more awareness and debate on climate change and what people can do to minimize the damage from it. People think that the water we have in infinite and it isn't. We need better regulation and usage of water resources.

118 I would like to see more sustainable practices in the county. More development of communities rather than suburbs. There is no reason why there can't be another "downtown" area developed in west Lawrence- to improve walkability and decrease strip malls. Safe bike routes. We need to think about what the future holds for the next 100-200 years and start working toward it. Do we need to think about alternative energies? Maybe we can attract wind farms on the outskirts of town. Or encourage passive solar home construction. Are we thinking about techno-utopias in 150 years? Lets start training people without skills in basic computer sciences and attract some start ups. Or begin by attracting google fiber. I realize this is all very easy to say. But I also realize it is very easy to look at short-term gains in terms of profit and population growth without thinking about long-term sustainability. Speculation on the needs of our people in 200 years is purely that, speculation. But moving toward some of these ideas can distinguish us from other communities who are more interested in how they can convince the next Menards to move into town.

119 I would like most of Lawrence to stay as it is, but would love to see more businesses based here. I love living here, but the only way that I can afford to live here is to work in KC.

120

121

122 Building better sidewalks and bike lanes would do more to promote Lawrence as a retirement community. Preserving wildlands and farms would also help. The redevelopment of East and North Lawrence is better than paving over more farmland in West Lawrence.

123

124

125 All residents thrive (earn a living wage and lead healthy, happy, and meaningful lives).

126
127 Funky and fresh-always with new people, new ideas, fresh perspectives. GREEN
128 Maintain high quality K-12 education; grow STEAM programs with the new tech ed center; continue to provide wide variety of cultural options, protect downtown district
129 More job opportunities in manufacturing and tech jobs. Better transportation connections to KC and Topeka
130
131 I would love to see Lawrence develop as an urban center between KC and Topeka and let other communities specialize in agriculture. I would love to see Lawrence become an "Overland Park West" in that it is known as a premier hub for businesses to be centered - perfectly situated between the capital and KC. I'd love to see food trucks, which are an essential ingredient in a vibrant, connected urban core and a wonderful avenue for small businesses to thrive. I'd love better shopping (if we had a Banana Republic, an Express, and a quality movie theatre in this town, I would never leave).
132 Things are changing so rapidly, that I am having difficulty visualizing Lawrence and Douglas County in 20 years.
133 Everyone has access to a job that pays WELL, green space is preserved, the arts continue to be a strong feature of Lawrence, cookie cutter homes are not paving over beautiful green space.
134 I have call numerous times about the construction and development of 31st street. I have been passed on to various folks. None of them would listen or answer the questions. Always vague! Came into the City Hall to talk with them and again, the run around and then he walked off. I don't think the city has the capability to actually listen to it's patrons. We live here but take what the City has to dish out. I don't think that is fair considering that Lawrence is the most expense place to life in Kansas. I can pay and pay but get no service in return. By the way, it would really be nice if someone from City Hall would say they would call you back, they actual would. If I did that at my job I would be fired and don't I pay part of their wages being a tax payer??? If you want to fix something, how about the pay system for the water bill. How about putting a grocery store on the southwest side of the city. Just DO NO HARM which that has come and went. But do try to learn
135
136 Quit pretending that the only thing in lawrence its ku
137 I want my children to grow up in a town that feels safe; I feel that expanding too much makes Lawrence less safe. I want to focus on preserving and nurturing what we already have here: culture, art, nature, and history. I want historical areas like downtown and the wetlands to be protected. I want to maintain our commitment to quality public education. Expand property tax base by reducing public subsidies to new development, e.g. Rock Chalk Park, apartment buildings, and new commercial development. Limit the use of industrial revenue bonds for new development.
138
139 A healthy city that uses factual based city planning guidelines that are geared for optimal livability for all - environmentally conscientious, sustainable growth policies, more redevelopment versus sprawl, healthy outdoor and indoor facilities, tax relief for lower and middle class, increase minimum wage, preservation of history and historical structures, continued expansion of the arts and beautification.
140 Keep it safe. Emphasize life long learning. Health & wellness physically & mentally should continue to be celebrated. Keep downtown local & friendly. Keep guns & knifes off the street Continue being smoke free. Mecca for sharing information on climate change, innovations. Quality of life for all.

141 My vision is for Lawrence and Douglas County to maintain its eclectic and unique character with increased racial and ethnic diversity increased economic development and a more open and positive relationship with KU and the Athletic Dept.

142 Intentional greenways and limiting urban growth with green belts and revitalization of urban areas, similar to Portland. Increase in community gardening efforts and preservation of natural resources (such as the wetlands south of town, which are being damaged by new roadways). CHECKED GROWTH. Sensible, community-oriented growth rather than corporate growth. Re-use of corporate sites for businesses relocating to Lawrence. Grocery stores in the East and North food deserts, and revitalized or new community centers in both (the new West community center is going in soon -- after that, we should have one in North Lawrence and work on improving services in East and South). More pedestrian and biking paths. Cease using 24D along public roads and the levee.

143 Development that enhances residential. Residential that enhances business. Capacity for growth. Livable city. Quality of place. More balanced emphasis on multimodal transportation. Less emphasis on vehicular transportation. More innovative city design. Nodal planning rather than focusing on just downtown. With retail/business nodes, there would be less time driving and less need for more or wider streets. Implementation plans for updating design in established neighborhoods.

144

145 Lawrence should be developed according to sound, best urban planning practices, not the whims and avarices of developers, landlords, and non-resident property owners.

146 The city and county would be a "demonstration" of how being "local" in food and business does include an appreciation of region and national issues through a media that informs the citizens. A city that has diverse housing that is not decided by a small group of developers and a city that is more "dense" in use of land with support for public transit/bicycles, etc. in construction. A city that attempts to support community "hubs" that bring residences together. Minimum wage would be increased along with ample affordable housing. Education would be accessible to all, including technical/vocational. Water for city/county would come from sources that have been encouraged to literally go "upstream" and prevent run-off along with support for less use of water for lawns, etc. It would be a city that uses extensive alternative energy, particularly solar for homes and businesses. The Kaw River would be appreciated by thoughtful development next to it - not overbuilding on edge, but expanding accessibility to it.

147 To strengthen it's character through stronger, unique architectural use and continue to be a great place to live.

148 Caring, compassionate, grassroots-driven community that prioritizes its public citizens above private corporations and promotes democracy.

149

150 Spend less with the Chamber and more on infrastructure maintanance and tax control. We do not need a fancy police building or a police force that believes it is the Army.

151 Still being a proud outpost in an embarassing state. Lawrence will continue to be a magnet for artists and innovative entrepraneurs (and the underpaid and over-educated).

152 Job opportunities would support the cost of living in Lawrence. Everyone could afford local food. Keep Lawrence safe, crime is rising rather than receding Decriminalize marijuana Increase public transit system Support local mental health maintenance and prevention

153 Lawrence will continue to be its unique self, compared to the rest of the state. Rampant expansion of the city into rural areas of the county will be restrained by using planning tools available to accomplish that goal. Citizens will value and preserve open spaces for their historic, recreational and health-related benefits. We will take the steps necessary to make North

Lawrence a "food hub" producing foods for local and regional markets. As development occurs, trees will no longer be bull-dozed and burned. Instead they will be selectively cut and those ground into mulch and either used on site or given to the city to provide to Douglas County citizens for their use. City-owned properties will use native plantings and developers will be encouraged to use native trees and other plants optimal for providing habitat and forage for pollinators and other animal species. We will continue to utilize sustainable development as much as possible.

154

155

156

157

158 Synergy- the ability to partner the city, county and private businesses and citizens to share resources to make our infrastructure stronger, and attract new business.

159 1. Become higher income lower cost of living 2. Learning to share existing tax dollar sources instead of increasing taxes 3. Lawrence to be known as a city without a slum = maintaining older neighborhoods 4. Being able to slow down instead of build build build for the sake of build build build which increases the budgets and taxes(user fees/rates/ fines etc etc etc). Being able to pull back on New thus providing the necessary attention to neighborhood issues and/or neglect.

160 Larger developments are common so they can include some amenities. People don't have to drive to Topeka or KC to work. Tax base has something other than apartments/homes to support it. We are really able to feed off the university and develop some good quality employers to create some jobs and industry.

161 I would like for Lawrence to embrace growth so that we can proactively plan appropriate infrastructure and policy for a population of 30 - 50,000 more citizens who work and play here. With so many of our current highly compensated citizens leaving town every day to work in KC or Topeka, we are already losing the engagement of the next generation. We should emphasize and consistently support well organized private and public economic development efforts.

162 Less apartments in residential areas, more attention paid to foot traffic and crosswalks, more community gardens in every neighborhood.

163

164 in greater DougCo, a mix of landscapes - forest, wetlands, agricultural - with good access to smaller towns in the county (Eudora, Baldwin). an economy grounded in innovation and tourism, support for start ups - tech but also other business start ups. DougCo has the potential and vision to be a local food hub - we can set up infrastructure (canning facilities, large freezer storage, meat processing) to serve farmers from around the region. many of these facilities are closing elsewhere in Kansas, opening an opportunity here where we have proximity to farmers as well as good access to larger markets like KC & Omaha

165

166 I would like to see Lawrence become more of a self-sustaining community. Invest in renewable energy as a standard, increase transportation, a commitment to multiple community gardens to support healthy eating. Expand housing and learning programs for underprivileged families, and eliminate slum areas before the pulsation expands causing them to expand (insure people have access to housing that they can afford, and that is safe and habitable, there are homes and trailers that appear to be on the verge of collapse that are silk being rented to low income people who have no choice but to except unsafe living conditions)

167 Lawrence and Douglas County is a destination today, and we need to make sure that it still is in 20 years. People need to be able to come to Lawrence, and spend a few days exploring downtown, the warehouse arts district, Rock Chalk Park, KU, and shop on South Iowa and W 6th.

They should be able to get to Clinton Lake and find useful, clean, and beautiful space along the lake to enjoy, and should find Baldwin City as a beautiful bedroom community of Lawrence, Topeka, and Johnson County. We need to continue to grow, and we need to be smart about it.

168 I would like to see Lawrence become the Midwest mecca for film, art, music and culture. Through a town and gown partnership, we have the unique opportunity to develop the talents of our young people and then keep them here to help us build and expand this culture. Lawrence must work hard to maintain the timbre of its downtown core while expanding its geographic and economic base on the North, East, Northwest and Southern boundaries. North and East provide an opportunity for industrial growth. South and Northwest provide an opportunity for retail growth. We must determine what causes Lawrencians and their dollars to leave town and attempt to bring those products and services into the community. The county should be focused on further agricultural development and the creation of sustainable living solutions. This includes perma-culture, earth-ships, community gardens and training facilities for individuals to learn how to work and live in this environment.

169 My vision, or the reality. Reality is nothing is going to change. Vision - seeing Lawrence in my rear view mirror for the last time. Vision - Lawrence and DC have the opportunity to be awesome. Reality - 20/20 and a "we know best" mindset among our commissioners and volunteer leadership will ensure that never happens

170 Lawrence must start offering real career opportunities to be able to retain our brightest young people. I see Lawrence as a high-tech center in Northeast Kansas that makes it possible for natives to stay around and earn a living wage. The town will become accessible to more than just those who drive cars. This means accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists, those without cars and for those in wheelchairs. Downtown will remain the cultural and business center of the town.

171 A greatly improved new law building, bike paths to get our children off the roads.

172

173 less ugly development, taking long time residents in older neighborhoods into consideration when looking to future development..

174 In 20 years, I would like to see Lawrence holding its own economically. It should have a strong and diverse employment base. All of the stakeholders should be actively working in one direction to help the City/County move forward rather than looking out for self-interest. I'd like to see the City actually go to a true elected Mayor type of government with City Council oversight. I'd also like so see Lawrence be self sustaining in terms of agriculture produced and consumed here. Downtown will utilately transform over to an entertainment district since that is what is in process now. I'd like to see County and CIty governments truly working for the benefit of the populace rather than focusing on their own pet projects.

175 I see Lawrence and Douglas County becoming a competitive city in Information Technology. Expanding Fiber Optic data speeds for commercial and residential use will support Net Neutrality and bolster the economy.

176

177 Controlled growth so downtown remains the city's strength while expansion occurs in an even manner along the outside areas instead of so much building occurring in the west only.

178

179

180 Smart growth. Maintain the uniqueness of our downtown. More trails and green space. Better public transportation.

181

182 have not thought that far

183 Need more professionally oriented career jobs and make sure they're not attached with KU.

More than 25% of working adults commute to Topeka or KC metro area to work. Most jobs are tied to retail or service industry. Nothing wrong with recruiting industrial jobs to town although business snobs believe they're too go to get their hands dirty working in a factory. Lawrence needs all spectrum of jobs as many won't/can't afford to go to college so fill these jobs and keep people working in their hometown and expand property tax base. Transportation systems will need enhancing to handle volume with particular emphasis on upgrading and expanding Lawrence Municipal Airport to handle the larger business jets that use the airport daily for business trips and recreational events, i.e. - KU athletics.

184 A fabulous community but elected officials and city staff are not looking out for the benefits of all citizens. I seek a strong downtown business, entertaining, and retail area. Just look at Topeka, Kansas if one wants to see what commercial zoning throughout the city can do to a downtown area - disastrous. Look what happened to three major shopping centers when all the business went to Wanamaker. Protect the interests of the arts and entertainment groups, as well as maintaining and improving the methods of getting to these areas, i.e. bus routes, better control of street signals, and fewer apartment building permits. Way too many apartment complexes spread throughout the city, with better financial data obtained from the developers to see if the need exists or the developer can perform.

185

186 Keep the size manageable, so quality can be maintained.

187 I would like to see the county to grow in more single family homes. The size of the lots to be back 10 acres minimum. The access points need to be review based on major roads and intersections. Not all roads need to have restriction to access the county roads.

188

189 I would love for Lawrence to retain its "small town" character. To do so will require thoughtful planning that eschews large urban development centers, and caters to the development of neighborhoods and the relationships we have with each other as neighbors.

190 I would like to see downtown Lawrence retain its vitality that has kept it going strong, when other cities have emptied out. The strict growth regulation that was in place for many years kept downtown Lawrence from falling prey to the big stores that would ruin the feel of the downtown area. I think the commercial growth around town has been mostly okay, but south Lawrence is beginning to feel like part of K.C., which is not what I think most people want Lawrence to feel like. There's something to be said for capping commercial growth in favor of maintaining the size and feel of our community, even if that means people will travel to KC or Topeka for certain things. There are more important things that developing MORE stores and businesses that can make money.

191 A destination location for art and culture. (It already is for KU basketball, which is fabulous.) A place where artists flock to live and work. A place where movies are made, music tours, performances happen and visual art is all around. The city maintains the unique feel that is Lawrence, while having more opportunities for art, cultural, learning, technology, and entrepreneurs.

192 By allowing the city to grow, I mean that the city should have an eye to primary jobs as much as tech jobs. Employees of blue collar jobs buy necessary items just like high income earners do and the city gets the added benefit of bringing in new money to the town. I believe that this can happen while not fundamentally changing the character of the city. The chemical plant in North Lawrence is a good example. Most people do not even know it is there, do to them being a good corporate citizen.

193 A community that embraces the local native american heritage, more incentives for small local farms, more outdoor activities and green spaces (i.e., board walks through wetlands not gigantic

roads and highways, bike paths), public shared bikes (like in NY city), and historical sites (i.e., homes) in great condition.

194 Limited population growth, growth in full wage employment (techonology etc, "smart" jobs), linked to but not necessarily dependant on KU.

195 First, the shelter (Lawrence Humane Society) should be relocated to a more centrally visited area of town and expanded in size so that it is better able to become a truly No Kill shelter by increasing adoptions. Furthermore, we need more bike lanes and more renewable energy deployment. Feral cat trap-neuter-return should be implemented. The city should work more closely with the University of Kansas on pilot-scale projects to increase the city's sustainability too.

196 A healthy and vibrant city that attracts families, young people and tourism dollars.

197 Thriving downtown, high-end technical job markets, easily walkable and rideable

198 How to maintain the unique qualities that Lawrence possesses without slipping into the culture of mediocrity that plagues most small towns in the American Midwest (i.e. value local businesses over national and international businesses, etc).

199 Working together- handling city growth and county interests carefully and thoughtfully.

200

201 Increased awareness of walkability and bicyclist safety. Satellite branches for the library Encourage cultural elements to move to other areas of Lawrence, not just downtown Maintain healthy education system More community gardens

202 Lawrence, particularly northwest Lawrence, grows and expands to accommodate new jobs and new opportunities, while infrastructure improves to meet the added demands of more population. Redevelopment of portions of Mass, New Hampshire and Vermont to add better parking access and amenities, strengthening downtown and preserving its status as a regional draw in tourism and retail dollars. Continued expansion around Rock Chalk park to create another regional draw. Continued development of South Iowa and SLT connections creating new commercial centers. A diversified retail base to truly enable Lawrence shoppers to "Start here" and "finish here" too.

203

204 Better infrastructure, streets/alley maintenance, bike paths & street/alley lighting

205 more green space for children and adults, less development

206 A progressive commuanity where everyone feels there is a place for them, . . . where everyone who wants/needs work amy find employment with liveble wages/salaries, . . . where people feel safe in their homes and neighborhoods, . . . where a priority is placed on quality of life for all, not just the few, . . . where people feel they are listened to by the elected officials and major decision makers, . . . where everyone has access to affordable social, educational and health resources.

207 Transportation to help with the needs of the ever growing senior population. More opportunities for folks from Eudora, Baldwin, and Lecompton to be included in Douglas County Senior Services

208 Stop letting a few "favorite" business men get all the contracts and make the choices for Lawrence. Let the people of Lawrence have a say in their neighborhoods. Stop raising taxes for large scale things that only benefit a few of the residents (sports center/KU things).

209

210 It is extremely difficult to see 20 years down the road. However, I would like to see Lawrence/DGCO maintain its character while becoming a more diverse business community. There is a perception that (outside of KU) we are becoming a bedroom community. Those who claim to foster eco-devo need to look at businesses that have succeeded in the area and why they have succeeded. It is particularly important to look at businesses that have not received

public help since it is always preferable for the market to determine growth. I also concerned that the options for affordable housing in Lawrence are becoming fewer. Increased residential options in the city are a good thing, but we need to ensure that we do not drive people out of their neighborhoods in the name of progress.

211 I would love to see an investment in local seeds, native plants, preserving the local wildlife population when it comes to agriculture in Douglas County. Chemical pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, etc. harm our water, soil, and the animals trying to co-exist in the ecosystem. The only positive thing to come from conventional agriculture is profit for the farmers, but at what cost? I would also love to see more of a focus and investment in "mom and pop" businesses. All of the cities around us are full of the same chain stores and restaurants. Let's keep Lawrence unique by encouraging local people to become entrepreneurs who open businesses that draw people because they aren't the same as what other cities already offer. Downtown Lawrence, and specifically Mass. Street are great, but I've heard of so many businesses failing because they couldn't afford the high rent on buildings that are not well maintained or well managed. I happen to work downtown in a building such as this where an out of town property management company can't be bothered to make even the most basic of repairs but the rent keeps going up. I understand that profit is important and of course everyone wants to make as much money as possible. Unfortunately, you can't eat money if the conventional agricultural system fails. Also, what will happen to the city of Lawrence if the divide between the rich and the poor continues to grow?

212 I'd love it if the landlords would paint and maintain their houses in the Oread and on Connecticut. These main arteries are some of the first things people see when they come here, and many houses that are currently shabby and run-down looking could be made to look quite lovely.

213

214

215 to remain a downtown centric community. to be bicycle and walking friendly. easy to commute to other cities. improve job market for those with college degrees.

216 I would like to see moderate and reliable economic growth. I would like prevent the suburban spark from jumping the gap from Johnson County -- in the way that it did with Olathe 30 years or so ago. I would like to see reduced dependence on private cars.

217 As fossil fuels are used up and become more expensive, Lawrence and the County should lead in ways to use energy more efficiently and develop solar energy. This will mean a more compact city and neighborhoods with a variety of services so we no longer must drive to South Iowa and west 6th street for so many goods and services. Emphasis should shift to walking and bicycling.

218 In 20 years, I would like to see our town thrive due to smart building, and budgeting. Build things we NEED, not things we want. Stop subsidizing building projects, and lower taxes for the citizens.

219

220 SEPARATED PROTECTED BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE. NOT bike-lane-protected parking like on Lawrence Avenue between Princeton and Trail Road! NOT mixed-use paths where people walk their dogs and toddlers and rollerblade--but separate, curb or wall-protected lanes exclusively for the use of bicycles or other pedal-powered vehicles (please note my exclusion of motor bikes, electric scooters, and mo-peds). We need to encourage more people to get out of their cars and walk, bike, or bus to work, and the ONLY way this can be accomplished is by making it safer for people to do so. Continue investing in alternative fuel sources for city vehicles and buses. When petrol-gasoline is 15 dollars a gallon in 2034, hindsight will not replace investing in 2014! HOAs banning vegetable gardens, wash lines, and mandates green lawns will be illegal. Everyone will a patch of land will have a garden. Massachusetts Street between Sixth and 13th Streets will be pedestrian-only. People-scaled urbanism is a great thing.

221 More opportunities for everyday healthy living through less driving necessity, more safe outdoor exercise options for all ages

222

223

224

225

226 I'd like to see Lawrence really crack down on the prevalence of theft and robbery that is taking place- for the city and police to view this issue as a serious one and begin actively pursuing and punishing people who perpetuate this issue in our community. I also feel that the cost of living in Lawrence and Douglas County is alarmingly high due almost solely in part to the inaccessibility of affordable housing options (particularly rentals) and that the rent costs do not reflect quality, family suitable housing. Often times your choice is to pay drastically inflated rent for a clean, suitable house or rent within your budget a house that is not up to code, falling apart, unhealthy, dilapidated- etc. There needs to be some sort of major change in the way landlords are held accountable for their rentals and a way to prevent large groups of students from overtaking and destroying the affordable rentals in the city.

227 We have returned to the River Kaw. Water is cleaner to sustain all the creatures, feed the crops and enable our jobs/industries. Everyone will understand our watershed, including plants, animals-the life-giving effect. More neighborhood schools including pre-existing ones. Haskell Indian Nations University is now shown the same respect, deference and inclusion that KU always enjoyed. Local minimum wage has increased to a living wage. Visual , performing-all arts will be considered legitimate employment and supported ($) by the local community. Inclusive zoning is required to mix low/mod and middle/upper people. All new construction (public, commercial and private)is built so anyone with a disability can enter the first floor and use an accessible bathroom. Our Waste management, water, sewer, etc. produces energy with methane, bio-miracles to help power this place.

228 Continue upgrading downtown and doing fill-in development. Stop building more retail and fill what we already have vacant first.

229 No more developing west on 40 highway or Farmers Turnpike but growth in other directions would be fine. Need to develop an area for job opportunities that will be long term (like create an area where large companies like Farmland would want to build. And Lawrence is the most expensive community to live compared to surrounding communities except Johnson County.

230 A vibrant downtown w/grocery and a wide range of locally owned businesses.

231 Improvement in traffic flow, eliminate congestion. (Expecting some improvements with SLT completion) Attracting higher end department stores, eg. Macys and Dillards. Attract businesses that would employ residents - less commuting.

232 Continue to encourage new business and new home construction.

233 Smart growth that does not desterb what downtown house but still for people who wish to live and work there.

234 Continue valuing and contributing to the arts, education, and the economy, but also make the necessary efforts and sacrifices to make sure everyone has a decent opportunity to live a full life. There would be plenty of quality, affordable housing for even people who work minimum wage. Minimum wage would be a living wage. No communities would be isolated by geography, economic status, culture, or language. There would be no slums because everyone could afford a better place to live. There would be no bad parts of town because officials and community members would care about investing in all areas. There would be a grocery store in north Lawrence instead of 15 grocery stores at 6th and Wakarusa! Traffic projects would be planned in ways that wouldn't trap us to one route south in the summer. People could come to Lawrence,

get a decent job, have a decent place to live, and have the other resources they need for healthy relationships, bodies, minds, and souls.

235

236 I would like Lawrence and Douglas County to continue to support education, local business, and the arts while increasing its commitment to the physical environment - parks and roadways.

237 A vibrant downtown, good looking neighborhoods, schools that kids walk and bike to...

238

239 More local businesses, less dependence on foreign oil, a thriving downtown, city more bike friendly, less bars and a more diverse downtown including more art galleries.

240 A place where comprehensive transportation is available to all citizens, especially bus loop routes that circle the town.

241 good paying jobs for those that want to work here. Community activities to keep the community together.

242

243 Too many city policies are appropriate for a small college town. We are no longer a "college" town. We aren't even any longer a "town;" we're a small/moderate-sized city. Policies such as the development restrictions within a 200-foot radius around historic buildings impact modernization negatively. Save individual historic buildings, you bet. But there's nothing wrong with modern alterations, or even new modern buildings, right next to these historic structures. Towns frozen in time are interesting to visit, but I have no desire to live in such a town, nor do the great majority of Lawrence residents, I believe.

244 I would like the town to make use of its riverfront - perhaps build restaurants and more trails. Also- stop building apartment complexes next to shopping plazas next to more apartment complexes. And better recycling.

245 Lawrence still growing, but the rate will plateau soon?

246 Strong, loca leconomy, conscious to mental & physical health of community members. Empowered and thriving.

247 Development of programs and activities which are so unique out of town folk will be drawn to visit.

248 A thriving community/partnership with whole counts to meet our growing needs

249 A community that has grown in a sustainable manner and has protected the history and culture of the area.

250 University continues to feed both. More infill growth, more businesses that employ

251 I would like to see us grow to about 120,000 while still maintaining the character of the area. We need to add/expand more jobs in the area.

252

253

254 Reasonable, well planned growth

255

256 Less car traffic downtown, healthier activities

257 Similar expansion while maintaining the diverse creative community

258 Will add people and business - more located in town - bio related

259 I'd like this to be a place where homes are affordable and have enough green space around them for personal land use

260 I'd like to see Lawrence stay compact and avoid sprawling out and out. It should work to maintain its character, continue improving its public transportation & bike infrastructure.

261 More public land, improved to be diverse native habitat, empower minority voices to diversify community

262 Continued controlled growth with emphasis on green space and ease of mobility
263 More job opportunities to include people who do not have the desire or opportunity to get a 4 year degree.
264 A vibrant and "upward building" downtown. Go European style.
265
266 Choices that allow city/county and sense of community to thrive. Choices that promote well being of entire community. Choices that prevent urban blight and urban sprawl.
267 An example to other communities of environmental care and what can happen if a city cares about all of its people
268 I know it's soon but love to connect with people train to Kansas City.
269 Lawrence restoring and redeveloping towards the east and north. Slow growth west until vacancy rates in existing areas is small.
270 A thriving cultural community with good businesses and opportunities for 20-30 year olds to be employed.
271 Lawrence will have a nice balance of a vital, vibrant, healthy, urban core and limited sprawl into the county. More small scale local food production and distribution. The county would be famous for artisan foods.
272 Continue the present. Promote goals which treis to produce a happy medium between preserving agriculture and economic development.
273 Be more aware of historic buildings and keeping them intact.
274 Diverse, well educated and forward thinking
275
276 More industrial to provide good paying jobs. All roads paved.
277 Walkable subcenters of activity connected by public transportation with no more than 15-minute headway
278 More employment opportunities for all. Factory jobs, technical jobs, service jobs, education jobs, professional jobs
279 adopting; balancing change
280 Preservation of downtown and historical buildings inc. emphasis on our history in the older parts with growth more sustainable neighborhoods with less sprawl
281 more affordable, more walkable and bicycleable. Riverfront would become attractive and well-used
282 Maintain the agricultural uses of the county, especially produce. Resist sprawl - more urban density of housing and less reliance on cars.
283 Creative infill (not gentrification). Expansion of literary and artistic values - keep downtown the core
284 Westar plant converted to natural gas. Absence of jobs not paying a living wage. More use of bus and bike transport.
285 Be prepared for all types of growth.
286 Lacks confidence and vision. Not equipped with skill and tools to make projects work. Especially mixed use. Land use policies are very conservative. Development opportunities are overly managed, studied and delayed. population growth rate from 2000-13 average a new 765 people a year. Below national average for annual population growth. Change "no growth policy character" of the city and county. Make policies innovative, flexible, & inviting. Evaluate a project's density, intensity, and compatibility by site design policies and standards. Example, challenge projects with a path to more density/intensity if it provides or advances a city/county goal, like "a network of trails and parks." The local economy should be improved. Expansion of Hwy 59, development of Lawrence Trafficway and expansion of city sewer treatment plat are

projects that will generate new industry and business. Employment opportunities will be created and PURCHASING POWER for the area increased.

287 Minimal changes

288 I'd like to see things not much changed, but better supported.

289 More tech jobs - less travel to KC area for employment

290 Have less spread and work to find more room for new business in more core of city. Work better to zone for walkable areas west.

291 Family & elder-friendly, local business friendly, pedestrian and bike friendly

292 sustainable vibrant community, diverse

293 Probably will get much larger, but I would like for it to still have a "small town" feel

294 A thriving, interesting place to visit, or live, or retire

295 I would love to see Lawrence maintain it's unique status as an open and locally based Kansas gem. It should still be on the list of top wonderful small towns in the US - not on lists of towns with the greatest growth or expansion

296 An integrated bicycle transportation infrastructure similar to Portland OR which will enlarge our carrying capacity without massive new outbuilding to accomodate more auto traffic. "Qualitative development" like we are seeing in east Lawrence, instead of quantitative expansion as demonstrated and proposed on South Iowa and in the vicinity of the SLT.

297 A cultural arts community that reflects current diversity, local entrepreneurial enterprises that are encouraged jobs if they showcase Lawrence creates 215 entry jobs and wages

298 More bike paths that connect the entire city across & around. Bike lanes in more streets. More home grown food and open minded to better local food

299 We take the lead with progressive politics and express true democracy, safe & affordable housing, transitional housing with co-ops

300 Get across town using motorized & other types bike walk skateboard

301 Living in the best city in Kansas!!! More people.

302 Downtown/OWL/E Lawrence/N Lawrence are a unified community with equal parts entertainment/residential/retail and business/office. Suburbs continue to develop, yet are linked with urban core via multi-modal transport.

303 Lawrence needs to grow sensibly and accommodate the needs of all it's citizens and taxpayers.

304 Growth west and east, with a revitalization of downtown

305 Growth based on sustainable principles. Embracing light rail hub between Topeka and Kansas City metro. More green space on the city and denser urban areas downtown

306

307 A city w/o threat of gentrification - especially in historic ease Lawrence wide

308 forward thinking

309 Progressive, innovative, creative, open, friendly, safe, affordable

310 Vibrant, active a place where my kids will have many safe transportation options and good jobs.

311 Business for more people of color

312 Focused on green energy, sustainability, increased access for bicyclists, and providing growth opportunity that maintains the current character of the Lawrence community.

313 An area which avoids growth for growth's sake just to accomodate the pressures to continually expand.

314 I see: * more sustainability, * renewable energy (in spite of Big Oil, ALEC and the Kochs), * a vastly expanded public transportation system (buses), * neighborhood gardens, * better jobs instead of low-wage jobs designs for college students (you have no idea how hard it is for someone to make it on a low-wage job and depend on tips. * a better relationship between KU and the town. It used to be town and gown, now it's gown over town. * affordable housing

instead of $800 dollar-a-bed 4-room apartments designed just for college students. * a better relationship with Haskell. Haskell is a jewel and the city needs to go to bat with BIA for its funding.

315

316 A vibrant, pedestrian and bike friendly community.

317 A city that I would vacation in.

318

319 I would like to see more green space, walking, bicycling trails. I believe that the girl scout camp is an ideal to aim for and we should have more environmentally friendly green space.

320 Mecca for interesting food production, innovative retirement options - keep the downtown intact. Smaller intergerational areas - know this happens naturally but it can be supported by keeping schools open - even as residents age - by changing boundaries because neighborhoods revitalize as we die off or move away.

321 Is there enough water in 20 years? Perhaps a static state city without growth, with stable employment, 10% of the cars, bikeable, URBAN agriculture provides 40% of city's food. Population is cut in half due to re-ruralization due to oil scarcity.

322 A community that is welcoming and engaging for all ages. More job opportunities for young & older, full-time & part-time positions.

323 Widespread organic farming No GMO products Sustainable agriculture and accommodation for wildlife Bicycle paths to provide good alternatives to driving Preservation of existing green spaces, and adding more

324 Increased public transportation, low income housing and cheaper "houses" that are smaller. Money spent on the eastern side of Massachusetts street so that the "ghetto" terminology changes to a much more positive set of language terminology.

325

326

327 The Poehler Bldg development needs to be a model for future development. Greater density, reuse of existing neighborhoods. I am a fan of Hobbs Taylor lofts and the two high rises. They will keep things vibrant. North Lawrence could be a focus of growth, rather than continuing the expansion West. Also, the revitalization of the east side of Lawrence along K10 is magnificent and could become more than just an industrial park.

328 safer, better communication between community members, more improvement of historical areas for mixed uses

329 Commitment to preservation of open spaces and ecologically significant lands and waterways. Strong career jobs available in locally owned businesses, including manufacturing, and in government. Generous funding from all levels of government for education, including KU and Haskell U; for culture; for social services; for public safety. Government, not private, management of public services. Downtown as city's soul, not just restaurants, bars, and t-shirt shops. All areas of town accessible by walking, biking, and public transit; de-emphasis on the personal automobile. Reduction in nonpervious surfaces.

330 More big box / chain stores. With the observation of farm land being for sale along K 10 on the east of town, I expect that the margins of Douglas County & Johnson County to be growing together but not touching.... yet. The water ski lake will be gone. Growth in Pleasant Valley (great view of Lawrence). Businesses built along the SLT. Baldwin will be expanding. More growth north of the river. A friend of mine who owns a business north of I 70 told me that he has been approached by developers to sell his business so that a hotel can be built on his place. Still some rural areas around but mostly south.

331 To create economic development opportunities To stimulate job growth To have city government

stop back and allow free market forces to not have artificial limits or restrictions placed on them by city government

332

333 High speed, high tech community with job opportunities in a broader range of areas. Enough jobs to accommodate all the KU grads who want to stay. Thriving entrepreneur segment. Innovative, creative, progressive.

334

335 I hope the city and county put a limit on the physical growth so that our character and resources remain intact.

336 I'd like the neighborhoods to have slower traffic, feel safer, have more walkable and bike rideable paths (and wider). The traffic on 19th Street from Iowa to Harper should be slower and have a better bike path. The neighborhoods need improved and additional sidewalks. Learnard currently has no sidewalks (at least not from 19th to 15th).

337 More bike and walking trails that promote leaving the car behind. Strong local commerce and a well educated/trained workforce.

338 Lawrence and Dg Co to be a unique community that offers opportunity to enjoy the arts, education, dining, entertainment, and quality employment in a manner that reflects the quality and character of the people who live there.

339 Same as 1 & 2 with a strong historic & land preservation ethic, a strong agricultural economy based around our high quality soils, a diverse downtown that is not an Aggeville or Westport.

340 Lawrence/Douglas County needs to become a beacon of community and public education done in a fiscally responsible yet progressive way. This will in turn help drive community and employment growth (families go where schools are good), which should be done in a way that builds upon, but doesn't disrupt the local flavor of this historic community.

341

342 I see a fantastic system of bike/ped trails that circumnavigate the city, as well as a green belt that encompasses the floodplains of the Kaw and Wakarusa, preserving natural areas and increasing outdoor recreational activities. Included in that green belt are small agricultural, family and community farms and orchards. We host a vast array of annual events, fairs, music, arts as we do now! I see a vibrants arts community and preserved historic districts centered around downtown, keeping neighborhoods safe and affordable for all. It goes without saying that we want a strong govt. and services, maintained infrastructure. I also hope we can create living wage jobs and keep it affordable for the vast number of farmers, artists, musicians, etc., people who make Lawrence what it is!

343 I see a fantastic system of bike/ped trails that circumnavigate the city, as well as a green belt that encompasses the floodplains of the Kaw and Wakarusa, preserving natural areas and increasing outdoor recreational activities. Included in that green belt are small agricultural, family and community farms and orchards. We host a vast array of annual events, fairs, music, arts as we do now! I see a vibrants arts community and preserved historic districts centered around downtown, keeping neighborhoods safe and affordable for all. It goes without saying that we want a strong govt. and services, maintained infrastructure. I also hope we can create living wage jobs and keep it affordable for the vast number of farmers, artists, musicians, etc., people who make Lawrence what it is!

344 be an even nicer college town in the Midwest, without nameless strip malls, huge parking lots for malls and car dealerships, fewer developers getting away with breaking rules/laws and getting only a slap on the wrist for it (or nominal fine).

345 I would like to see even greater vigilance to protect downtown and surrounding agricultural areas from runaway growth. I would like to see it become a place where local organic growers make a

living selling food to residents. I would also like to see the University academics get the attention, appreciation, and financial help they need.

346 I would like to see the diversity grow, more arts & culture, use smart growth strategies when growing, more transportation options (our population is getting older and younger people like active transportation)

347 See question 2

348 We would build on our ability to live a sustainable life, bicycle and pedestrian-friendly, supportive of the many cultures present and setting policy with culture and history in mind. Support for current businesses and care used in incentives given new development. Affordable housing throughout city. Support of arts for all. City schools vibrant throughout and embracing a comprehensive learning plan. Vibrant neighborhoods that are walkable, with good sidewalks and streets in excellent maintenance. Support for small businesses and neighborhood businesses as well as innovative larger industries and employers. Consensus-building on new projects and community undertaking.

349

350 Transparency in allocation of resources and project approval. Whether exactly accurate or a complete view, it is widely held that commissioners and developers are able to push their agendas without a fair amount of democratic process. Rock Chalk Park: was this really a no-bid process? The city and county should answer to that and work to dispel the notion that certain developers can and do demand and receive unfair advantages. Bikability, walkability are wanting, as are a majority of roads - particularly in E. Lawrence.

351 With its University and unique flavor, I would see Lawrence become a major University City on the order of Oxford, Cambridge (G.B.) and Harvard and Princeton in the centuries ahead. There is much to be gained by our University of Kansas built on the model of a Greek acropolis rising up from the rational Roman city grid with Massachusetts Street as our cardo. There is considerable charm to be enhanced in the century ahead in the various neighborhoods surrounding Mount Oread.

352 Variety of social and cultural events. Continued emphasis on downtown opportunities. More attention to food, housing. Preferences for local businesses instead of "big box" stores.

353 A place where our natural history is integrated into a city/county with good paying jobs; where development is not exclusive of historic & cultural conservation.

354 Maintaining and furthering this area as the state's center of thought arts and culture. (Let me reiterate - not Johnson County)

355 I'd like to see way way more bike routes, and have Lawrence be way more pedestrian- and bike-friendly. It would be great to have grocery stores and other amenities in walking distance of ALL the neighborhoods, especially the ones in the core of the city. I would like there to be lots of small thriving family farms.

356 I would like to see Lawrence have some more big city amenities with regards to more options when it comes to retail shopping and grocery shopping (such as a Whole Foods). I have lived in bigger cities and miss having those amenities and I don't like driving to K.C. to shop. I would prefer to shop and spend my money in Lawrence. I would also like to see more activity options for teens and families (in addition to all the sports stuff), such as an indoor skating ring, an outdoor skating rink, go-karts, miniature golf, bocce ball courts, etc. I hope Lawrence's population continues to grow and doesn't become stagnant, so that it will then allow for these amenities to come here. I hope the population growth includes all age groups, and not just college students which would then require more apartments. I hope Lawrence is able to attract more jobs (more better paying jobs for well educated people) so that Lawrence can continue to thrive and keep people here. Many people come here to live, but don't work here. It's hard to

find a well paying job in Lawrence. I don't want Lawrence to become a bedroom community. I also hope that the city becomes more developer friendly so that development will actually come here. I believe that there should still be development standards, if fact the city should consider making developers pay more for certain things (other cities have development fees and make developers pay for infrastructure, utilities, and roads, etc.) and also require higher standards for architecture and landscaping for residential and commercial. I would like to see the riverfront area be developed. I've visited cities such as Savannah, Georgia and Asheville, North Carolina where they have development along their riverfronts and it's amazing. These places have made these riverfront areas very much a tourist attraction as well as an artistic community location, which is fantastic. I have been to other cities such as Austin, Texas where the city is thriving and so much development is going on, but it's not a free for all. The development is cool, eco-friendly, sustainable, unique, and beautiful. Austin has thought out how to build up and how to build out. They have also thought about lots of outdoor common areas and spaces and made them beautiful. I would like to see Lawrence think about where to put future common / open spaces where people can gather and spend time together. These spaces need to have greenscapes and hardscapes, seating, trees for shade, outdoor lighting, covered areas, open air areas, playground areas for kids, adult places - such as bocce boll and chess tables, green space for dogs, walking paths, etc. There also needs to be more artwork incorporated into these common/open spaces. I would like to see more events, concerts, festivals, etc. that bring people to Lawrence. More art galleries and more restaurants. Again, Austin has many of these. I consider Lawrence a smaller version of Austin. I don't want Lawrence to become as big and have all the people and all the traffic that Austin has, but I think Lawrence could learn a lot about how Austin does things. Austin seems to be very developer friendly, but yet it maintains it's motto of "Keep Austin Weird" and it's also concerned about lifestyle and living healthy. I think Lawrence needs to develop in a fashion that keeps sustainability in mind and also healthy living (with regards to open spaces, gathering places, bike paths, walking trails, Clinton Lake, more swimming pools, and access to local, organic foods). I think agricultural tourism is a huge thing that should be explored more. I think development around Clinton Lake should be explored (again look at development around lakes in the Austin area). I think new residential development should try to be steered towards the more traditional style of grid streets, beautiful and unique single family residential homes (with garages in the back), narrower streets, and lots of trees, rather than the suburban model. There also needs to be consideration for a major thoroughfare (highway) through the heart of the city or on the edges of the city somewhere. It's great that the South Lawrence Trafficway is finally being completed, but it's weird that as Lawrence grows, there isn't an option of a speedway of some sort to get from one side of town to the other. It takes 20 minutes to get from Clinton Park to East Hills Business Park. This is something Lawrence really needs to look at and consider (this is something that Austin did not develop well, their traffic is awful and they didn't plan for it).

357

358 Better walkability/bikability, no more bars and limited tall buildings (maybe limit them to 5 floors only).

359 Make west Lawrence more like downtown. Have for affordable condominium living available close to downtown

360 not to have houses packed all the way to clinton lake


361 I understand the importance of economic vitality, but the charm I described earlier should always be considered to attract young professionals with money and education.


362

363 Even the new areas remain true to the core feel of the city - conscious, connected, and local

364 See Question 2
365 More green space
366 The area should have better public transit and pedestrian facilities. City growth and development should be according to sound planning and not developer greed. Neighborhoods should be protected from rental property degradation.
367 Growth within - there are a lot of vacant buildings in the city that could be put to good use if the right business were attracted here
368
369 Culturally & intellectually vibrant, emphasis on preserving unique historical & environmental legacy while pursuing sound economic development. Agricultural & natural area preserved.
370 Still vibrant, artful, respectful of divergent points of view, relaxed, livable, friendly, looking to the past while looking to the future- but with increased accessibility to transportation and services and food, and with more artfully thoughtfully planned space for gathering and creating, not juts art but thoughts for the future :)
371 Growing community that is more open and inclusive to all types of new development. Embraces a wide range of employment and housing options to appeal to a diverse audience. Creates more of a retail destination to increase our retail sales pull factor.
372 Growing community that is more open and inclusive to all types of new development. Embraces a wide range of employment and housing options to appeal to a diverse audience. Creates more of a retail detination to increase our retail sales pull factor.
373 We have returned to our rivers and educated ourselves about our watershed and the water immigrants that will be moving here.We maked decisions with a broader criteria, mental/physical health, environmental impacts, cultural & educational benefits- beyond the economic value only.

4. As Lawrence has grown over the last several decades, how satisfied are you with the type and quality of development?





	6. Give us an example of a city you have lived in or visited where you think growth has been managed well?
1	
2	No. You will pick and choose programs from that City rather than doing your job here and figuring things out.
3	
4	
5	Chicago
6	Austin
7	Overland Park Kansas, Denver Colorado, Breckenridge Colorado
8	
9	
10	Burlington, Vermont
11	Portland, OR
12	Columbia, Maryland
13	San Francisco
14	Portland, OR
15	
16	Overland Park, lived there
17	Lincoln, NE

18 Don't have one...
19 Naperville, IL
20
21 Boulder, Colorado or Burlington, Vermont
22
23 Boulder
24 These questions are obviously skewed to encourage respondents to advocate for denser growth patterns. If we want to compete with other cities, we will need to aggressively grow like Olathe, Lenexa, and KCK.
25
26 Madison WI, Boulder CO
27 Many cities in Europe are managed well - You have dense city populations with great public transportation that are spotted throughout rural farmland and forests with recreation and small village goods.
28
29 Overland Park, Denver
30 Been in many - growth almost always ends up beig managed to reward and punish various groups. Teston VA and Columbia Maryland among otheers come to mind but they are dated.
31 Kansas City, Missouri
32 I have not been in a city that I thought managed growth well.
33 Not sure - I liked Indianapolis' urban and older suburban areas because they are connected to an urban bike trail system. This encourages people to fix up older homes and discourages new subdivisions.
34
35
36
37 The very concept of managing growth is an anathema to a free society. Yes, Lees Summit seems "nice", but are its citizens free?
38 Portland
39 Portland, OR, maybe.
40
41 San Diego, CA
42 Wichita and Derby KS
43 Unfortunately very few have done that. One really has to look abroad for examples of cities that have managed growth well.
44
45 moved here from Johnson County 20 years ago and thought I was in Heaven; now it just seems like Johnson County. Wah!
46 Boulder
47
48 Fort Collins, Colorado
49 Don't know
50
51
52 Boulder
53 Corvallis, OR
54 Mason OH
55 ?

56
57 Minneapolis MN
58
59
60 Des Moines, IA
61
62 Berkeley
63 Portland, although I have not lived there.
64 Lawrence in the 1970s
65
66
67 I lived in Hong Kong, where the city is spectacularly dense, but public transit and services are still convenient and easy to access
68
69
70 Overland Park
71 I have lived in Boulder in the past. Boulder has definitely managed its growth well. Due to unique circumstances, however, there is too much pressure on real estate in Boulder to allow for class diversity.
72
73
74
75 Portland , Oregon
76 Door County, Wisconsin and Lincoln, Nebraska
77
78
79 I like towns that haven't put all of their energy into the outskirts of town. Cities with vibrant, walkable downtowns and walkable neighborhoods. San Luis Obispo.
80 Boulder, CO; Portland, OR;
81 Grand Rapids, Michigan
82 I'm not familiar with any city where growth was managed well. Maybe I just don't know much about growth management - done well or not so well.
83
84 n/a
85 Wichita
86 San Diego. Much bigger scale but there was a lot of leg room
87
88
89 N/A
90
91
92 Portland OR
93
94
95 Boulder, CO
96 Seattle
97 Portland Oregon and Seattle Washingrton
98 Santa Fe

99 London, the green belt
100
101
102 Olympia, WA
103
104
105 Cliffton Park, NY
106
107 Knoxville, TN
108
109
110 Sioux Falls, SD and Duluth, MN
111 Boulder, Colorado.
112 Ft. Collins
113 ?
114
115
116 The Maryland Suburbs in the DC Metro Area and Bend Oregon
117
118 Iowa City, Iowa.
119 Boulder, CO
120
121
122 Boulder, CO
123 Ottawa
124
125
126
127
128 Boulder, CO
129
130
131 Southlake, TX; NOT Irving, TX
132 I cannot think of a specific city at this time.
133
134
135
136
137 N/A
138
139 Many cities in Vermont-Burlington, Montpelier. Portland Oregon.
140
141
142 Portland, Oregon; Also Boulder County Colorado, with its legacy of green spaces
143 Rochester MN
144 Chicago
145 Santa Fe, NM
146 Portland, to some extent

147 Burlington, VT
148 Not sure, perhaps Portland or Ashland, Oregon?
149
150 Op
151 Iowa City, IA
152
153 Burnsville, Minnesota
154
155
156
157
158 Liberty, MO
159 Unless one spends a fair amount of time being involved that is hard to know. A well managed community can be of any size.
160 Manhattan, San Fransico
161 I think growth has been managed well in Lawrence. Density is a style that some prefer, but it is not for everyone. I think people should have a choice. I personally prefer density for retail, but not for housing.
162
163
164 Madison, Portland OR.
165
166 unsure
167 Greensboro, NC
168 Columbus, Ohio
169 Ames IA, Olive Branch MS, Grand Rapids MI, Lansing MI, Lincoln NE
170 Portland, Oregon
171 Don't know of any
172
173
174 Fort Collins, Colorado.
175 Maize, Kansas
176
177 rochester, new york
178 norman, ok
179
180 Des Moines Iowa
181 Denver
182 n/a
183 Have lived in many cities but Lawrence always has a plan but seems to deviate from it to fit agendas at time of need.
184 Can't think of one, but certainly not Topeka, KS
185
186 Washington, DC
187 Columbia mo. It has growth to all sizes of the community transportation around the outside of the community
188
189

190
191 Providence, Rhode Island. They have huge incentives for artist to live and work which has brought significant growth.
192 Manhattan, KS
193
194 Potsdam (Germany) post-unification: special circumstance, preserving and modernizing a historic town center while keeping rent increases capped
195 N/A
196
197 Amsterdam
198 Burlington, Vermont
199
200
201 Can't think of one. Lawrence's respect for its downtown has served us well. Let's keep focus on unique attributes.
202 East Wichita along Greenwich has nodal-type corridors with a good mix of residential and commercial/office.
203
204 n/a
205 Wash. DC
206 NA
207
208
209
210 Unfortunately my other experience was in a major metropolitan area, so not a valid comparison.
211 I have only ever lived in Topeka, Overland Park, and Lawrence. The first two cities I mentioned have certainly not been shining examples of cities well managed.
212 Nowhere I can think of. San Francisco has been ruined by "growth".
213 Portland, Oregon
214
215 st paul/ minneapolis minnesota
216 You may scoff -- but I'll say Boulder.
217
218
219
220 Boulder, CO
221 Seattle
222 Boulder, CO
223
224
225
226 Lincoln, NE
227 Minneapolis, Minnesota
228
229
230
231 Prairie Village
232 SanAngelo, Texas

233
234 I don't know one.
235
236 Berea, OH. The community has made a commitment to education, local business, and public parks
237 Ft. Collins
238
239 Parts of New York
240 Boulder
241
242
243
244 Pittsburgh, PA!
245 no example
246
247 Portland, OR and Irvine, CA
248 Grew up on the east coat in NJ- dense housing, fewer new construction and more investment in existing facilities/housing/structures
249 A small community in central KS that hasn't grown a lot but hasn't lost/degraded its population. They have done a great job of maintaining quality of life by attracting business.
250 San Diego
251 Portland, Vancouver
252 Portland, Oregon
253 Portland, OR
254
255
256 Amsterdam
257 Minneapolis MN
258 NA
259 Flagstaff, Arizona
260 Asheville, NC
261 Seattle, WA Minneapolis, MN
262 Indianapolis
263
264 Lucern, Switzerland Rome, Italy Hamburg, Germany
265 Eugene, OR Had neighborhood shopping
266
267
268 Des Moines, Iowa grew from 200,000 to 300,000 outward along interstate
269 Omaha, NB
270 New York City, Washigton DC
271 Ithaca NY
272
273 Richmond, VA
274 I like Boulder Colorado downtown area
275
276 Richmond, VA
277

278 Manhattan, KS
279 Portland, OR; Denver
280 Rhinebeck NY. No franchised businesses, small town atmosphere. Portland, OR
281 Fort Collins, CO
282 Inner area of Portland OR
283 Boulder, CO; Madison, WI; Ithica, NY; Asheville, NC
284 Evanston, IL
285 Boston Mass
286 Waco, Lincoln, Lubbock, Ann Arbor, Madison
287 Portland; Ft. Collins, CO
288
289 Madison Wis
290 New York
291 Burlington, Vermont
292 Denver
293 N/A
294 Overland Park, KS
295
296 Portland, OR
297 Boulder, Colorao; Burlington VT; Providencetown, RI; Madison, Wisc.
298
299 San Francisco - residential neighborhoods built aroundneighborhood commercial center but in a human scale not giant buildings.
300 This is the biggest city I have lived in
301 Not Washington DC, Portland, Boulder
302 1. Little Rock 2. Tulsa, OK 3. Columbus, IN 4. Springfield
303 Madison, WI - Ann Arbor, MI - Boulder, CO - Austin, TX - Tuscan, AZ - Portland, OR
304 No city grows well because the growth is left to developerss/outside, economic factors
305 Portland
306
307
308 Austin TX
309
310 Boulder, CO - I think there are other ways to meed desired objective (walkable, bikeable although I think the UGB has inflated costs)
311 Dallas
312 Lawrence
313 Portland, OR
314 None as they all gave in to sprawl.
315
316
317 Boulder CO, Seatlle WA, Copenhagen Denmark (all of these cities have a lot of what I like)
318 Boulder Colorado
319 Boulder Colorado
320 I have not lived in one that attended to its growth
321
322 Boston
323 Lyon, France

Bentonville/Rogers, Arkansas

Portland, OR
Seattle
Growth is not necessarily a goal. Des Moines has both unpleasant suburban growth and some city center improvements.

Denver

Portland, Oregon put a physical boundary around the city to preserve it's natural resources, but also left plenty of green space within the city
Large walking paths. Abundant parks. Plenty of space for social gatherings.
Mission, KS
Palo Alto, California
Louiston? Louisville? Colorado
Think of any, well managed downtown area or revitalized area where the focus has been on community vs. commuter-ville

Boulder, CO
Boulder, CO
Hamburg, Germany
Missoula, Montana
There are pockets of cities that do a good job. Example: Kansas City, MO brookside neighborhood, Mineappolis, Denver stapelton neighborhood all have areas that I like.

Boulder, where bicycles and foot traffic are well-supported. Fort Collins, for appearance of new buildings and maintaining green space.

N/A
Princeton, New Jersey

None really - Lawrence may be the best
I can't think of a city culture that manages growth as a culture but just look at downtown Lawrence - walkable, mixed-use, vibrant
I don't think I have lived in a city that managed growth well.
Austin, Texas

None - came from the East coast - Maryland and its a cest pool there with overgrowth and high traffic volume.

Definitely not anywhere in Texas :) Boulder, Colorado has done pretty good job

Naperville, IL

365 Indianapolis particularly the downtown area
366 Santa Fe, NM
367 Steamboat Springs
368
369 ?
370 Portland & Denver
371 I am ashamed to say Manhattan, KS. Due to new conference center, I have been forced to travel there often for meetings that I would love to have in our community.
372 I am ashamed to say Manhattan, KS. Due to new conference center, I have been forced to travel there often for meetings that I would love to have in our community.
373 Minneapolis/St. Paul, MN

7. What did you particularly appreciate about that city?

1
2 A government that was neither despotic nor condescending
3
4
5 high density upscale housing downtown
6 It has a well balanced approach to residential and business neighborhoods.
7
8
9
10 Progress was not judged on population growth.
11 The "clean" density of the city with access to transit and bike routes galore!
12 The growth has been well managed the downside of which is a really sterile and lifeless community.
13 Environmental leadership, integration of transportation opportunities
14 You can walk, bike, or take the MAX nearly anywhere in the city easily
15
16 Special interest people of th eloud people did not rule the decisions
17 More biking & peedestrian friendly
18
19 The balance between residential and commercial areas as well as the incorporation of recreational facilities and open space.
20
21 Growth considerations balanced for the entire population instead of one kind of development.
22
23 A robust active transportation network that allows all ages to get around town safely.
24 Lawrence has a great diversity of housing options. Some residents want urban living in downtown. Some residents like the suburbs in West Lawrence. Our leadership should not be discriminating against either option. The market will guide growth,
25
26 vibrant pedestrian shopping in historic downtown
27 It was welcoming and lovely with beautiful old buildings that have been well cared for and stretches of forest and farmland that are accessable to everyone (you could ring the doorbell and pick up a carton of eggs or nuts, etc.) - city was connected
28

29
30 There was some attempt to accompodate diversity, allow people to select among living alternatives and to focus growth to control it.
31 I am from that area and the renovated Power & Light District, old Quay area and attention to what the residents want and need are superb
32 I have been in many cities with good public transportation, and I think that is critical. My favorite cities to visit have good public transportation, and that is why they're my favorite cities to visit over and over again (Chicago, Bay Area, etc.)
33 Five distinct cultural districts are connected by an urban bike/ped trail system interspersed with public art and historical markers. This is VERY compelling.
34
35
36 I love the people and the smaller city feel of Lawrence
37 They did not allow home construction under the approach path to the airport. Smart. Avoiding noise complaints, and providing a margin of safety.
38 They've focused on density rather than expansion, which is effective for both the environment and for transportation. You can get anywhere in Lawrence in 15 minutes now, you can spend 90 minutes getting across Kansas City's urban/suburban sprawl.
39 Fantastic public transportation (that everybody uses), neighborhoods with stores/gas stations in them, few big-box stores, lots of walking/biking.
40
41 investment in multimodal transportation-including new bike routes, light rail, bus, good sidewalks and pedestrian routes, increased density in downtown, repurposing of historic buildings, emphasis on downtown!
42 Favoritism is not given to the same developers and there is more competition to build better housing (not all student oriented) and more retail. I rarely shop in Lawrence, as the taxes are so high and less variety of retail businesses.
43 Good public transportation, walkability, nearby countryside, convenient shopping for everyday needs.
44
45
46 Walkability, green space.
47
48 Character
49 N/a
50
51
52 Smart growth principles adhered to.
53 paved riverfront park, good restaurants throughout, great frontage for university (e.g., shops, restaurants, clubs)
54 It was developed in a beautiful way with landscaping/water features included at commercial sites and pronounced entrances into neighborhoods
55 Downtown and the lakes
56
57 Miles and miles of connected bike paths where you actually went somewhere on a bike not back and forth. Outdoor living was embraced. Green energy.
58
59

60 The fact that it wasn't in the state of Republican Right Wing Conservative God, guns & anti-gays KANSAS!!!!!
61
62 UCB building a community college dispite being surrounded by many-Great support for the student-Foodies-Holistic Medicinal Well-Being
63 One man planned the city decades ago and is credited for his vision. And the city stuck to the plan.
64 The town feeling of it. Now it's just sprawled all over the place.
65
66
67 I've also lived in St Louis, which is re-urbanizing nicely.
68
69 I appreciate the downtown area and the sense of community and neighborhood that exists in certain parts of the city.
70 The mall and the roads
71 the bike paths and great restaurants
72
73
74
75 Limited sprawl, and built skyward.
76 Lincoln, Nebraska seems to have a very good relationship between the university and the city. Door County has done an excellent job of maintaining the character of the area and maintaining economic success without allowing chain stores on the island.
77
78
79 The pedestrian holds a more important place in city life than the car-centric community that we have become.
80 Growth management practices to protect the cities from the real estate industry that is prone to overbuidng unless checked by growth management.
81 Revitalization of the downtown areas, excellent public spaces, increased arts availability.
82
83
84 n/a
85 Freedom
86 They kept fluoride out all the way until 2007. so I never consumed it growing up
87
88
89
90
91
92 thoughtful growth in city proper. Pedestrian-oriented
93
94
95 They put a limit to what could be built. There weren't sprawling strip malls, housing developments and banks on every corner.
96 Well-equipped public resources, effective public transportation, and a continuing commitment to improving the standard of living for all.
97 The walkability of the neighborhoods. Each little suburb had all the necessary accoutrements, i.e.

grocery, restaurants, movies, dry cleaners, etc.
98 City wide aesthetics
99 The community feel of East and North Lawrence
100
101
102 Its willingness to make tough decisions when faced with environmental and economic challenges.
103
104
105 Retail was centrally located.
106
107 Development was limited by the mountains and rivers that encircled the city and so growth happened within the existing space.
108
109
110 Business diversity that complimented and provided funding for the arts and festivals. Clean cities, minor league sports available to all citizens .
111 Focus on green technology and care to create many green recreational areas for the denizens of the city.
112 Good balance between commercial & residential development
113
114
115
116 They mandate landscaping in both residential and commerical developments. They create "town centers" in their suburban development and they have mass transit.
117
118 They appeared to be densely populated throughout the town. They also had a really wonderful, pedestrians-only, downtown area. There were many different areas with local businesses outside the downtown area. They seemed to mostly avoid strip malls.
119 How accessible everything is
120
121
122 The sidewalks and bike paths.
123 minimal development and preservation of the victorian character of the town
124
125
126
127
128 maintains its character
129
130
131 Southlake has managed to keep its identity, small town feel, and quality schools while growing, bringing in business, and maintaining their roads. Irving is a disaster.
132 Less urban sprawl and optimal opportunities for interacting with nature is important.
133
134 DownTown-Mass
135
136 football
137 N/A

138
139 A sence of community provided by easy access to local businesses and entertainment, walkability, gathering places. ie. Our downtown
140
141
142 Greenways and pedestrian access
143 City amenities for residents.
144
145 The City appeared to be relatively well-planned with strict building codes that prevent the development of slums.
146 public transit, vitality of downtown and relation to river
147 Compact design, great public transportation, and stronger sense of character through architecture
148 Ashland is a distinctive cultural oasis (given Oregon Shakespeare Festival since 1935) with plenty of walkable green space (its river/creeks enhance nature); unique, non-corporatized downtown shops; its college offers intellectual stimulation
149
150 Balance is the key. Sustainable growth is the long term solution not high dollar debt creating programs and projects that benefits the few.
151 Better balance.
152
153 They were especially tuned into leaving trees in apartment complexes, and generally valued their open spaces.
154
155
156
157
158 Great mix of new development, existing neighborhoods, and retail located within close proximity to each other.
159 A well managed city would allow taxpayers considerable opportunities to approve city/county projects,housing projects,retail projects etc etc etc. Taxpayers are the largest number of stakeholders in any community.
160 Quality industry and public funds for economic development
161 I love Lawrence because I can work in a densely developed downtown, but enjoy my large back yard and privacy at home. Its not broken in that regard!
162
163
164 Portland has an urban growth boundary, so farms can exist close to the city and its markets and denser development is encouraged.
165
166 n/a
167 Green space has been preserved, the commercial and retail options are welcomed and kept managed well (with design guidelines that are fair), and housing does well. There are strong neighborhoods, schools, and hospitals.
168 Rather than packing existing areas with more business and living space and obscuring residential skyline, Columbus simply annexed more territory when it needed it. Greenville, Sc has also done a good job with this.
169 choices in retail and retail not confined to a limited area - ie south Iowa and Mass St being the

only areas in Lawrence. Great growth in new businesses moving to the area
170 Accessibility of the city via bike and on foot.
171 Good police and fire, but could use more personnel for better coverage.
172
173 educated small town
174 Denisty is good, everyone works together to make attractive projects and new developments must be justified and blend in with the environment.
175 The expansion of their schools brought in many families.
176
177 vibrant inner city, but with suburbs that did not sprawl.
178 good balance between apartments and single family homes
179
180 public park system blended into development
181 communities able to form within smaller sections of the city
182 n/a
183 Cultural diversity and many opportunities to get involved.
184 Having lived in Topeka for over 50 years, I am ashamed of what happened.
185
186 Maintains plenty of green space. Public transportation is awesome.
187 Good mix of apartments and single family
188
189
190
191 They have huge incentives for artist to live and work which has brought significant growth. Rather than thank the artists by raising rent and forcing them to leave, they provide tax breaks, rent reduction, and other incentives.
192 That the city is actively looking for business to locate to the city, of all types, yet still develops the commercial sectors in a way that is growing the attractiveness of the city, such as the new entry corridor off of Highway 177.
193 less concrete and fences, less commercial development and more locally owned businesses
194 public parks and lakes, lively restaurant scene, bicycle lanes, historic center
195 N/A
196
197 Few cars, active and conscientious people and government, progressive
198 In many ways it is very similar to Lawrence, however, it feels more walkable than many parts of Lawrence, especially the newer developments in Lawrence. Burlington also more clearly values community and the arts (I believe Lawrence does, too).
199
200
201
202 Greater amenities (new theaters, Cabelas, churches, offices)
203
204 na/
205 because of the limit on buildings
206 NA
207
208
209

210
211 I cannot find a single thing to appreciate about Overland Park but I will say that Topeka seems to be doing well in the area of historic preservation of neighborhoods.
212 n/a
213 Neighborhoods and downtown growth
214
215 ability to travel throughout city.
216 An intentional and comprehensive effort to maintain the unique character of the community.
217 The great variety of cultural life and options.
218
219
220 VERY bicycle friendly--could be better, but it's a start.
221 low crime, safe, pedestrian outdoor options for everyday life and fitness
222 town was not allowed to spread into green space. Endless suburbs are distasteful. Let's curtail the growth.
223
224
225
226 Quality expansion in all directions, suited to the existing neighborhoods, good business models and choices that have added to the community as a whole.
227 Committment to the outdoors, corporate support of culture, city health and education. Deep respect for neighborhoods.
228
229 they were able to capitalize on the old town charm, without over populating the town. They renovated historic buildings and homes/houses - repurposed. I would like to see some revitalization of East Lawrence!!
230
231 Well maintained streets and infrastructure. Lots of mature trees. Sidewalks well maintained. Investment in parks and recreation areas. Higher quality stores and restaurants.
232 The willingness to allow growth with regards to new business.
233 The diversity of the town. Bg town, with a small town feel.
234 N/A
235
236 All of the above
237 walkability, bikeability
238
239 Residential area were clean, spread out enough not to feel claustrophobic.
240 Plenty of parks and open spaces--unfortunately it's too expensive to live there.
241
242
243
244 It takes advantage of its 3 rivers and built trails and parks to utilize riverfront space. Also, it turned old steel mills and construction sites into mixed housing/shopping/entertainment districts
245 N/A
246
247 Excellent public transportation, sustainable city, also with public transportation
248 Accessable to all needs, entertainment, transportation, etc., working with city's limitations (space, etc.) instead of sprawling

249 People understood and agree they need to work together to maintain all of the great things about the community
250 Wide range of resources- all marketed well
251 Great public transportation, strong quality employers, good natural resources
252 1: Protection of older housing stock, 2: transportation/biking, 3: Spirit of Community
253 Transit, bike & ped considerations, density in core
254
255
256 The general happy feelings and a progressive attitude
257 A mix of urban and suburban aspects with a very diverse creative and economic blend.
258 NA
259 Dark sky
260 You can park downtown and walk everywhere- shops, food, museums- it's like a bigger Lawrence only with mountians.
261 Open markets are spacious, natural areas appreciated living within a local neighborhood means not needing a car - all need available in walking distance
262 Attention to bicycles and pedestrians
263
264 Public transport, dense residential, Lawrence isn't a big city, however, it can build long term infrastructure
265 Easy bike lanes, able to do shopping near my house
266
267
268 Available to all, the needs of each community within the city
269
270 Public transit, a dense downtown, neighborhood diversity
271 The lack of traffic in the enter city mall provided a "commons". I like cities that provide residents with a refuge from the automobile yet encourage the promenade so residents can mingle and bond. everything one needs should be within walking distance or
272
273 No destroying trees, not as many apartments, historic values & preservation
274 No cars in downtown area - well maintained and numerous bike paths
275
276 Natural beauty protected
277 Lawrence has lots of dense housing and commercial areas that I hate to frequent. Density can work beautifully if and only if design works with it. Promiity means nothing if it is not walkable. Density is uncomfortable unless foilage provides year-round
278 Old downtown was revitalized. Industrial uses that became out of oplace were revitalized into retail. Ease of navigating the city, campus area.
279 Upgrades. Accommodating diverse such as - "Something for everyone"
280 Portland: designated bike streets, small shopping areas in neighborhoods, good public transportation
281 More liveable, walkable, easier to bicycle
282 Single-family but relatively dense housing and very accessable by bicycle routes and public transit
283 Pedestrian friendly, vibrant downtown, diverse culture, great music scene
284 Excellent parks, schools, culture and recreation
285 The way it retains its character whilst promoting ALL types of growth
286 In the last 20 years these university towns have promoted diverse economic growth. They've

created a number of small businesses, manufacturing & technology employment opportunities. Increased the population and purchasing power and have become more livabl

287 They both keep the charm of a much smaller town while supporting growth into a fairly lg. city (great bike life in CO - great public transit in Portland)

288

289 Orderly planning & well maintained

290 walkability

291 Downtown pedestrian walking mall, limit on big box stores, sprawl and highways

292 Land Use & transportation plans are linked cohesive and take a long view (50 years)

293 N/A

294 The traffic - busy but easy to get around - the retail opportunities - the business opportunites - a well respected community and provides many opportunities for its residents, both business and pleaseure

295

296 Bike transportation infrastructure, distinctive neighborhoods with local eateries and business; very practical mass transit system. Emphasis on the arts, local food.

297 Forward thinking. The best of Lawrence without the traffic; in case of Burlington, emphasis on walking paths and biking. A walking "Mass St" in Masidon and Burlington. Good afforadable housing and neighborhood revitalization plans that have land trust

298

299 The financial district has the skyscrapers and that is the oldest and least populated part of town. Smart, vibrant, tolernat, distinctive neighborhoods something for everyone

300 Live music, lots of fun bars, good restaurants, the swimming pools, the parks, looking forward to Rock Chalk Park

301 Art, biking, dogs, music

302 1 & 2. Investment in urban core, connected to suburbs 3. Incredible commitment to world class architecture 4. Relentless pursuit of business & industry investment that pays for urban core enhancement,connectivity,meaningful architecture & placemaking

303 These cities encourage diversity and offer ameneties for all ages, socio-economic groups and cultures

304

305 Mix of high dense area and green space

306

307

308 arts development

309

310 being able to walk, bike, and bus and dirve safely anywhere with the WHOLE family regardless of age or ability

311 There is growth for all races.

312 Recently, the focus on public transportation refocusing retail to the downtown district, and thoughtfulness toward sustainability

313 Tried to develop with a plan to maintain good environmental aspects of the area. The planning process at the time seemed to accept the idea that slower growth is not necessarily a bad thing.

314

315


316


317 Connected park system, walking, biking - face to face communication lots more than having to drive everywhere, neighborhoods markets

318 Being able to move safely on pathways all over town.
319 You can go anywhere in the city by bike in 15 minutes. It is very walkable also. Bikes and Pedestrians don't have to cross traffic as there are under-passes.
320 A city I have visisted that I enjoyed is Seattle - preserving the old while retaining its character - and having modern conveniences - public transport, etc.
321
322 Revitalization of older or historic proprties and neighborhoods
323 Public parks, beautiful walkways along the two rivers, beautiful bridges, municipal cleaning crews to accommodate the trash created by the tourists. Recycling bins everywhere.
324 Money from the wealthy Walton family making community improvements, job growth, tourism
325
326
327 Converting warehouses into housing and providing combined work and living areas has been done well
328 public spaces and parks available and safe
329 Downtown: skywalks, neighborhood improvements, farmers market, government buildings; green belt surrounding much of city.
330 Interesting question. What "did" I appreciate vs. What "do" I appreciate. I did appreciate the support of small businesses & industry. I did appreciate less traffic. I did appreciate a quieter town.
331
332
333 Like LoDo and the green space
334
335 It clearly values as nautural beauty and resources and prioritizes sustainability
336 It just felt friendly and inviting. The sense of community drew me in.
337 Encouragement of residents to enjoy the city and use of the community facilities and businesses
338 Careful planning, quality architecture of bldg, streets, parks, transportation. Lots of work put into planning process.
339 It has a diverse and vibrant downtown area and a strong trail system with neighborhoods built along it.
340 community and ability to be outside, walk, etc.
341
342 Green belt by design and car-light emphasis
343 Green belt by design and car-light emphasis
344 buses run every 10 minutes (not every 40 minutes).
345 It's appreciation for people's absolute need for quick access to the natural world at city edges coupled with a vital urban core with healthy foods, arts venues, and shopping.
346 Variety of housing, transportation, high density, walkable
347
348 Both had wonderful city parks, green spaces, bicycle lanes and paths.
349
350 N/A
351 The interrelations of an 18th century university with the last third of the 20th century
352
353 I like our 2020 Plan; sticking to it is hard, but somewhat done sucessfully
354 Pockets of many cities are amazing. Parks around downtown Minneapolis, Brookside/West Plaza in KC, walkable, open to public spaces, mix of business/living

355
356 the city center is thriving, development is booming within the main heart of the city (and it's surrounding area), the architecture is unique and interesting, there has been thought to the layout and beautification of streetscapes and common open places
357
358 Nothing.
359
360
361 Very walkable - local cluture appreciates outdoors and seems to understand importance of supporting local business
362
363 A centralized downtown with other hubs of activity away from the town's center
364
365 Emphasis on rebuilding downtown for arts, culture, and green space
366 There seemed to be strong, consistent code enforcement
367 Green space
368
369 ?
370 On both cities, light rail/train transit has been or is becoming key. And in Portland, planned neighborhoods with access to healthy food and activities within walking distance.
371 A new conference center, new hotels and a growing mix of retail options on the east edge of the community are stealing conferences, events, and jobs away from communities like Lawrence.
372 A new conference center, new hotels and a growing mix of retail options on the east edge of the community are stealing conferences, events and jobs away from communities like Lawrence.
373 Great public transportation, committment to the health & necessity a walk/bike networks, great recreation & cultural opportunities, wraparound outreach to new immigrant communities, restorative justice programs, industry/corporate support for the arts.

8. How important is it to mix housing types in neighborhoods (single-family, duplex, multi-family)?





	10. What do you like best about your neighborhood?
1	access to k-10
2	Nine is a worthless push poll. None of those things can be implemented by a code. They must arise from the populace itself. Stop making Lawrence so expensive to develop that it can only be a bedroom community. Instead, encourage businesses, which will in turn facilitate greater employment for a population that will bring with it certain expectations. You cannot impose those upon an employer because the employer will simply go somewhere else.
3	
4	
5	I live in the County, so I like to be away from the hustle and bustle of city life.
6	It is well planned; however, this is due to the HOA and not to city regulations.
7	large lot size, close to retail
8	It's an older neighborhood and we all look out for each other. The lots are bigger than the newer houses being built.
9	green space, gardens, enough space for people to feel ownership.
10	A very good mix of all types of housing, socioeconomic classes, commercial and parks/open space.
11	East Lawrence - walking or bike access to Burroughs Creek Trail and many local parks such as South Park, Brooks Creek, Hobbs Park, etc The diversity of residents in East Lawrence.
12	It is quiet. Access to the rest of the community is good. Good neighbors. Crime is not an issue.

Good streets and public services.
13 Immediate availability of bike path and greenspace.
14 Proximity to downtown
15
16 Let development or business thrive or die. Don't dictate there possible downfall or success. Maintain what we have. Too much is spent oiling the squeaky wheel. Learn to say NO.
17 Neighbors know each other & meet out on the sidewalks & each other's yards to talk.
18 It's a semi-private neighborhood with only one way in/out, which reduces through traffic, noise, etc. Enjoy that we have walking paths nearby on three sides. Enjoy that commercial districts are no more than 1-block away. Enjoy that do NOT have large apartment complexes in the immediate neighborhood, although are near by. Neighborhood is mix of owner-occupancy and single-family rentals. Like that.
19 I don't like my neighborhood. I haven't tried to sell my house because it is worth less than I paid for it.
20
21 Mixed residential housing styles, mostly single family (except where houses are rented) but close to arterial streets with commercial shopping. A sidewalk network that is better than many neighborhoods in Lawrence with walking proximity to downtown and KU. Not a plethora of density caused parking problems;
22
23 It's proximity to the KU campus, downtown, schools and shopping.
24 I appreciate my neighborhood because it is exactly what I want in a neighborhood. It is a single-family neighborhood in your classic "suburbia" mold. Diversity is a great thing. If I wanted to live in a denser neighborhood or in an urban setting such as downtown, I would have that option in Lawrence. However, I am extremely offended by people who use the term "suburbia" or "sprawl" to describe my living situation. These are subjective terms and carry negative connotations when used in this manner.
25
26 I live outside the city limits. It still feels rural, reasonably quiet, and beautiful, but with the new Highway 59, less so (noise).
27 We have a nice mix of renters and home owners, but not many families (as we have no sidewalks or parks near our house). I would like more diversity and more resources for homeowners to repair older homes. I think the older homes really provide a lot of the character of the city (not cookie cutter). There used to be grant opportunities for homeowners to repair and make their homes more efficient. It would be great if we could help develop those types of programs. I would be open to having more big stores if they provided resources to their community (our community). As long as it was ongoing and needed. My neighbors are pretty communicative, so that makes life easier. We can ask for help moving things or loan them a cup of sugar. When my daughter fell off her bike one of our elderly neighbors came out to make sure she was alright and offered to fix her bike. I am glad to have neighbors that are helpful and wish we could get rid of some of these rundown rental properties that are unsafe and lower the appeal of the neighborhood for families.
28 It is close to walking/biking trails, Clinton lake and the elementary school.
29 The neighbors
30 The neighborhood has a subtle sense of community. The people who live here share common values and a sense of pride in their property. They help each other while respecting differences.
31 I live N of Hallmark, W of Michigan, E of Black Hills and S of I-70. Not much traffic. Live in a cul de sac. The homes are mostly even in size and price. Our neighborhood is qiet, calm, without rental

houses or individuals who cause problems.

32 How walkable it is, that I can walk to work without needing to drive or use Lawrence's spotty public transportation, that it is close to walking/hiking/biking trails and eating establishments.

33 I live in close proximity to downtown. I can walk or bike to work, to the grocery story, to the hardware store, and to downtown. I like the proximity to Burroughs Trail but I wish it was better connected with similar well marked and safe trails to other parts of the city.

34

35

36 mature trees, nice well maintained homes, the sidewalks, active lifestyle, good neighbors, lots of wildlife

37 That I can, if I need to, walk 5 blocks to a place to buy food and whatever. That I am only two stopsigns away from a real road (which is only one stop sign too many - should be a yield sign). That the house that was populated by loud drunken teenagers selling pot has been sold to nice quiet law-abiding pillars of the community. That none of the many helicopters that fly overhead all day long are city police. That, unlike other neighborhoods where I have lived, the street actually gets plowed when we have 4+ inches of snow, within 24 hours. That my neighborhood has no covenants and restrictions that decimate property values.

38 Ah, North Lawrence. The garden soil, the increasing population of North Lawrence Lesbians, the facebook page dedicated to finding lost dogs and explaining loud noises. The mix of business places and housing, walking to the neighborhood restaurants, the basic safety of the neighborhood, the way neighbors look out for each other and talk to people they don't know, the strong neighborhood association. The fact that I can afford to live in a nice, safe place that is close to nature and beautiful. The mighty Kaw, the Union Pacific Depot - the fact that it is a public space that's affordable to rent, I got married there, the staff were great. I even love the grain elevator and the trains. I love my 110 year old house, still going strong, sturdy enough to last another hundred years, unlike the growth in New West Lawrence, which I predict in 20 years will be a crumbling slum.

39

40

41 I live downtown. I like the mixed use properties and the new buildings going up in the area at 9th and New Hampshire. The hope is that increased density will bring more services to the area. Being able to catch a bus or walk to work is fantastic.

42 Elementary school next to a park, walking paths are well maintained, close access to K-10. We need a grocery store on the southeast side of the city though....growth west is ridiculous....

43 My neighbors. You pretty much get a mix of housing types in Lawrence. Just the nature of a college town. Whomever designed, approved, or had anything to do with the military baracks complex on West 6th Street (just West of Walmart) ought to be really proud of themselves. It just doesn't get any worse than that.

44

45 Well, I actually live on the best block in East Lawrence. I consider my block my neighborhood. I appreciate that all of the homes are single family homes. I wouldn't mind a mix of housing types if they were consistent within the block. One block for single family homes; one block for student housing; one block for apartments; one block for duplexes, one block for commercial, etc. I would like to see new construction designed to better fit the existing homes in the neighborhood.

46 Trees.

47

48 Clean, single family, quiet

49 That no one bothers me for the most part and it is central to everything.
50
51
52
53 trees
54 not much (houses are cookie cutter, not well lit, side walks are narrow and there isn't an appealing entry or any amenity outside of DeVictor Park and Langston Hughes
55 Quiet
56
57 Sidewalks on both sides of road, diverse architecture
58 A park within walking distance, decent sidewalks and lighting.
59
60 Nothing
61 No outside street access. Nice trees, safe family atea
62 It's full of old timers, working families and students but not riff raff !! It has neighborhood bars, day cares, pre-schools, KU speakers can be heard-love the music and roars of the crowd. KU events spill over in my Old West Lawrence neighborhood and I like it - We have tons of dogs as well.
63 I don't like much about Fox Chase. It is quiet and relatively safe and the residents care for their homes and yards. But it was built by developers without much care. All the houses look alike: like big box stores with a veneer of brick or stone pasted on the front. The trees were not chosen carefully. (Someone I know saw them planting the trees: a truck drove by and tossed two random trees onto each lawn, not even bothering to choose a matched pair.) There is no variety in price range. One cannot find a mix of larger and smaller homes.
64 My neighbors and the fact that we are neighborly to each other. However, a lot of single family houses are being rented out which does not foster folks becoming good neighbors to each other.
65
66
67
68
69 I like the sense of neighborhood and easy access to trails, such as the Levy trails.
70 It's very unique and I don't think there are any crack houses near so that's great.
71 The unique blend of various architectural types and the great trees.
72 Established single family houses where neighbors know and care about each other
73
74
75 We are lucky. We live in an upscale neighborhood with easy access to shops that supply our basic needs: a variety of restaurants, grocery stores, liquor stores, dry cleaners, etc. are all within walking distance. Crime is low, neighbors are friendly and of various ages and nationalities, and the houses are well-maintained.
76 The family-oriented nature of it and the "front porch" mentality that residents have. In general, most neighbors know each other, are friendly, and are interested in keeping the neighborly aspect of our area intact.
77 We bought our house in North Lawrence in 2010 and we love the sense of community. I walk down the street and people are friendly.
78
79 Walkability as defined by walkscore.org. Lawrence receives a score of 37 overall, but my neighborhood receives an 85. Sidewalks on both sides of the street, walkable destinations, and

20 mph speed limits all help.

80 Trees. Historic homes. Walkability to parks and downtown. Alleys for car storage and trash storage permitting homes to have front porches and not be dominated by garages.

81 People: The sense of activity and engagement by neighbors with each other and Lawrence. Environs: Interesting architecture, homes with gardens.

82 North Lawrence feels like a small town, but the conveniences of a city are not too terribly far away, although we do REALLY need a grocery store! At least we have the Iwig store. Neighbors are neighborly, and look out for each other. The crime rate is low. The soil is awesome, and yards are big. The homes don't all look like they were cut with the same cookie cutter. Streets are straight. It's easy to find your way around.

83

84 neighbors quiet

85 I don't like it very much because of my neighbors. There is a lot of crime in our area. There is not a lot of personal space because the walls are so thin in our complex.

86 nature is intertwined and thrives on this part of town.

87 Neighbors try to know each other and take care of their property.

88 It is geographically located to businesses that I can walk to, and it it close to a biking/walking path

89 The diversity of Old West Lawrence

90

91 Diversity, sidewalks and accessibility to grocery stores.

92 Older yet updated homes. Most are well maintained. Closeness to KU campus and Downtown Lawrence.

93 I like the community of our neighborhood. It is nice knowing and talking to our neighbors. Being in an older neighborhood, we also have a mix of house styles and sizes. I like the lot sizes too. Further west, lot sizes tend to be too big and houses spread out. I also like that most garages aren't front and center in our neighborhood.

94

95 It's quiet and peaceful. I feel like my children are safe when they play outside. It's close to downtown so we can walk lots of places. The trees are tall and none of the houses match but they are all well cared for.

96 I live in North Lawrence and I appreciate its calmness and how neighborly it feels. Many other neighborhoods try to include its residents in a collective group, but I think that it largely depends on the diversity of housing type. We have had so many complexes arise in recent years that it inhibits cohesiveness in neighborhoods. I also appreciate the NoLaw dedication to growth but not overwhelming growth. I think the development happening at 19th and Mass is going to create a lovely new neighborhood (butcher shop, bakery, maybe a candlestick maker?) because the new businesses are directed at the neighborhood instead of other places.

97 Walking distance to a grocery store.

98 Live in the country

99 The community feel and being close to downtown.

100 I live by Cordley, and I like my neighborhood. The development at the 19th and Mass area has been very nice. I like the limited number of large apartment complexes in the area. I like the houses, most of which are quite old. I worry about areas close to campus, especially the proposed apartment complex at 11th and Mississippi. While Berkeley Flats isn't the nicest apartment complex, it provides *affordable* housing close to campus. The new building will drive up costs there, causing students who need affordable housing a lot of problems. I don't think of Lawrence as an exclusive place, but rent prices here are super high and they continue going up. This is troubling and will make it harder for Lawrence to continue growing. It will limit

the type of people who can come here.

101

102 It's a quiet street at the back of a neighborhood. It has ample green space, access to a recreation center, and shopping nearby. The neighborhood is mostly single family dwellings, and has a relatively stable population of people who demonstrate pride in their homes and yards.

103

104 I like being near parks and I like houses that have big yards. I like the diversity of my neighborhood.

105 Few neighbors.

106 the people, the neighborhood association, close to campus and shops, good access to bus, bus shelter for rainy days, diversity

107 I live in the country with access to downtown within 10 minutes. I like being able to see the moon and stars at night

108

109

110 No college apartments are close. A quiet neighborhood. Schools within walking distance. A stable neighborhood with no rentals.

111 Distance from congested traffic.

112

113 Beauty and quality with NO mix of rentals etc

114 It is an older neighborhood with a mix of architectural styles which draws a variety of people to the neighborhood. It is close to needed amenities. It is a very walkable area. That said, it has changed due to a mixing of housing types; from mostly single-family, owned homes to a mix of owned and rental houses. It has changed the dynamics of the area and not to the positive. Having a mix of residential, duplexes and apartments is not necessarily a good idea as the reasons that these different types are chosen are not necessarily conducive to a neighborhood.

115

116 It is 20+ years old with mature trees and landscaping. The neighborhood is a mix of ages and apparent income levels; very white however. It is quiet, it has easy access to campus and to needed commercial sites.

117 It is close to South Park and a church and downtown. It is is quiet. It is on a bus route. It has a Community Center where people can go to exercise and play basketball. It has a mixture of single family homes and apartments and it is kept up with the houses being repainted as needed and lawns kept mowed. It is easy to take advantage of all the events that are scheduled at South Park.

118 I love that I can easily walk to Dillons. There are some very beautiful old houses. I live in a weird complex that involves two houses and a triplex- and I like how I can interact with my neighbors easily.

119 That even though we don't have any kind of HOA everyone still takes good care of their property & respects everyone else's.

120

121

122 Our neighborhood is an undistinguished housing mix build in the 70s.

123 Trees, green spaces, proximity to the wetlands, decent roads

124

125 Walkability, green space, pool for common use

126

127

128 My backyard

129 Green space. Service
130 There is a neighborhood school, trees, parks, and some bicycle paths.
131 I love the nature trail immediately behind my house. Love it.
132 I do not like anything about my current neighborhood. It is unsafe and unsupportive. I would like to see a reduction in slumlords, drugs and litter.
133 Walkable! A trail is nearby to exercise/walk the dog, strong sense of community.
134 I use to love my neighborhood. I lived on a cul-de-sac with piece an quiet and the love woods across my house where I could watch the wild life come into the field that was reserved as green safe. But NOW, the woods are gone, the wild life are gone, because their homes have been destroyed, the piece and quiet gone, because of the construction of 31st. Every morning I wake up to the banging and the beeping of the machines destroying my loving neighborhood. I have to deal with the dust in my house and scenery is gone and all I get told by the City, is we will get back to you. I have asked point blank if they will put back some of the trees they destroyed, no! In the future I will good to listen to traffic and the noise but what is worse, I get to see it. Did I meant the view at night I have, it is beautiful. Its at the edge of town with no lights so watching the stars if beautiful. I'm sure that will go away to with most likely street lights. So to cap this off, my neighborhood, the reason I bought my house and have lived their for almost 15 years, is now a nightmare and the City can't even have the disency to return a call. SHAME ON YOU! ALL OF YOU! I understand growth but with no compassion for wildlife and nature. NOT IMPRESSED AT ALL!
135
136 My backyard
137 North Lawrence almost feels like its own little town. I like that neighbors make an effort to communicate important neighborhood information with each other. North Lawrence has a nice mix of businesses, parks, and trails. I just wish it had a grocery store.
138 Proximity to I70 and access to running/walking trails.
139 Easy access and walkability to downtown and the many services it offers. I have a sense of community and pride in my neighborhood and feel I have a connection and identity to the larger city.
140 It's walk ability. It's safety. Trees
141 I appreciate the history and unique housing stock in my neighborhood. Front porches help give a real neighborhood feel.
142 The incredible sense of community. It really is the best neighborhood in Lawrence.
143 Our neighborhood is walkable. Retail is two to four blocks away, but separated from residences. Groceries, hardware, restaurants, drug store, ...The only downside is the lack of sidewalks.
144
145 The redeeming feature of my neighborhood is the large apartment complex that does not tolerate loud parties, trash, or residents who disrupt the peace in any way. It is also a well-landscaped complex. There a more owner-occupied residences, but the rental properties, particularly those infested with feral KU students, remain a detriment to the neighborhood quality of life.
146 diversity of homes/incomes, older trees, openness of neighbors, close to retail downtown and in neighborhood (live in east Barker neighborhood)
147
148 Close enough to walk to KU, parks, grocery stores, and basic needs/retail outlets; lots of mature trees offer beauty, shade in hot summers; strong neighborhood association that promotes social community;
149 we all know each other and watch out for each other

150 Street access and quiet
151 Everything. OWL is the dream community I was fortunate to find and am willing to fight to maintain its character.
152 Beautiful old architecture, cobbled streets, and sence of community. East Lawrence feels like a neighborhood where people know and help each other. When I lived in west Lawrence the only time I interacted with neighbors is if I went over and introduced myself. I also love the ability to walk/bike pretty much anywhere I need to go.
153 It is very stable, has large mature trees, and everyone is very friendly and helpful. It's also convenient to shopping, etc. When we first moved to Lawrence I was surprised at how easily I was able to go downtown to the library, post office, etc. and get back home within a very manageable time frame. That's part of the reason why we chose to stay in Lawrence when we both retired.
154
155 safety
156
157 I like that there are varying housing styles and types. I do not think it is the City's/County's prerogative to determine the "architectural quality" of homes. Many of these features are determined by the price point. To dictate architectural quality is elitist and negatively affects affordable housing.
158
159 Still close enough to downtown for walking and biking. The neighborhood association is alive and well. The old growth trees. Neighbors work together for the most part. It's quiet.
160 Little crime, good schools, close to large walking sidewalks. BTW, 34% is not much over 20 years. That is not 2% a year before we compound it.
161 I love my neighborhood because we have very large lots, so we have personal privacy, but we also have a strong sense of community, our kids can play in the cul de sac or driveways and we gather often. Many of my best friends are also my neighbors. There is a shared sense of responsibility for planting and maintaining trees and landscaping. Our sidewalks are great, but our street is badly in need of repaving.
162
163 I like the mix in economic status and diversity. I also love the walkability, although there could still be improvements.
164 a feeling of community and smaller, neighborhood identity that complements Lawrence as a whole.
165
166 I like that there are numerous walking trails, that it is child friendly, and very close to schools.
167 The people are super, and people take care of and improve their properties. We are walking distance to Quail Run Elementary, and a couple parks as well, which is very nice.
168 It is quiet and peaceful without a lot of traffic.
169 It's character even though the development is only 20 years old.
170 It's unique character and proximity to downtown.
171
172
173 very neighborly, working class, lots of trees, artistic
174 My neighborhood is close knit and feels like neighborhood from the fifties. Neighbors talk to each other, help each other and genuinely care about each other. They don't come home at the end of a day and stay inside their house. The houses are of variable character so that not every house looks like all of the others. The streets are in fairly good condition.

175 I live next to a free recreational facility.
176
177 It is stable and friendly.
178 the mix of people
179
180 quiet, low traffic, access to main artery (6th St)
181
182 it is a very nice and quiet place considering
183 I live in an older neighborhood in southeast Lawrence. Enjoy living on a street with traditional single family residences although our street lacks sidewalks and could use more street lights. From our street, we have easy access to major east-west arterial street then onto major north-south primary streets. We are close to retail, entertainment and grocery shopping. In 19 years, we've only had two incidents on the street requiring police interaction. Prior to current address have lived on streets with major duplex developments - large volume of car traffic, overcrowded populations and frequent crime activity. Lawrence should cap the number of permits granted for duplexes and zone apartment complexes away from traditional residential development. More emphasis should be directed to developers on building affordable single-family residences and not shoehorning duplex developments into limited land use for higher profit margins.
184 Living on a private street, no sidewalks, limited overnight parking on the street, protecting each other's rights and taking pride in how our properties look, including landscaping and yard maintenance.
185
186 Lots of trees.
187 I do not live in a neighborhood. In the county I like the distance between homes and quiet surrounding.
188
189 The elementary school (Prairie Park), the Nature Center and the path around Mary's Lake.
190 the spaciousness of the yards, while still feeling like a neighborhood
191 The community.
192 I like the community feel of my neighbors and the proximity of the grade school my children attend.
193 nothing, its sterile and no one talks to one another. Would like to move closer to town but the old homes that have been kept up nicely are hard to find
194 quiet residential neighborhood, dead ends, no through traffic
195 I live close to downtown, so I can walk to many businesses and I can access services and my workplace easily without driving a long distance. My neighborhood has lots of trees and is close to parks. It is a nice place to live and to enjoy what Lawrence has to offer.
196 The Barker Neighborhood is socioeconomically diverse and that makes it wonderful.
197 Light traffic, friendly neighbors, quality homes
198 It is close to the University.
199
200 "Heart of the city" right next to downtown. Quiet street but close enough to hear the bands playing downtown.
201 Funkiness--it has a distinct, unique feel--but the neighborhood is very run down, codes are never enforced, slumlords rule, abandoned homes are left to decay, and walkability is zero (no sidewalks at all). Cheap to live there, but also nearly impossible to sell again once you buy. Seriously, there's a school bus packed with trash and cats on the corner. Who would want to invest in this neighborhood?

202 I can walk out my front door and onto a sidewalk that connects to a park, and can take my young child for a walk. Easy access to bike trails. This is in northwest Lawrence. I wish stretches of Harvard west of Wakarusa between Deer Run and Wakarusa had speed humps - people tend to speed through there which is dangerous with all the children on bikes, scooters, skateboards, etc.
203
204 proximity to downtown. historical buildings
205 wonderful working class neighborhood where most people know each other and watch out for each other, good school, lots of trees, close to downtown, our old house.....
206 I live in a neighborhood close to the University. I like having easy access to downtown Lawrence as well as the university resources. As a retired KU faculty member this has greater importance for me than for those not so directly connected. In addition we live in close proximity to other persons with similar interests, as well as close to KU students which provides a sense of intergenertional relationships.
207 More open - not back to back housing
208 NO mixing of housing types!!! Single family areas are important to single families. We need to remember the children and let them be in neighborhoods with other children, not college students!
209 I'm in the Barker neighborhood, and I like being able to go downtown or to campus on foot or by bike.
210 The people - we look out for each other without getting into each other's business. In terms of layout/structure I like the fact that commercial areas are accessible without being an impediment.
211 We are close to a park and an elementary school.
212 The look and feel and of course the people. We are a close-knit community and are proud of our block.
213 Proximity to downtown
214 It's distinct personality and the passion people have for preserving its history.
215 i can walk everywhere. close to downtown. easy to get to K10 / I-70. The history. Hobbs Park.
216 Economic and (to a lesser extent) social diversity.
217 Mine is a single family neighborhood with a mix of house styles and economic levels (not including McMansions.) There is increasing cooperation among neighbors about matters affecting the neighborhood.
218
219
220 High-density, with good (not great) access to stores and services. On multiple bus routes. Safer to bike through. Close to parks and downtown. Close to the University. Fairly charming.
221 Although we have no sidewalks in front of our homes the neighbors still maintain a friendliness and watchful eye on each other. There are many more families with children and a higher need for safe walking options and increased lowering of speed limits on narrow neighborhood streets. Even 5MPH on street with no sidewalks would help the children walking to school, pedestrian shoppers, dog walkers and very elderly walkers who cannot drive.
222
223
224 quiet
225 Location: near high school and university, walking distance to shopping, park available, friendliness of neighbors (neighborhood association), mix of ages and family types
226 I live in East Lawrence and like the sense of community that comes with living in the area. I also appreciate that East Lawrence contains a variety of housing types that accommodate people of

varied income levels. Additionally, the proximity of parks, activities, and businesses is well planned. I'd like to make a note that I think North Lawrence is unfortunately suffering from several issues that need to be addressed immediately by the city- the food dessert issue taking place in North Lawrence is completely unprecedented and uncalled for in a city that is thriving economically the way Lawrence is. Additionally, the issues of crime and theft in North Lawrence are being virtually ignored and there needs to be some large scale plan to protect the families and property in North Lawrence.

227 Live and let live. Very little beige. Walkable, bikable. Residents respect the history of the neighborhood told through houses, bldgs. spaces, alleyways.

228 Open, green space - parks, walking trails

229 The size of my yard (It's very large) and my neighbor can't seen in my bedroom window - also, no homeowner associations with strict rules and crap like that. I know all my neighbors it awesome.

230 Old well taken of home

231 Diversity of houses (architecturally) and good landscaping. Friendly neighbors.

232 It's in the county

233

234 I like that there are houses, apartments, and duplexes all in one area near 23rd and Louisiana. I like that it is mostly residential but that two grocery stores, other stores, restaurants, and two universities are all within walking distance. I like that when the roads aren't under construction there are several options for driving out of the neighborhood. I like that most of the property seems to be maintained. I like that it stays pretty quiet despite being near two important streets. I like that there is an elementary school, a middle school, a high school, and a couple of parks within a family's walking distance.

235

236 It is quiet and located conveniently to many enriching opportunities.

237 the sidewalks on both sides of the street, great old houses, lots of people and activity (and I do live next to one of the most beautiful gardens in Lawrence...)

238

239 That there are still a few remaining single family dwellings.

240 We are within walking distance to KU and downtown. The houses are mostly well maintained.

241 close to where I shop, close to schools

242

243 Vibrant. Lots of energy, largely due to KU students. Central location: close to KU, downtown, shopping.

244 I live near Checkers Grocery store and like that I can walk to the store, dining, KU, or even downtown if I want to

245 Very close to downtown and university, very active

246 Walking distance to grocery and parks and schools. And connectivity.

247 Close to central Lawrence,on bus routes a few blocks from hospital, library, Amtrak, Post Office (not dependent on automobile)

248 Quiet, feels removed from traffic. Family-oriented, but accessible to downtown, shopping (though no grocery store) and parks.

249 Safe place to live. Access to non-residential places. Residents care about their neighborhood.

250 open space

251 Location of parks and sidewalks. Availability of commercial options.

252 Mix, age, proximity to downtown

253 Proximity to grocery and other services & goods

254 Open areas, street connectivity to arterial.

255 Green tree has many walking trails and pedestrian connections. Promotes health and socialization.
256 Quiet, little traffic, diverse neighbors, no apts
257 Connectivity to downtown via pedestrian and bicycle routes
258
259 Mixed housing stock, proximity to schools and downtown, many large lots (Barker)
260 Wide sidewalks along a busy road make me, as a pedestrian, feel safe using it. I also like the proximity of bus stops nearby; however, this may be because I live near a busy intersection.
261 Walkable, safe I can see the stars in my backyard because there isn't a lot of light polution
262 Burroughs Creek Trail connectivity
263 I enjoy the diversity of the neighborhood- the fact we watch out for each other even though we might not be friendly.
264 North Lawrence - No law. F*** the police.
265 I know my neighbors
266
267 People care about their homes and family and are friendly - we are close to park and trails for walking
268 Friendliness, nice park
269 ease of travel
270 East Lawrence has a nice mixture of refashioned homes and green spaces with cheap rent. Also, downtown is nice and nearby.
271 I live in East Lawrence in the Barker neighborhood. I love having a grade shoool and middle school nearby bringing with it a rich mixture of young families with children as well as elders. I love the proximity to the Burroughs Creek Trail and the neighborhood's mature tree cover.
272
273 Quiet & few neighbors
274
275
276 We have a farm. Love our neighbors.
277 Privacy and nature. I live on a farm.
278 Quiet neighbors, open space
279 Space. Access to amenities
280 Sunset Hill NA. Can walk to my church, the Merc, Centennial Park, KU. Meadowbrook apt complex is way too big @ their latest addition. The green space is missed and was needed for the residents there too
281 It's homeiness
282 Big trees, close to downtown, close to schools
283 Like the Cheers Bar - everyone know your name. Folks share information and resources
284 Close to downtown, I-70, fully integrated in terms of age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, etc.
285 It is old! You cannot produce that today
286 I only have to drive 3 miles (cross 1 collector and 1 arterial street) to get groceries and gas
287 No H.O.A, great yard space
288 My neighborhood has a mix of housing types and socioeconomic demographics. That, to me, is a healthy neighborhood.
289 trees
290 proximity to the lake. Affordable housing, quick access to Topeka & KC.
291 Access to shopping; mix of housing types and style
292 Diversity, proximity to campus

293 On the farm - open space! :)
294
295 Walkability, sense of neighborhood character, residents concern for well kept property
296
297 Diversity of income; housing styles; walkability; near neighborhood retail but removed from higher density commercial; near parks and trails
298 How we all get along with a mixture of ages and sizes of families and races are mixed and lots of space. Many trees.
299 Small scale buildings, older housing stock that encourages community across alley and next door, safe and affordable, something for everyone
300 The park in front of my house
301 Neighbors, safe
302 Close to schools, parks, shopping, freeway
303 Complete sidewalks - diversity of age groups - close to downtown
304 Green spaces
305 Walkability, close to grocery and downtown. Liberal neighbors
306
307 I like its homey of a city. History - the passion is the people for honoring the preceding generations - diversity - not homogenized
308 location of modern conveniences
309 access to open space, mix of socioeconomic
310 It's proximity and ease to get to husbands work (I work from home). My husband can cut through west campus to get work. My neighborhoods otherwise is okay
311 The people and the house.
312 The closeness of the community, the rustic/traditional feel, and accessibility to downtown.
313 very low density and open areas
314 We look after each other and offer help when we see someone needs it. We all look after or check on older members of our community. No covenants. We're close to the bus line. We talk with each other.
315
316 Proximity to downtown, and influx of younger (late 20s/early 30s) residents.
317 Backs up to West Campus (woods and trail system)
318 Close to university and the center of town
319 It is separate from through streets and distinct neighborhood people know each other and walk the streets.
320 Trees, quite - nice people, safe
321 Old East Lawrence. Its historic/neighbors collaborate/arts, music & fun are close at hand/culturally unique/its not overly sanitary and boring/mix use neighborhoods w/ local business/bike friendly/varied architecture
322 quite & private; natural plantings
323 The woods. Many of the trees were cut down to accommodate the building of a new fraternity house, but mercifully, some woods are left. We see wildlife and are renewed by the surrounding nature.
324 Grocery store convenience; access to public bus route; access to downtown and KU; connectivity to churches; spring/summer/fall weather (not winter). Would like more local television to connect us to one another.
325
326

327 Being able to walk to a destination such as a store or restaurant rather than walking in a circle without any place to go. The fascinating stories each neighbor has about their life, where they have traveled to, what they are reading.
328 neighborhood group congeniality
329 Houses fairly close together, interactions among neighbors on the front porches, in front yards, and on sidewalks. Well-maintained older structures. No covenants requiring conforming practices, such as banning the hanging of laundry or front yard gardens. Walkable to grocery stores, hardware stores, banks, parks, etc.
330 Live in the Barker neighborhood. Love it! Walkability. Interesting small businesses opening up. Neighborhood Assn. Mix of houses w/ Babcock Place is nice. Benefits the neighborhood. Neighbors know each other. Not many rentals. People keep their property cared for. The Community Theater Building now has a vibrant church that is becoming inclusive w/ out neighborhood. Really really like it here!
331
332
333 Green space, bike trails, connectivity
334
335 Much of the surrounding natural environment has been preserved, it's not very commercial, it has character
336 We just moved to the Barker neighborhood. We absolutely love it so far. We love the growing businesses in the neighborhood from Alchemy Coffee, Hank's Charcuterie, and the improved Dillon's. I appreciate the active neighborhood association and the community interest in improving the neighborhood for all. This is definitely an up and coming neighborhood and we're excited to watch (and) the community grow in more positive ways.
337 Being in the country
338
339 Porches, walkability, mix of ages, grocery store nearby, farmers market, friendly neighbors
340 We recently moved to the Barker neighborhood. I was not anticipating the benefit of being able to walk to many conveniences such as the grocery store and some local shops (Cottins, etc.). Incredible benefit and we should be encouraging this more across our community vs. sprawl. Also like the mix of architecture in the neighborhood, though have to take the various levels of upkeep with a grain of salt.
341 fds
342 Walkability, accessibility to downtown and river trails. Historic homes and character, mature trees, good people.
343 Walkability, accessibility to downtown and river trails. Historic homes and character, mature trees, good people.
344 proximity to Downtown; able to walk to many amenities and activities in town.
345 I most appreciates its proximity to downtown and the university and that it is easy to walk and bike, which encourages not only a small carbon footprint but also neighborliness and connection. Also, I value its alleys, which provide places for slower transportation and neighborly connection. Also, I like the absence of unnecessarily harsh rules from Home Owners Associations that prohibit things like clothes lines. I love the diversity of housing types as well, which allows for a diversity in ages and income levels.
346 Connectivity to neighbors, neighborhood relationships
347 Friendly neighbors, food growing, small and modest homes, walkable and bikeable, parks, schools, small businesses.
348 There is a grocery store and other small businesses nearby, and new shops opening. The

neighborhood is walkable. We have a mix of rental and owner-occupied with more of the latter. People are invested in the community. People look out for each other. We have lots of old trees. We have a diverse neighborhood and a multigenerational neighborhood. We have a neighborhood school that is being cared for and remodeled.

349

350 Access to downtown and neighborhood parks.

351 Barker Neighborhood retains the charm of the early decades of the 20th century: front porches that foster conversations with neighbors walking by, lawns and gardens, individual houses, all different, different style, a great place for walking, Cottin's hardware store as a pillar of our neighborhood (the piano at the front door, the market on Thursdays), the gravel driveways and chain link fences (cf. Alferd Packer Memorial String Band's song "East Lawrence"), the responsive emails of Barker Neighborhood. Our children walked to Grammar, Junior High, and High School from our home, older neighbors died, and young families with children bring laughter and joy to our diverse community. We have lived in the same house on Massachusetts Street for 45 years and plan to stay in our home as long as we possibly can. We are very pleased with the new Dillon's and recent small commercial developments around 19th and Massachusetts. We're pleased to see certain houses upgraded and look forward to new neighbors who will help us all to grow as a neighborhood.

352 Access to green spaces, walkability.

353 Access to bike path on K-10; access to commercial options at 6th & Wakarusa and downtown

354 I live in country. What is best is that our neighbors are more connected to each other than any city I have lived in.

355 Great mixture of people. I know TONS of my neighbors.

356 It has good schools, it's close to shopping and my daily errands, it's also close to the highway and close to Clinton Lake / Park and it's trails.

357 Quiet. No loud apartment complexes.

358 Neighborhood association, lots of trees, quite street where people often like to walk down.

359 Walkable, sidewalks, mature trees, houses of don't look like cookie cutters

360 can take walks in safety

361 Walkable, unique homes, I actually see my neighbors, close to commercial district

362 Walkability proximity to trails, parks, and some retail amenities, diversity of residents, incomes, and housing choices, neighbor interaction.

363 My current neighborhood is close to the bike trail to Clinton Lake -that connectivity is good, but I'd like more connectivity to retail.

364 Friendly neighbors, food growing, small & modest homes, walkable & bikeable, parks, schools, small bueinesses

365 Connectivity of trails

366 Recently, the rental residences seem to be fewer on my street. The apartment complexes across from my home is well-maintained and doesn't tolerate tenant misbehavior.

367 Open space!! I live on 13 acres

368

369 Historic homes - proximity to KU

370 We live in the villas on the west side of town, Bob Billings & Bobwhite. We certainly dont have a mix of housing types. But we have a nice mix of ages among neighbors, very quiet, relaxed, friendly, easy access to green space. Sure would be nice to have a neighborhood restaurant, grocery, coffee shop, etc close by!


371 I believe in a range of housing options. I like suburban settings and single-family homes. It is a great place to raise my kids. Please don't restrict my choices to more dense and less suburban

options.

372 I believe in a range of housing options. I like suburban settings and single family homes. It is a great place to raise my kids. Please don't restrict my choices to more dense and less suburban options.

373 Live & let live attitude, people who realize that everyone needs a roof over their heads regardless, no pressure to paint, primp, conform so as to be boring, loving sharing, friendly community.

11. Which of the following types of commercial development would you prefer to see as the community grows? (Check as many as you like)



12. Downtown is a mix of employment, residential and shopping/eating/entertainment uses. What would enhance Downtown and its relationship with the rest of Lawrence?

1 evening hours are a must - shoppers are workers and we all work until 5. Open at noon and stay open until 8 pm.

2 More push poll questions. Why bother with these when you simply ignore the districts and zoning anyway?

3

4

5 fewer bars

6 I believe Downtown is a jewel and needs to be maintained rather than changed.

7

affordable shopping
more accessibility for disabled. more affordable events and affordable parking.
I wouldn't change the current mix.

more of the same with more residential opportunities
Bicycle and walking path connectivity away from automobile and truck traffic (independent pathways)
Closing mass street and making it a pedestrian mall like Boulder

Tax equity
Fewer bars, a convenience/drug store such as Walgreens
More shops, less restaurants/bars. Getting awfully heavy on the eating/drinking establishments and less on the shopping experience.

Affordable housing close to downtown, and more opportunities for unique local retail that doesn't sell food, alcohol or high dollar clothing

We need more people living downtown, which will reinvigorate the shopping and retail scene. Downtown is too focused on restaurants and bars at the current time.

Keep a healthy mix. We have enough eating establishments and bars. More affordable shopping. Grocery store.
Keep businesses on Mass Street (lower rents or offer incentives to local business owners) and surrounding blocks - more affordable shopping

Down play it as the center and disperse ammentities in clusters and convenience shopping near underserves neighboorhoods.
Nothing. Leave it alone. If the businesses are sustainable they will survive. Too much emphasis is placed on that area already.
More retail. It seems to be getting saturated with eating and drinking establishments and needs some re-balancing with unique local retail shops, NOT major retailers.
Better bike/ped connectivity and better access to historical information, markers/wayfinding

Fewer bars, less violence after KU games, still need more parking.

A pedestrian mall.

Better pedestrian access from East Lawrence, less parking on Mass, a downtown circulator free bus to get people around, more services such as a major drug store or grocery.
better availability of free parking; don't go downtown much because parking is a nightmare
As much as I like downtown, it would be nice for the commercial establishments there to stop whining and asking for handouts. It has been an amazingly resilient downtown. Obviously nobody knows why or they would bottle it and sell it.

44
45 fewer drinking establishments; more start up businesses, not national franchises. Bring back Esquina!
46 No more high rise.
47
48 Maintain Downtown personality... excellent at the present time
49 Stores that cater to someone besides college kids.
50
51
52 continue to have exciting venues downtown.
53 more parking, more days of farmers market, better bike routes to downtown
54 connectivity and expanded (and explained) parking
55 More art
56 a grocery store
57 TRADER joes, More independent shops (lower rent for mom and pop shops)
58 More general retail, a grocery store. Fewer bars without food, more restaurant/bars.
59
60
61 A grocery store
62 I think it's just perfect the way it is. It's a good mixture now. More exciting than Telegraph Street in Berkeley CA-Get some herb shops
63 Encourage more stores that are not restaurants to locate downtown. Get a Trader Joe's down there.
64 Fewer bars
65 Keep a mix of retail and entertainment with attention to the needs of pedestrians and bike riders.
66
67 I love downtown, and located my business there. I'd love to see it grow and become denser, to become the 'center' of lawrence even more.
68
69 easy access to downtown, better public transit and biking paths.
70 More retail shops
71 More apartment buildings
72 A grocery store and a drugstore downtown
73
74
75 The Downtown is a special place. Keep it by limiting urban sprawl, e.g., the Walmart on 6th.
76
77
78
79 Absolutely.
80 Enhance its capacity to attract investment into vacant and under-utilized development by restricting the pace of growth of retail space away from downtown.
81 Less specialtiy stores, more stores that those who live in the neighborhood could walk to to buy dinner, pick up groceries, have small convenience store (mini-Target)
82 I love it just the way it is. The addition of parking garages was a great idea.
83
84
85

86 Honestly, get a guy to power wash the sidewalks or something. It looks pretty gross and smells like homeless people. I'll do it. Hire me.
87
88 Easier parking, fewer homeless people begging on the sidewalks, decorative sidewalks that are better maintained and easy for older people to walk
89 Residential will help this relationship.
90
91 More free events
92 Strict architectural standards and review for all new and remodeled buildings. Any new parking be in garages (no surface lots).
93 It's footprint needs to grow beyond Massachusetts St to include more surrounding streets. More peripheral parking. The parking garage near the library is a great additions. Making Mass. St. more pedistrian friendly would be nice too.
94 More open space/ as a park
95 Staying true to the heart of it and not over building around it.
96 Sensitivity to its diversity of uses, encouragement for local businesses, and a grocery store!
97
98 Easier flow to downtown, sometimes too traffic bottlenecked. Close Mass Street to make it a pedestrian area.
99
100 In the last 10 years, we've had two (third in the works) high-rises go in. One (7th and NH) is pretty much empty. Not sure about the other. Why keep building when spaces are already there?
101
102 More stable commercial establishments. There is too much turnover. Downtown has a sense of unfamiliarity due to new businesses that seem to flame out.
103
104 More trails and greenspace. An indoor permanent farmers market. Better bike lanes (specifically Tenn. and Kentucky----very dangerous but necesary to travel)
105 We gave up downtown to the under 25 age group too long ago to try and change it. Just leave it alone.
106 a pedestrian mall or plaza-type space on Mass Street (closed to cars)
107 Less restaurants, more movie houses and the parking is now being addressed
108
109
110 Downtown is no longer the downtown I grew up in. It is only an entertainment and bar district. It is not welcoming to the older folks in our city. They are afraid to go downtown. We need more police presence and more control over the drunks at night.
111 Make Massachusetts Street into a walking promenade rather than a street with parking.
112
113 Continued emphasis on beauty of downtown
114 A better blend of types of shopping/eating/entertainment uses; less emphasis on uncommon.
115
116 well....parking....damn it....but this is it until mass transit is better
117 I think it is fine the way it is.
118 It would be nice if it had more employment uses- not just service- but more tech jobs. I do love the entertainment uses though. We hang out there a lot.
119 More/better parking options. Many appointments & other business requirements take more than 2 hours. Not everyone that goes downtown goes there just to shop & eat.

120
121
122 There are minimal bike paths that connect Downtown with other parts of Lawrence. A route west would help a lot.
123 better parking, or restricted vehicular traffic. More pedestrian friendly.
124
125 Better connectivity, better parking
126
127
128 keep it the way it is
129 Parking. Better access to shopping in evening
130 More events! Close off the main street, and have street festivals like Madison, WI and Memphis, TN.
131 Better shopping -even if that means more chains.
132 The parking situation could use some improvement. It is difficult to use the downtown businesses because of the lack of parking.
133 Less corporate businesses so that the shops/dining etc are unique, more communal spaces where folks can hang out, better transit system
134 You sure don't need a hotel but I guess that is going in downtown
135
136
137 Make it a car-free area, so people can walk, bike or take a bus but not drive in the downtown area. Bring in local, unique businesses.
138 Grocery Store
139 More shopping. Perhaps incentives to rent space downtown.
140
141
142 Less corporate stores and more locally owned stores.
143 More pull for adults other than entertainment.
144 More parking, restaurants
145 Another good men's clothing store. There are too many trees along Massachusetts St. and too few benches, most of which are dominated by panhandlers and buskers. Snow and ice removal from Massachusetts Street sidewalks is pathetic. Too many outdoor patios
146 more retail/residential, less eating entertainment -
147 Become more of a daily shopping destination than a niche destination.
148 More unique, non-corporatized shops with lower, more affordable rent; less bars, fewer high-rise tower buildings that block sun; maintain historic structures
149
150
151 More local retail and less food service.
152
153 I think Downtown Lawrence is great!
154 app of the stores in map format
155
156
157 Obviouusly, Downtown is awesome the way it is. Leave it alone! The market will determine what the commercial mix should be.
158

159 Fewer drinking establishments with an Old Navy,LLbean,Social Service League(special rental rate),an exclusive LEGO store, Apple Store, Sony Store
160 Larger buildings to support major chains of retail.
161 A major chain tenant, like a Crate and Barrel or a Pottery Barn in place of the Antique Mall. A Trader Joes or Dean and Deluca would also be nice - maybe where Borders was.
162 Community gardens
163 Grocery Store
164 lower commercial rents to allow new downtown businesses to start more easily, replace the large, single level paved parking lots with more development. parking garages are more efficient.
165
166 Unsure, down town is great.
167 Shut down Mass Street to traffic, have Vermont and New Hampshire as the main streets. Landscape the street, and have live art, live music, and places to rest or eat on Mass St (similar to downtown Boulder).
168 More parking
169 The bulk of the current employment is low paying restaurant and bar jobs. Retail is not geared towards the avg family that lives in Lawrence long-term. The bizare people and things you see downtown discourage me from taking clients to the downtown area
170 I think it's pretty darned good as it is. Perhaps less entertainment and more eating/shopping.
171 Less eating places.
172 Large plaza area or commons area to be used for variety of entertainment and recreation
173
174 Clean up the party mess that happens every evening. Make it truly a friendly place to be at all hours.
175 Include more bicycle paths.
176 Public use areas such as parks, shade, and benches. Mini-parks (bench, shade, shelter, trash can, possibly drinking fountain) at some of the bus stops (throughout Lawrence would be a big plus!
177 more residential use, grocery and other community needs for employees
178 bring in larger more anchor merchants (ie a dillards like store to anchor with weavers)
179
180 tougher enforcement of parking rules and pedestrians use of crosswalks, and drivers yeilding to those in crosswalks
181 maybe more expansion onto New Hampshire and Vermont
182 more bike and other festiveals
183 Recent investment in new construction in downtown will reinforce its image as the epicenter of downtown. Downtown does nice job of promoting entertainment and cultural activities that bring residences downtown. Sometimes on weekends downtown is TOO busy.
184 More retail establishments where affordability is prevalent. Some owners require too high rental per sq. ft.
185
186 Easier parking
187 more parking to get to the downtown
188
189 More of the same. I love Downtown Lawrence.
190 DON'T allow big corporations, like hotel chains, to build in downtown. It needs to keep its mix of small local businesses.
191 Permanent artwork, and more artwork around the area.
192 Traffic on that street is bad. Making it a walking mall, i.e. 16th Street Mall in Denver, would make

it able to have more people down town and more pedestrian friendly.
193 more shops for local artist and unique restaurants
194 that is the mix that is needed
195 More nearby housing and a small general grocery store
196 More local, less chains. More museum/gallery.
197
198 Increase density and expand this character a bit further than just Mass street.
199 keeping the mix, not letting food or bars dominate
200 REAL comprehensive bike paths providing access
201 Walking and biking trails connecting from other parts of town. This would ease the parking problems, too.
202 BETTER PARKING. The 900 block of New Hampshire will be greatly aided by current and planned developments there. To be an effective draw for retail, the parking needs to be easy during peak times.
203 It is already wonderful.
204 better/safer sidewalks/bike paths in adjoining areas. Street lights
205 less street people
206 At the moment I have no clear suggestions. I ned to listento
207 better parking. Lots of parking is closed during events
208
209 Any increase in employment opportunities in the downtown area would be nice to see.
210 The downtown area became much more vibrant once the restaurant/nightlife sector become more prominent. In regard to residential I am concerned that we are headed toward a gentrification of development around the downtown area.
211 New investors and/or property managers who care about diversity, the environment, and sustainability.
212 A grocery and a drug store would be a good start. There's nothing like that down there anymore, just restaurants and bars.
213 More housing and a convention center
214
215 more places to park bikes. close mass street off for pedestrian / walk ability. more events downtown.
216 Expanded public transport. A greater variety of kinds of businesses.
217 Increase density modestly without disrupting the adjacent neighborhoods.
218
219
220 Make it pedestrian only, deep-six free parking for everyone who is not there to work, free parking for employees of business Downtown and the city, KEEP THE BUS HUB DOWNTOWN, a grocery store on the east side would be great, too
221 Brighter night lighting, pedestrian signals at busy, confusing intersections (for example 11th and N.H., more bike police patrol
222
223
224 love downtown as it is
225 Frequent and more convenient bus service to downtown from the rest of Lawrence!
226 The planning of downtown has been really satisfactory for me as of late
227
228 fewer bas that are not part of a restaurant. no more high-rise buildigns. Close bars at 1am not


2am to reduce drink induced crime events
229 better access and parking - downtown is unique - quit trying to chage it! I like it the way it is - don't fix what isn't broken - The library and parking garage is a huge upgrade to downtown
230 More retail and fewer bars & restaurants
231 Providing stores and restaurants that would attract and serve the established citizens of Lawrence in addition to the student population.
232 Additional hotel/conference space
233 Maintain the way of currently is going. The new parking grages are going to be a big help as more and more people want to take part in the downtown and what it has to offer.
234 Free parking! At least free parking for employees. It is ridiculous to expect employees to work downtown generally for minimum wage or less and then pay for parking. The parking downtown leaves a lot of people annoyed.
235
236 I love downtown Lawrence and would change very little. I think the parking garage has helped.
237 more neighborhood shopping
238
239 I discussed that earlier.
240 Continued support for institutions like the library and art center.
241 pedestrian walkways & behcnes instead of Mass. st going our way thru
242 closing off parts of mass to be pedestrian only
243 More residential, more restaurants, a small grocery.
244 When I think of downtown, I think of shopping and eating. I don't think of it as a big source of employment beyond service/retails jobs. Perhaps attracting new businesses would be beneficial.
245 Expanding commercial growth on streets adjacent to New Hampshire and Vermont.
246 Less parking for cars. bus hub downtown. less street dining.more bike parking/less angled parking. try back-in angled parking. downtown grocery. affordable housing downtown
247 Promote as a safe walking area
248 Love it as it is!
249 Continue to provde a balanced mix of uses. I believe protecting the historical character of downtown while expanding by infill development will enhance its relationship w/ the rest of the community.
250 Expand, increaes diversity of businesses, high quality residential lofts (Owned/condos)
251 Expand to the north. Great opportunity to use the river as a central location and spread to the north. I also think expansion along 9th to the east would be preferable
252 More residential, fewer college focused bars
253 More jobs downtown, more residential downtown
254 More residential such as "lofts" below grade parking
255 I don't think downtown needs to change or move away fromthe modelits currently following, butI do think other areas of Lawrence should follow that model. "Mini" Mass Streets throughout the city.
256 A few block just for foot traffic, cafes
257 Better connectivity to other areas of Lawrence via pedestrian or bicycle access
258
259 Fewer bars, more local businesses
260 More affordable downtown living spaces, more varied retail. Downtown does great with the variety of restaurants, but the retail kind of all seems the same.
261 Pocket parks w/ natural habitat, desirable trees to replace bradford pears
262 Ease in connectivity via transit bicyclest pedestrians


263 You are kidding, right? Lawrence has protected the downtown experience as an ongoing priority.
264 More residential living that is affordable and a good downtown grocery store
265 not sure
266 Fewer chain stores. Balance between retail, restaurant, and bars
267
268 Parking, free
269
270 No comment because I love downtown. DO NOT tear down the nice two story row buildings on Massachusetts.
271 Less cars. I would like to see designated parking for automobiles on the edges of the downtown, with several, central, designated streets offering free, hop on/hop off, trolleys for those who are mobility impaired.
272 All of our family members from out of state cannot believe what a prosperous downtown. My only concern is the number of eating establishments thre are noe the business to sustain all the high rise apartments.
273 Fewer bars
274 No cars and increase parking around the perimeter
275
276 Lawrence has a pretty downtown.
277 Transit service on 15-minute leadways among activity centers!
278
279 Parking integration. Better security
280 Greater access to public transportation to downtown
281 If downtown were less noisy and less pricy
282 increased retail and somewhat less restaurants and bars
283 More retail establishments open at night, a downtown grocery store, a riverwalk area similar to that in San Antonio
284 Quit building so much high rise stuff
285 1: A conference center 2: supermarket
286 a mixed use development district with preformance policies & standards that allow substantially more height density and intensity. an improvemtne to all sewer water and infrastrucure would also help. establish impact density policies that allow any develo
287 Make it strictly pedestrian - like Pearl Street. More ppl. walking, more patrons, more street performers, less danger, food trucks could come in, Final Fridays and the Mass St Mosey could be eaiser, more frequent, more ppl if they have the whole street.
288 Fewer bars/more restaurants; retain green spacce and open space downtown! Keep enough free parking downtown that it can compete w/ South Iowa for shopping
289 STOP the highrise development
290 More shopping at night. Working families can only eat downtown. Better parking
291 Safer pedestrian and bike access; fewer bars and chain stores; appropriate architecture and preservation of historic buildings. Appropriate SCALE.
292 Better bus access, to Kansas City. Also, senior housing
293 fewer bars
294 Downtown used to be the major retail center here and now its not. The city should recognize that and build downtown for more "boutique" restaurant, retail, and bar atmosphere - let the retail development build elsewhere closer to residences
295 Downtown is such a critical element of the Lawrence Community. It is vibrant with a mix of all populations - families, college kids, seniors, etc., it is critical to protect the local small business

that deive this. Mass St. and other local amenities mus
296 More green space, parks; bicycle friendly access
297 Make affordable housing, actual nuts and bolts retail
298 More outdoor activities blocking off Mass Street for outdoor activities more - outdoor eating areas
299 No more tall buildings, be careful of residential and commercial gentrification downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. No more private parking. better value of historic structures. better transition between downtown and east Lawrence
300 Keeping the outdoor swimming pool open until at least Labor Day!! Please turn the temporary library into either a grocery store or a health club.
301 A walking mall on Mass St like Pearl St in Boulder. Parking on New Hampshire St & Vermont. More restaurants & bars downtown. Ford trucks too.
302 Multi modal connectivity from suburbs to core
303 More retail businesses - a grocery store
304 More parking, Mass closed as pedestrian walkway
305 More living space & grocery
306
307 Less high-rise unattractive corporate buildnigs that do not blend/compatibility with over unique historic buildings - anything that takes away from Lawrence's heart & soul.
308 easier way of getting downtown - transportation
309 Keep as muc free parking as possible. Be sure there are affordable places to rent to live there.
310 A grocery store, parks more accessable, improved sense of space. Better bike infrastructure to (so I can bike not drive)
311 Places for seniors to shop.
312 More parking (which is nearly impossible) and perhaps more public transit opportunities (from west/north Lawrence)
313 Fewer high rises
314 more retail and cutting the property taxes. It's turning into Aggieville in some spots - this should stop.
315
316 Bike paths and more pedestrian access to downtown. I love the shopping and entertainment downtown, but more hours in the retail would be great.
317 Pedestrian/bike connected to downtown; bus converge/transit center downtown; encourage multiple neighborhood center markets that are walkable and have high architectural standards (ie, don't look like your typical strip mall)
318 To not spread out the town. Density! Shouldn't have commercial vacancies.
319 The downtown is very vital and atracts visitors as well as locals. I think less bars are needed.
320 Public transportation - seems like the focus is moving away from downtown to serving campus and other areas - not to bring folks downtown. Also parking - when there is an event - it would be good if buses could transport on 10-15 min schedule from remote
321 Pedestrian only Massachusets Street. Affordable real estate for grassroots, arts and community focused non-profit enterprises. No more gigantic hotels! Incentize walking & biking instead of promoting car culture with parking garages.
322 Increasing places to sit & enjoy; contine the mixed use plan
323
324 low income services; higher wages; freebies and discounts; no sales tax shopping days per year
325
326

327 Keep it safe after dark. Continue to add parking.
328 better police presence by walking and bike patrol
329 Public spaces.
330 Am not sure... friends who live west of Kasold often don't come to downtown. They get what they need near where they live. Downtown is where the city still has its "groove". Keeping businesses that supports that image to bring people in.
331 More restaurants encouraged, free parking for two hours & then car must be moved, less boutique type stores
332
333 I love downtown. I work, shop, and play downtown. However, I would like to see downtown be viewed as one of many community assets. Downtown should work with other community assets to elevate our entire community.
334
335 I like it as is.
336 I think the growth in housing in the area will help businesses thrive. The increased parking and new library are also wonderful additions. I think traffic on Mass St. should be slowed a bit which would help give it a more community feel.
337 Maintaining the historic element of West Lawrence and reducing student house rentals
338 Needs to continue to be the center of arts and community events while including the unique neighborhoods to be a unique part of bigger central event.
339 Limit on # of bars- the more bars, the more noise and crime- and downtown becomes less attractive to live in or be in at night. Downtown crime spills over to other parts of town too- gas station robberies, etc.
340 Parking improvements have helped. Continue to ensure proper mix and commercial locations that support residential (food, etc.).
341
342
343 Fewer bars, a real grocery store like a Merc satellite
344 addition of shopping that people need on a daily basis - grocery store/supermarket, pharmacy/drug store
345 More stores that offer real goods, such as drugstore, for instance. Fewer restaurants.
346 I would try to recruit more businesses (employment) to downtown to give the businesses located a base of people to shop/eat during the day as well as at night.
347
348 Downtown grocery added. A mix is good. Maintain that. Support for current businesses and incentives to keep rents reasonable. Grants to remodel historic buildings.
349
350 LPD foot and bike patrols being present to discourage rowdy behavior/underage drinking and to make sure families and individuals feel safe.
351
352 Fewer bars, more locally owned clothing, furniture, hardware stories.
353 A grocery store (could shop there when downtown). More personal services.
354 Transportation and the encouragement of that type of development everywhere
355 More parking!
356 more of everything - more retail, more restaurants, more art galleries and shops, more events / festivals, more employment, and also a grocery store, more places to live and more parking spaces
357 a grocery store

358 Postive Teenager venues.
359 Affordable condos in 5 block radius of downtown.
360 pharmacy and grocery stores
361 That's tough - everyone wants more parking but where would you put it. One totally radical idea would be to make the entire downtown a car-free zone (not sure where you would put the cars) but then use street space for food carts, kiosks, etc.
362 Lower rent, additional service-oriented businesses, maintenance and restoration of historic character, increased night-time safety, building height limits
363 Better parking options - like the new garage
364 Safe & convenient bicycle boulevards to downtown, curtail or ban autos on some streets to create public plazas, jitney, pedal taxis, integrate the riverfront into downtown.
365 Trails pedestrian bicycle connectivity to rest of Lawrence
366 It should have more "real" stores such as a grocery, men's apparel, and an auto fuel station. Easy public transit access to downtown.
367 Close off the street like Boulder Colorado. Make it a walking mall atmosphere
368
369 More retail - mass transit between Mass St. & residential. Develop more river-oriented attractions - tilize the river to its fullest. More pedestrian access to river.
370 Downtown is a gem. We've always been hesitant to create other employment/residential/shopping/eatting/entertainment areas elsewhere for fear it would "take away" from downtown. With growth there will be more need for those pockets of vibrant mixed use are
371 I think we need to continue to promote large-scale residential development in the downtown area. This will lead to a more robust retail environment and more employers looking to locate operations downtown. Downtown simply needs more residents.
372 I think we need to continue to promore large-scale residential development in the downtown area. This will lead to a more robust retail environment and more employers looking to locate operations downtown. Downtown simply needs more residents.
373 An affordable grocery store, more housing for elderly- the Riverfront Mall could be partially retrofitted for senior housing- accessible, elevator, escalator, parking- more affordable shops for "real" people & some free outdoor spaces for kids & families.


13. How Satisfied are you with the following as it relates to industrial development in the community
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
a. Physical compatibility with commercial and residential land uses
b. Location
c. Diversity of types of employment
d. Architectural quality of development
Not Satisfied
Satisfied



	14. Other
1	
2	OMG, please read your own "options" and see that they are all tools to implement the very thing killing business interest in Lawrence. Start by unwinding your ill informed social engineering
3	
4	
5	Lawrence is not an industrial hub so we should be concentrating on white collar job creation.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Maintaining top educational institutions and creating opportunities for gifted "creative class" individuals to develop their careers in Lawrence and Kansas.
14	
15	
16	If a commercial store has done their reasearch and says they can thrive in lawrence, don't tell them they are wrong
17	

18
19
20
21 Local Entrepeneurial grants
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 Manage what comes but not with my tax money!!!!!!! Make an attempt to balance the types of commerce Stop protecting the existing status.
31
32 Critical is that existing small businesses get support. There is a lot of support for starting up a small business, but then it's just on its own with very few options to help it survive hard times and grow in good times.
33 Make Lawrence the coolest, most walkable, bike-freindly, prettiest, historical center in the midwest. Places popular for tourism are also popular for business.
34
35
36
37 No absurd "architectural wuality" requirements for business willing to locate here and bring jobs.
38
39
40
41
42 job creation for those without degrees from college
43 None of these are necessary or desirable. The realtor who has filled the office building on Wakrarusa (a few blocks south of Billings) ought to become the ecodevo guy. No subsidies needed. He has brought in nearly 100 good paying jobs.
44
45
46 enhance quality of life for retirees--public transit, handicapped-friendly housing design rules; support local food movement; support local energy
47
48
49 Quit spending money on stupid things like turnabouts and building stuff that is just going to be a taxpayer suck (Rock Chalk Park)
50
51
52
53
54 a known incentive plan
55
56
57 Dump brown back.

58
59
60 Stop handing out tax breaks to the Fritzles, Comptons & other well connected local developers & chambercrats that have run the city of Lawrence since the 1960s
61
62 Legalize Medicinal Marijuana - Be the leader in research
63 KU is the only employer in my field (Information Technology). The university does not compete with industry on salaries, so it does not do IT well, in any department I have encountered.
64
65
66
67 I have a web-based business, and we chose our location based on quality-of-life and the city's attractiveness - not because of any tax or incentives available.
68
69
70
71
72 More quid pro quo in tax incentives, as in, we will give you a tax break if you locate a grocery store in eastern Lawrence
73
74
75
76
77
78
79 Improving the existing infrastructure.
80 Change in economic development leadership. Lawrence needs to be led by skilled professionals rather than staff of the Chamber of Commerce who lack training and expertise in the field.
81
82
83
84
85
86
87 Lower property taxes
88
89
90
91
92
93 Investment in gigabit speed Internet would be a big boon for the community if done in the next couple of years. It is a short-term investment that will yield mid-term growth and long-term relavency.
94
95
96
97
98

99
100
101 stop subsidizing the greed of a handful of already-rich developers (doug compton, fritzels, etc)
102
103
104 larger permantent local farmers market (indoor development possibly by river or something) to encourage small business start up
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116 recognize that if you want to be a retirement community you better have more levels of supported living that don't cost $3000-$5000 per month.
117
118
119
120
121
122 A living wage
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130 Public investment in public projects. Less public money for private projects.
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139 Maintaining good schools and education is critical.
140
141
142
143
144

145 Less focus on tourism and more on substantive employments that pay living wages
146 increase of minimum wage
147 Capitalize on the already present strenghts of our local economy, not just piggyback on KU
148 Partner with KU entrepreneurs more closely and hire its graduates as interns and involve/train less skilled labor force.
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157 Economic Development opportunities have been presented to the City. The City drives them away with overly restritive REGULATIONS.
158
159 More focus on the arts such as the Int'l Ballet Competition,the art industry = plenty of revenue,more cycling competition(where there are cyclists there is money)
160 An absolute must is city wide money for economic development. Sales tax, property tax, hotel tax, whatever. And a specific plan for where that money is going. (Unlike the school bond)
161
162
163
164 support for regional food hub infrastructure.
165
166
167 Let's tell the world that Lawrence and Douglas County is open and welcome to new business. Let's sell what we all know is so good here!
168 Special incentives for locally owned and operated businesses
169 Lower the taxes on commercial and industrial properties. These businesses employ people that pay property and sales taxes. More new business equals more employees equals increased tax revenue.
170
171 Transport to KC and Topeka via bus.
172
173
174
175 Expanding Fiber Optic Data Speeds will improve economic development in Lawrence.
176
177
178
179
180
181
182 supporting our arts and makerrspaces
183 Stop overregulating/coding for business startups and we don't need to subsidize KU any longer for incubators.
184

185
186
187
188
189
190
191 Strong public investment into art and culture and entrepreneurs which will attract employers, skilled workforce, and help nurture new and existing SMALL business.
192 All type of business are important. Creating too narrow of a focus, say on biotech, limits the capability of a city to utilize opportunities as they arise.
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202 We can't assume that the new Venture Park will be a catch-all for future businesses. It's not a great location in terms of "cool" factor for new corporate headquarters, for example. Need more options.
203
204
205
206 Creation of LABOR incubators. The emphasis tends to be exclusively on "business" incubators and there needs to be both.
207
208
209
210
211
212 Skilled jobs are scarce here. Many people with good skills have to freelance.
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224 neighborhood groceries are needed in Lawrence may not bring about large amounts of money but are needed
225
226

227
228 Chamber of Commerce has not given Lawrence what we need as a city even though our tax dollars are paying them to do so
229 I think repurposing industrially zoned property and making smarter choices/investments. Instead of build it & then someone will come. Maybe offer great areas avaialble for growth & expansion& East Lawrence
230
231
232
233 Why are there so many delays for inspections in the city? I know of several places, that have waited months for inspections. This is not a good plan to continue if you want new business to open in Lawrence.
234 Support employees - support their rights and invest in their education and growth.
235
236
237 nurturing ALL existing businesses
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246 Create a livable community where people WANT TO LIVE
247
248 I like having most industry on the outskirts of town but am concerned about accessability in terms of employee transportation to these locations (do buses run there at what hours?)
249
250 Support development in North Lawrence. Market activity on Clinton/Kaw
251 Yes but KU bioscience incubator not serving as incubators, serving as low cost office space
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259 Affordable commercial property for developing small businesses
260
261 Persuade taxpayers to support infrastructure improvements. Create jobs to rebuild infrastructure
262
263
264
265
266
267
268

269
270 Raising wages for small scale ag workers
271 trade schools for our high school students & graduates. Green energy industries & associated product fabrication. Distribution centers for local food and associated food products
272
273
274
275
276 All are very important
277 None of these questions can be answered without having a vision. What economci csectors does Lawrence want to develop? The strategy develops that vision. The business community should be surveyed to determine what businesses will naturally grow here
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285 Sell Lawrene to the world it has many advantages which need to be more widely marketed.
286 Relax the "round hole - round peg" policies. Move to preformance standards and policies
287
288 Poeple come to KU, they love Lawrence and they want to stay here. You need to leverage that highly-educated & skilled workforce. Also, grow the workforce needed for industrial jobs.
289
290
291 Limit the use of public incentives to ONLY appropriate industries (eco-friendly, living wage)
292 Connectivity, Bus Access
293
294 Don't respond negatively to large retailers wanting to come the city or county
295
296
297 less gentrification
298 Increase the pay scale so we have less people commuting out of town
299 fiber internet, recogntion that most new jobs come from existing small business. stop giving tax breaks to developers - equal playing field for all.
300
301
302 Maintain high regulation in exchange for rapid approval and/or public investment
303
304
305
306
307 More variety and economic opportunities. We have enough service and entertainment employment
308
309
310 Make Lawrence live up to its expectations/image of walkable/bikeable & vibrant so people such a

our friends (who moved to Oregon) aren't disappointed by what they find.

Focus on employing college age students in career readiness opportunities/intern/externships

More desirable city to live in. Citites like Boulder, Portland, etc, naturally attract business

NO. We don't need to give tax breaks for businesses.
invest in Dr Domeis New Cities and work with Senior Center on attracting new retirees

Local economy.

Streamlined processes that are relevant, make sense and are easy to navigate. Technology infrastructure. Must have high-speed availability.

Public schools and overall education opportunities. I think the question is how do we make Lawrence such a compelling community that employers naturally gravitate here.

Emphasize what we've got - arts and ag

Creating Lawrence as a unique place to be. If Lawrence keeps looking & feeling more like Johnson County we will never attract good businesses. The businesses might as well go to JoCo where there is a larger pool of employees, more amenities in closer prox

Housing and work for the middle class
More consistent evenly applied regulation as opposed to "less regulation"; less burdensome and

more manageble would be desirable

354 Invest in infrastructure and school system

355

356

357

358 Also investment nurturing new and existing small businesses.

359

360

361 Educate public - if they love Lawrence they need to buy local. And taxes are fine. Don't listen to old people bitching.

362

363

364 utilize prime farmland for food growing economic development NOT for industrial economic development

365

366

367 Bioresearch parks

368


369


370

371

372

373


15. How important is it that development provide pedestrian, bicycle and transit options?
1%
1%
9%
10%
79%
Not Important
Important



	17. If money were no object, what transportation improvement would you make in the next 20 years?
1	commuter connection to Johnson County
2	Wow. I want a Space Shuttle. See notes above.
3	
4	
5	light rail from Lawrence to Johnson County
6	Maintenance of the roads.
7	
8	
9	Licensing and training bike riders so the streets can be shared safely. Disabled and senior accessible options to enjoy the outdoors. Many sidewalks are so degraded a person using a walker, cane or wheelchair can not use them.
10	
11	Small rail
12	multi-use path connectivity throughout the community
13	Highly developed bike and pedestrian pathways away from auto traffic. Recreational and storage canals between Wakarusa and Kaw rivers
14	Max like trolly system that was cheap/free and operated during hours people actually need it up to and including past 10pm

15
16 Expand bus routes along new routes. like Harvard road.
17 Better bus system and separate bicycling commutor paths
18 Light rail between KC and Topeka, with stops at major business parks.
19 expansion of current east-west routes
20
21 DEdicated and interconnected bike and walking paths with possibly some sort of hig speed train to connect to NE KS communities
22
23
24 Realistically, 90% of the population will never be able to walk or bike to work. Whether you like it or not, cars are here to say and our transportation funding needs to be focused on providing an effective network of streets.
25
26 More buses, taxis, more availability outside the city limits. Buses to Baldwin, Ottawa, Eudora, KC
27 More bus routes (at all hours) and better train routes leaving Lawrence (specifically Lawrence to KC)
28 Better access along major roads for biking and walking. More incentives to do so!
29 Improve traffic flow and synchronize traffic lights.
30 Clean up the mess we have. It takes me longer in Lawrence to go 5 miles than it did to go twenty in Northern VA or Los Angeles.
31 Not interested
32 Light rail in the region that connects the cities and directly connects to local public transportation (buses, trolly cars, etc.).
33 A fantastic system of off-street urban trails/linear parks, bike lanes, bike tracks, etc... to connect all parts of the city to primary destination centers, schools, etc...
34
35
36
37 Tear down the barriers to the flow of traffic: Traffic calming, undersize roundabouts, speed humps, speed bumps, physical obstructions, overuse of stop signs, stop letting kids play in the street. .
38
39 a comprehensive trail systems to allow bikers and walkers to get anywhere safely. And a better public transporation system.
40
41 More busses running more frequently, downtown circulator busses, new transit center, fewer cup de sacs and more grid street layouts so that we don't have to all pile on 23rd.
42 commuter rail between Lawrence and Johnson County/Topeka
43 Pedestrian, bicycle, public transit - Money is an object. All of these will ultimately save money.
44
45 small car lanes; bicycle lanes on major streets (23rd; 6th; Iowa); bus lanes; parking for small cars; safer pedestrian crossing at major intersections
46 complete bike and pedestrian systems leading everywhere; free bus service within 2 blocks of each residence
47
48 Trolley connecting KU and Downtown
49 More taxi services, and services to go to KC airport. Maybe a rail to Johnson county.

50
51
52 complete K-10, complete 15th st interchange with SLT
53 trolly to Clinton Lake
54 connect the east let of the slt to I70
55 Buses and bike trails
56 much better bike routes, light rail to kansas city
57 Connect bike pathways. More amtrak service!!!!
58 Widen every sidewalk except in historical areas. Finish incomplete sidewalks, i.e. Princeton Blvd.
59
60 Use more concrete than asphalt when renovating existing roadways to add longetivity regardless of cost
61
62 I would have system like BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit) -it would go all the way to Denver
63 Increase the bus system coverage. Make bike lanes everywhere, especially going west to east. There is no good way to bike from Wakarusa to Mass.
64 Bike lanes everywhere
65 Walkable sidewalks in every neighborhood and bike paths throughout our city. Too many of our neighborhoods are plagued with crumbling, uneven, deteriorating sidewalks. Many of our intersections are dangerous and put pedestrians at risk of injury.
66
67 Dedicated bike lanes on Mass from 23rd to 11th. A light rail line from Topeka > Lawrence > Downtown KC.
68
69 Better bicycle options, the city is fairly unfriendly to bicycles. Dedicated bike paths that would connect the city, widening roads to allow for protected bike lines on major roads.
70 Build better roads and make sure the roads can actually the population of the town
71
72 More routes for the T, more bike lanes, sidewalks that people can actually walk on in the eastern part of town
73
74
75 I am not sure. But, as we age, I see more clearly the value of the bus system. But, as of now, I do not even know the frequency of its schedule.
76 More and safer bicycle lanes/routes
77
78
79 Improve all existing sidewalks and add sidewalks to neighborhoods that lack them.
80 Complete streets (bike lanes, walkways, lanes for non-traditional vehicles, etc.)
81 Light rail to KC
82 a bike trail system that connects to most of the city, improved pedestrian sidewalk system, replace all the city's diesel buses with electric buses, make major thoroughfares (e.g. 23rd St, 6th St., Iowa) include 2 lanes in each direction plus turn lanes.
83
84
85
86
87 Money IS an object, but some in Lawrence think that it is NOT an object.

88 Interconnected pathways that are specific for alternative modes of transportation, such as golf carts, mopeds, bicycles that enable people to get around town without a car.
89 All residential areas would have good walks and the would be small service businesses within walking distance.
90
91 More bus routes with smaller buses for less used routes
92 Mass repair and replacement of road surfaces, curbs and sidewalks in older parts of Lawrence. City-wide fiber internet access (such as Google).
93 I would build a trolley that connected KU's west campus to the main campus to downtown. And then expand it to go to South Iowa and West 6th. That would give Lawrence a very distinct, romantic feeling.
94 Bike paths small nurse with more routes
95 A train system from Lawrence to Kansas City and even to Topeka.
96 A metro! More buses! A monorail! Something that makes getting from point A to point B less of a math problem. Or a car share program, something that encourages mobility in all community members.
97
98 Bike system where you could rent bikes at stations all over town, many more pedestrian connections, pedestrian overpasses at Lawrence's busiest intersections
99 Increased infrastructure for cycling and walking
100 More bike lanes, more buses and routes
101 24/7 public transportation-friendly entire city, not just a few streets with buses that stop running at 6
102 Improve/increase east-west traffic corridors, time stoplights to traffic flow.
103
104 I would like to see faster public transport like the ski-lift style box cars they use in some other cities
105
106 Dedicated bike lanes separated from moving vehicles by parked vehicles. Improved bus stops with shade trees and/or shelters and with benches.
107 More frequent buses, with good connections to other lines
108
109
110 Invest heavily in a mass transit system that is easy to use and goes all over Lawrence.
111 light rail and subway train system
112
113 Improved quality of roads streets and maintenance
114 advantages to using public transportation, options for using public transportation
115
116 a bus system that ran everywhere people live and work
117 Have just one bus system for Lawrence and make it easier for seniors to use it.
118 I would love to see a rail system that moves between the KC area, Lawrence and Topeka. Like Chicago's CTA rail system. A smaller system within each city and a larger one in between.
119 Make the SLT 4 lanes all the way, with only entrance & exit ramps, no cross streets. Add another section to the SLT, taking it from K10 up to I70 in the east side of Lawrence. Also, require a "round-about driving test" in order to get your car registeredu
120
121

122 A bicycle friendly community with safe streets. Add connectivity and lower speed limits.
123 train or monorail to reduce the need for cars in the city and surrounding communities
124
125 More bus stops, more frequent schedule people without other transportation options can depend on
126
127
128 Comprehensive bicycle, pedestrian accessibility, ease of use
129 Light rail to kC and Topeka
130 More bike & pedestrian paths. A route that basically circled Lawrence would be heavily used. In my wildest dreams? Commuter trains to KC and Topeka.
131 I would love to see a light rail system like San Francisco has.
132 I would have the buses running 24 hours per day every 20 minutes and they would be available in all areas of town.
133 public transit that covers the entire county AND gets people to and from Topeka and Kansas City
134 Streets that you can drive on in Lawrence.
135
136 free bus
137 Bring back the downtown streetcar system to enable downtown to become car-free. Connect neighborhoods with streetcars.
138 Mass transit between Topeka and Lawrence and Lawrence and Kansas City
139 Sidewalks on both sides of the street. Improved public transportation.
140
141
142 Light rail to other major cities and throughout town
143 Complete sidewalk network with innovative design that works for pedestrians.
144
145 Improve sidewalks in the older neighborhoods close to KU.
146 bicycle access increased greatly and light rail for city and out into county
147 Expand public transportation so people could live anywhere in Lawrence without a car.
148 More non-polluting busses
149 monorail
150 Connectivity a Roos the city
151 More bike paths
152 light rail, quick transit
153 More small buses that require less fuel to operate.
154
155 more bus routes
156
157 Walking/biking trails throughout the City. Although, it's disappointing that bicyclists frequently don't use them but will opt for the street.
158
159 several hundred miles of shared use paths. Lawrence is lagging behind.
160 Commuter train to downtown
161 Uber will make private car transportation the most efficient mode. We could provide vouchers to those who cannot afford it and stop running expensive underutilized buses in circles.
162 Grants to long-term residents to help purchase a low-emission car.
163 Sidewalk improvements and more biking/walking trails

164 a pedestrian and bike only bridge between the 8th Street levee access in NoLaw and East Lawrence
165
166 I would increase the bus to stop at each stop at least every half hour and to run from at least 5am- 12 am 7 days a week. I would increase sidewalks to make pedestrian travel easier. I would invest in low emission vehicles upto and including electric and
167 The best, smoothest roads in Kansas.
168 Light rail connecting Lawrence to Topeka, Wichita and Kansas City
169 Get rid of the emp T. Put that money back into street maintenance.
170 More bike and pedestrian trails.
171 Bus
172
173
174 Rail connecting Lawrence to Kansas City
175 Above or below ground public trains.
176 Transition from large buses to a larger fleet of small buses covering greater ares. Sell day passes on the buses.
177
178 increased transit service -- it shouldn't take 60 minutes to get across town....
179
180 more buses running to shorten the wait at stops
181 lightrail type system along a few main roads
182 n/a
183 Your planning staff have completed ignored rail and aviation as viable transportation sectors. You have a great municipal airport that needs upgrades. Do you know that you have an airport?
184 Better transit system.
185
186 Commuter train system to KC and then around KC
187 Improvements to the major roadway
188
189 Full implementation of Complete Streets in all regions of the city, encouraging bicycling, walking and public transportation, as well as automotive travel.
190 animal-friendlier roadways so fewer wild animals are hit
191 The ability to get through or around the city quickly with an overpass. It seems that the city is intentionally making it difficult to travel through the city causing frustrations. At least lights could easily be set to allow traffic through quickly.
192 Create a street corridor on the north side of town so that 23rd Street is not the only way to get from one side to the other without constant turns.
193 more public transportation + increased hours and traffic lights timed better, great bikes paths and shared city bikes
194 more buses, bicycle lanes and bicycle roads, more dead end streets for cars with pedestrian and bicycle through-paths
195 Solar roadways; more bicycle lanes; a funicular to move people easily up Mount Oread from lower areas
196 HSRail to KC, local trolley
197 Intramural bike/walk pathways, benefits for those who walk/bike, penalties for unnecessary large vehicles
198 A good street car system.


199 More biking trails county wide- i.e.: a bike path from Baldwin City to Lawrence.
200 Dedicated bike paths that provide adequate separation of bikes and motor vehicle traffic. The present "system" is a cruel joke, especially when the "bike path" simply disappears when most needed -- where the traffic gets heavy. See 9th at TN/KY.
201 Install sidewalks and repair the broken ones!!
202 That's tough because KU creates a big road block in terms of east/west transportation. Corridors like 6th and 23rd need to hum along so that people can get east and west, so maybe adding lanes? 2-land roundabouts = many fender benders
203 Would be super to provide more east-west corridors to ease traffic on 23rd.
204 return east lawrence roads to brick. improve alleys to be drivable.
205 more buss times and routs
206 Expanding public transportation into the evening and weekend hours.
207 mass transit into topeka and kansas city
208 Reparir roads with better quality material so it doesn't have to be torn up every single year.
209 More bike lanes, especially wider bike lanes to make it easier to get around town.
210 If money were no object I would seek ways to make the east/west transit more user friendly. The north/south transit continues to be smooth. I realize this is a minor thing, but please stop renaming small stretches of streets. It drives visitors nuts.
211 Safer biking routes. More places to lock up and store bikes. As an example, it would be great if there was a covered space inside of parking garages where people could lock their bike.
212 Light rail from downtown to the sports village boondoggle, South Lawrence shopping area, Topeka and KC.
213 Imrove integration of multi-modal complete streets with sidewalks and bike trails
214
215 bike lanes everywhere. bus service for free.
216 Light rail and inter urban rail.
217 A more complete network of bus lines with smaller buses and frequent service. As it is I do not use the bus service.
218
219
220 Separated bike infrastructure as described previously in every neighborhood, on every arterial. Biodiesel or other alternative fuel buses. Light rail to KC and Johnson County. No more dead-end sidewalks! Sidewalks on both sides of every street.
221 more sidewalks where no exist, more bike paths to destinations where work and necessities such as groceries
222 Bike access, east-- west.
223
224 street cars or trams
225 I would like bus service to be free and much more convenient. This would do away with many traffic problems, including parking.
226
227
228 Due to limited east/west and north/south corridors, buses need to have routes through neighborhoods
229 Tear out roundabouts - put in traffic controls that worl better (longer red lights at some intersections is a problem. Complete K-10!!
230 Greater bus coverage
231 More and safer bicycle lanes and sidewalks. Light rail between Topeka and Kansas City.


232 Unsure
233
234 Expand bus service. Make it free to Haskell students. Offer it on Sundays. Expand it in the summers. Equip the transit system enough so it can support the whole city instead of mainly catering to KU.
235
236 Public transit connecting cities
237 Streetcars
238
239 More bike paths, and maintain the buses.
240 Light rail from Topeka to Kansas City with a station in Lawrence.
241 a bridge over campus or a tunnel under campus
242 Tram system in Lawrence, also to neighboring towns and to KC
243 More bike/hike trails. Much better public transit, which means a lot more buses, running much more frequently. "Trolly" line running down Mass. Street, from 23rd at the south to I-70 at the north.
244 Better bus system!
245
246 Road diets on Kentucky/Tennessee/Connecticut to add bike lanes- development of 5th and 21st as bicycle blvds. Complete sidewalk gap fill, improved ADA ramps
247 Tram service on major thoroughfares and to KU
248 Bicycle lanes on all major roads in Lawrence - buses running to more locations at more times of day
249 Ability to safely walk/bike anywhere in town
250 Public transportation throughout Douglas County
251 Light rail from Topeka to Lawrence to KC and MCI
252 1) system of bike lanes, 2)bust stop structures, 3)trolley between KU and Downtown
253 Passenger rail TOP-LAW-KC-OP-LEAV
254
255
256 More bike paths, direct routes, benefits for less car travel
257 Connectivity throughout the city via bicycle, transit, and pedestrian access and less focus on individual vehicles.
258
259 Light rail
260 Realistically- road paint I can see. It's really hard to see in the rain. Big dream- high speed rail with a stop in Lawrence.
261 Eliminate S. Lawrence trafficway to restore Haskell wetlands
262 Bicycle & pedestrian paths
263 More bike/walk trails, also bike/walk to interior of town, not just outskirts.
264 Bike lanes in every major street - not like 9th - parking lanes street side of bike lanes
265 Dedicated bike lanes
266 Expand bus lines and hours. Build bike lanes.
267 More buses to KC
268 Connect KC & Lawrence with people mover (train)
269 blacktop all township roads, get rid of roundabouts
270 Train system to Kansas City
271 regional passenger rail

272 remove the roundabouts
273 extend bus routes
274 Better bike/pedestrian paths - less congested roads through Lawrence - SLT
275
276 All roads in county paved
277 See page 8.
278 A bridge over the Kansas River from Noria Road to 9th Stree in North Lawrence connecting K-10 to 24-40 and the turnpike
279 Better integration of all the above, and flexibility for growth
280 fewer parking garages for greater incentive to us public transp.
281 City would take responsibility for sidewalks and improve them.
282 significantly expanded bus service
283 Sidewalks on every street - bus system extended (more routes, extended hours)
284 Compressed natural gas powered bus, taxis, city trucks
285 Increase city wide bus service
286 Improve sewer, water, storm management, trails, parks, and transit especially south and west
287 Light rail, commuter trains
288 (Light rail to KC & Topeka) Widen streets to allow more bicycle traffic
289 improve streets
290 More trails, better busing options
291 Sidewalk infill or repair
292 Electric street car
293
294 Quit investing in roundabouts - everyone stops at them
295 Light rail options throughout the city & to popular destinations
296 Fully integrated bicycle transportation infrastructure
297 connected bike pathsand trails; rails shared by NE KS communities
298 Trolley, bike lanes, monorail
299 light rail connecting neighboring cities, trolly down Mass Street, pedestrian bridges over river (yes, plural bridges)
300
301
302 More rail connections to industrial land, connect (via multi purpose paths) west and east,north and south
303 Bus transport 24/7
304 Bike paths along every major street
305 Light rail to Kansas City
306
307 casch 15
308 local tram/subway
309 light rail connecting Lawrence to Topeka/KC
310 Multi-use paths, narrower roads (for pedestrian saftey)
311 More buses
312 Bicycle safe streets
313 Expanding mass transit & more bicycle options
314 electric busses
315
316 Better sidewalks and pedestrian paths around town.

317 Connected park system w/trails for running, walking, commuting, biking, etc.
318 Overpasses/underpases. Not so much concentration on autos
319 Bike routes should be separate from auto traffic and should provide connecting bike/pedestrian paths
320
321 Increase motor vehicle taxes, create dedicted bicycle-ways throughout the city. HALT growth altogether.
322
323 less pollution from automobiles and buses. More sustainable energy sources
324 Smaller automobiles in the city limits; rental sites for bicycles and smaller cars.
325
326
327 More and better sidewalks
328 safer streets by including sidewalks where none exist
329 Frequent routes, geographically comprehensive public transit.
330 Get smaller buses; the big buses are ineffective. Too big for a small numbers of riders. Safer bike lanes; they tend to be too narrow. Time stoplights so they flow with each other. Keep using roundabouts to increase smooth traffic flow.
331 From all areas of town a bus route should be no more than 4 blocks
332
333 6th Street flyover!!! need a better connector from downtown to West Lawrence neighborhoods
334
335 Cicycles and pedestrian infrastructure
336
337 Subway/train to popular locations in the Kansas City/Johnson County
338 Improve bike lanes, pedestrian walkways and connections
339 Retrofit many streets to "complete streets" or build a much more extensive trail system.
340
341
342
343 Complete streets - bike-safe streets connected by a thorough network of trails around the city. More regular and extensive bus transit.
344 increased bus service to at least 4x/hr per route, so that it is really a viable option for people to use on a regular basis
345 Revitalization of Amtrak and light rail or bus connection between Kansas City, Lawrence, and Topeka.
346 Street car
347
348 A safe network of biking and walking paths, sidewalks replaced, introduced, or improved not on the individual homeowner's "dime".
349
350 More sidewalks and bike lanes. "Jersey" style barriers to safeguard pedestrians along busy/fast routes.
351 Public transportation
352 More frequent buses. Also, a bus or train connection with Kansas City, especially for the elderly who cannot drive.
353 Connect bicycle paths, expand sidewalks to be bike paths on major streets
354 High speed rail between KC and Topeka with multiple secondary rides in and around Lawrence

355 I would expand public transportation--more routes, more frequent busses, and many more dedicated bike routes.
356 bicycle lanes everywhere on all streets / a rail system all around Lawrence and the surround counties and also to K.C. and Topeka / a highway through the middle of town - one going east and west and one going north and south / a highway around the edge
357 streetcars
358
359 More bus routes
360 bus routes that are more direct - straight shoot down the major roads (19th etc)
361 Continue to improve trails, walkability. Public showers for people who bike places, continue the T
362 Development of shared-use paths seperated from roadways
363 Bike only streets/neighborhoods
364 Build a safe & convenient bicycle TRANSPORTATION system
365 Public transit to connect city
366 Better bus service
367 More bike paths/running trails/parks
368
369 Better mass transit in the city & reaching into the county.
370 Introduce a light rail transit system, connecting downtown with outlying residential & commercial industrial areas, and then connecting Lawrence with KC & Topeka.
371 it is already happening. Finish K-10 bypass through SLT.
372 It is already happening. Finish K10 bypass through SLT.
373 Monorail (as in the proposed Austin plan), bike bridge over the Kaw to N Lawrence, accessible to wheelchairs & strollers.


18. How satisfied are you with vehicular roadway options when traveling across town?
13%
10%
24%
23%
30%
Not Satisfied
Satisfied



	20. Which of the above types of parks would you like to see more of as the community grows?
1	Neighborhood parks
2	The kinds that do not serve as an excuse for more hand-wringing over your stretched resources in taking care of them
3	
4	
5	more mini play lots
6	Neighborhood parks
7	another wading pool on the west side of town with longer hours like the one at south park
8	
9	Linear and walking paths.
10	Neighborhood parks
11	Bike trails/walking paths
12	multi-use paths
13	Linear parks associated with bike and pedestrian pathways
14	Would like to see more dog parks inside the city
15	
16	small open spaces for neighborhoods. IT does not have to be developed or a huge park.
17	asphalt running or walking trails. Loose Park in KC just resurfaced their paths with an awesome

material - kind of lke a running track material
bike trails/walking paths and/or linear parks.
Neighborhood parks

bike/ walking trains

Biking trails that connect to everyday destinations such as schools, workplaces and shopping.
Very satisfied with our park system.

Even more neighborhood parks. More rural-area parks
More accessability to walking paths and more community parks

walking paths, dog parks in city limits
A balance as the community grows (if it does)
Finish what was already approved...on N Iowa perhaps ?
e,g, c
Linear Parks, Bike Trails, Walking Path by a wiiiiiiiiide margin.

I like all the parks, regional parks are really great
NONE! We have enough parks. Perhaps too may parks. Too much teaching kids that the only route to financial success is through athletic scholarships and pro sports.
more mini/play and community parks
bike trails/walking paths

Neighborhood Parks
It is a pity that you didn't explain to the City Commission before it undertook Schumm's Folly that recreational opportunities are needed throughout the community, not just at the NW corner of town.

smaller dog parks and more of them; linear parks for getting around town; bike trails and walking paths to edge out obesity. Most everyone can walk a little; easy and infinite health benefits.
linear, paths and trails. Vest pocket parks and resting places.

Neighborhood parks
Don't care

more linear and bike/hike trails (connected)

walking paths
Community based
Neighborhood
Bike and walking paths HOWEVER. They NEED. To connect !!

Bike/walk/dog

61
62 swings
63 More neighborhood parks in new neighborhoods.
64 Bike trails, neighborhood parks
65 Small neighborhood parks.
66
67 The linear and neighborhood parks are really, really great.
68
69
70 Neighborhood
71 Linear
72 Small green spaces
73
74
75 I do not want the community to grow. Growth in population is the source of our (and the world's) problems. More summer recreational playground programs are neede for our curent choldren.
76 bike trails/walking paths
77
78
79 Biking/Hiking trails that connect with each other to encircle and criss-cross the town.
80 It is important that the City continue its policy of providing neighborhood parks in close proximity to all residential development.
81 Bike/walking trails
82 Bike trails/Walking Paths
83
84
85
86
87 Bike trails and walking paths
88 Clinton Park and Rotary Arboretum connect with a walking/biking path. I love that!
89 neighborhood parks
90
91 Bike trails and walking paths
92 Linear Parks. Walking and bike trails.
93 Bike Trails
94 Neighborhood green spaces
95 all
96 Development of the Riverside dog park (or at least a semblance of maintenance) and improved bike access on busy roads.
97
98 Connecting trails that made it possible to move from one destination to another, as opposed to trails that are destinations for people who want to recreate (although these are important too)
99
100 Dog park within city limits. The one at Clinton Lake is great, but it's a jaunt to get there.
101
102 I think we have a great balance.
103

104 food garden parks... orchards
105 all of the above
106 A fenced dog park closer to town for small dogs only. More mini/play-lots and other small neighborhood parks. Even a small space with a couple of picnic tables.
107 Diversity within larger parks, with theater in the summer, music, etc.
108
109
110 Family Parks
111 regional parks
112
113 Satisfied
114 small parks in neighborhoods
115
116 need accessible parks for persons with disabilities of all ages
117 Dog parks and walking paths.
118 More bike trails and walking paths! I really like that I can get from east Lawrence to 23rd without huge amounts of danger, like I would if I had to take the streets.
119 Neighborhood & linear
120
121
122 There needs to be more connectivity between the existing parks for walking and biking.
123 neighborhood and community parks
124
125 Walking paths
126
127
128 bike trails/walking pathes, rec center on west side of twon
129
130 All. I'm partial to bike paths.
131 Nature trails around neighborhoods.
132 I would like to see more parks like Clinton Lake.
133
134 Both dog parks and Neighborhood parks
135
136
137 Dog parks, walking paths.
138
139 More open space.
140
141
142 Open, multi-use space with bike and walking trails
143 Neighborhood parks. More options for toddlers.
144
145 Those that serve as green space in dense neighborhoods and commercial areas.
146 linear neighborhood, community
147 More soccer field
148 neighborhood parks
149

150 Require developers to provide park space as part of the planning process
151
152
153 Linear trails/walking paths that follow along creeks and streams -- like Johnson County does.
154
155
156
157 Bike trails / walking paths
158 Neighborhood and community
159 g. Bike Trails/ Walking Paths
160 Hiking
161 Walking Paths and Bike Trails should continue to be included in future development. A balance of all of the above.
162 Bike & walking trails
163 More of all parks, they should be made a priority. Even just areas of green space. More parks with picnic areas that can be rented and include amenities, similar to lyon's park
164 linear / paths should be both recreational and support commuters.
165
166 neighborhood, mini, walking
167 Neighborhood
168 options c and d
169 Current park situation/growth pattern is fine
170 Bike trails and walking paths
171
172 Connectivity of trails and bikeways throughout the community
173
174
175 South Park
176 Play areas, especially water play. Another pool (north lawrence could really use one!) and some spray play areas would be terrific additions to Lawrence. We need to spread these out, though, not concentrate them all downtown.
177
178 bike trails / walking paths
179
180 linear
181 linear
182 bike and nature parks
183 Neighborhood parks
184
185
186 Family fun centers (golf range, baseball hitting, putt putt, go carts)
187 Neighborhood Parks
188
189 Linear and bike/walking trails/paths
190
191 Enhancement of all parks and specifically a sculpture park or parks in either existing areas or new areas.
192 Like to continue to see all types as they all are great attributes of the city.

193
194 bike trails / walking paths, and connecting them much better
195 Community; dog parks; bike trails
196 More water activities in parks.
197 bike/walk paths and parks
198 I think Lawrence does a good job with the parks system. I would like to see denser, more thoughtful development near the existing park infrastructures.
199 Trails & Bike/Walking paths
200
201 More walking paths, and small fenced dog parks in town
202 More of the same as we expand
203 The only dog park is at Clinton Lake!!! No one goes to North dog park, too isolated and scary! We need at least 3 neighborhood dog parks. I will help pay for fences!!
204 connection of walking trails between neighborhoods
205 neighborhood parks and green space
206 More green space
207 walking paths
208
209 Linear. I love Burrough's Creek Trail. I use it mainly for exercise, but it's also a useful pathway that connects my neighborhood to downtown, and makes it easy to get there by bike.
210 Ideally it would be cool to have vibrant neighborhood parks. I realize it is difficult to place these in existing areas.
211 Community and neighborhood parks.
212 c, e, g
213
214
215 parks are always an asset. more is not a bad thing. more bike paths.
216 E and G
217 Neighborhood mini-parks and walking paths.
218
219
220 More neighborhood parks.
221 Dog parks with fencing, poop bags, trash cans, lights for night, more lit bike trails and walking parths
222 Please, please, could we have several in town dog parks. These enhance friendliness, as well as benefits our pets.
223
224 neighborhood
225 We have incredible park service! the Park and Recreation department is outstanding.
226 Walking paths/hiking trails
227 Bike Trails/Walking paths
228 dog parks
229 Bike trails/walking paths - made on dirt - not concrete
230 Neighborhood open space
231 Bike paths and
232 More trails for biking, walking, etc.
233
234 neighborhood parks and bike trails/walking paths

235
236 More bike traisl/walking paths
237 bike trails/walking paths
238
239 Dog parks and neighborhood parks.
240 Connect trails they way they are in Overland Park, so you can walk or bike without having to stop for traffic.
241 walking paths
242 B, C and G
243 Bike and walking paths.
244 walking paths
245 Regional/Community
246 bike trails/walking paths/linear parks with transportation connections
247 Parks featuring unique activities (such as Centennial Park offers)
248 More dog parks and walking paths/bike trails
249 Bike trails/walking paths
250 Bike trails - for running/jogging
251 I think our parks are a strength of our community
252 West seems to be under-parked more than anything
253 Linear, community
254 neighborhood green areas
255 Community & dog parks
256 Through/linear bike paths
257 Linear, trails, large community
258 Multi use parks band concerts etc
259 Linear
260
261 More like Martin Park and Prairie Park - native habitat w/ trails
262 Bike trails/wakling paths and linear
263 All
264 communal gardens
265
266 Bike trails and walking paths
267 Dog parks and walking trails
268 Walking paths, bike trails
269 walking trails
270 Linear
271 linnear
272
273 Bike trails & walking paths
274 Clinton Park area developed
275
276
277 N/A
278 river parks and pocket parks
279 neighborhood
280
281 linear, bike trails/walking paths, neighborhood parks

282 expand safe bike/walking paths
283 Pocket parks
284 Linear
285
286 bike trails and walking paths
287 Bike trails
288 More linear and trails/paths
289 comunity & bike trails/walking
290 bike trails, neighborhood parks
291 Open space like Baker wetlands - low maintenance wild lands
292 Childrens play area, splash parks
293 South and Watkins
294 neighborhood and regional
295 bike trails/walking path - particularly when they serve to connect destinations
296 All of above. These are indicators of community health.
297 See comments walking trails are better than disappearing bike paths
298 More bike trails
299 dog park on far east side of town
300
301 More bike stuff
302 Bike trails, walking paths
303 Mini/play lots - neighborhood community
304 Biking/walking
305 All
306
307 Watson
308 bike trails/walking paths
309 more trails & paths connecting housing areas
310 The dog park is very busy - maybe one more central (I guess this could be an issue through) Would like to see interconnected multi-use paths
311
312 Dog parks, neighborhood
313 More linear and bike/walking trails
314 community and neighborhood parks
315
316 Bike trails and walking paths
317 Linear
318
319 Haskell/Baker wetlands and other green space that is undeveloped except walking/biking paths
320 needs to fit the need - may be mini - play-lots and/or neighborhood
321 Community orchards, farm parks that grow food. Biking and walking paths, nature corridors and reserves
322 more walking trails
323 bike trails and walking paths
324 Events for people to talk...what can I do in the park...I need activity.
325
326
327 Walking paths

328 fenced dog parks for small and large dogs separated with clean up supplies
329 Linear, so that one could commute off roadways via bicycle.
330 More "pocket parks" where people can gather to increase sense of connection in neighborhoods.
331
332
333 Pcket parks in neighborhoods
334
335 Bike trails/walking paths
336 More small dog parks. I only know of the one out at Clinton Lake and I don't like having to travel so far.
337 More neighborhood activities: basketball, frizbee golf, miniture golf
338 Bike trails/walking paths
339 Bike trails/paths, more mini parks
340 I think the neighborhood parks should continue. the small play areas seem to be afterthoughts.
341
342
343 More natural, outdoor rec use parks - as in bike trails, river trail system. Not so much the mowed, manicured lawn parks.
344 neighborhood parks
345 Preserved riparian areas and more natural type easements. Places kids would want to get lost in, maybe even build a treehouse.
346 Bike trails and walking paths
347
348 Riverfront development, continue and increase all of the above types.
349
350 Neighborhood.
351
352 Trails, especially labeled nature trails.
353 Linear; long enough to get some real exercise
354 More dedicated bike/walk trails that connect places, not just go around them.
355 Bike trails & walking paths
356 I'd like to see "all" neighborhoods have mini/play lots and also have neighborhood parks (only the old neighborhoods have these) / there also needs to be community parks on the west side of town
357 Community, neighborhood
358 Bike trails / walking paths
359
360 safer bikes trails in straight shots across the city
361 Continuewalkability/bike lanes/etc. Expand Linear! Levee is great
362 Add additional linear trails, wide trails that connect people with parks, services, and employment
363 Neighborhood parks
364 Need bicycle TRANSPORTATION, less spent on bicycle recreation
365 BCDEG
366 Bike trails and walking paths
367 Linear trails
368
369 Linear, walking paths. Community
370 Wow! All of them...? I think access to nature is so very important to the health of a community.

Really love the trails connected to DeVictor Park.

371 Very satisfied with parks system. Rock Chalk Recreation Center will fill a huge need for youth sports & recreation.

372 Very satisfied with parks system. Rock Chalk Recreation Center will fill a huge need for youth sports and recreation.

373 All 3, some combined, flat water features for kids to cool off safely.

21. What would enhance the parks system?

1

2 They are good, and currently underused. Allow wiffle ball in parks

3

4

5 better public awareness of parks

6 Nothing, it is executed quite well.

7

8

9

10 More family oriented as opposed to ball fields and group sports facilities.

11

12 Keep park assets clean and safe

13 Water features such as ponds, canals,etc that could also function as water storage for the city

14

15

16 better mowing and weed control

17 It is pretty good as is

18 Little Public Libraries in the parks for accessing free books while there.

19 better equipment, more parks, open recreation areas

20

21 SMaller interconnected parks with less high dollar maintenance infrastructure

22

23 Our parks system is great. The only thing that would make it better is bikeways to popular destinations.

24 Nothing.

25

26

27 More than just a lawn and some playground equipment - Think Big! Butterfly gardens water features with canoe rental and lots of information about local animals and plants.

28

29 community input

30 Better maintenance

31 Security cameras in parking lots

32 Better upkeep, perhaps better policing to prevent vandalism, which seems to be on the rise.

33 Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, shade structures, places to sit, historical markers and way-finding.

34

35

36 make sure they are patroled for safety

37 longer hours.
38 well maintained play equiptment, swings for adults, more art projects
39
40
41 Better pedestrian access to them! Can't use a park if you can't get to it.
42 More sidewalks leading to the parks in neighborhood
43 More parks
44
45 i think the city does a pretty good job; no specific suggestions.
46
47
48 We have excellent parks
49 Don't know
50
51
52 More connection from trail to trail and destiny connections.
53
54 consistent wider walk ways that are well lit
55 Maintance
56 No more rubber tire mulch, it contains toxic chemicals and can be harmful if ingested by kids
57 More shelter houses
58
59
60 An infusion of the tax funds the city commission gave away to the Fritzels & Comptons & etc.
61
62 more wading pools for kids
63 Get rid of that rubber bark under swing sets and jungle gyms.
64 It works pretty well right now.
65 Hiking and walking paths.
66
67
68
69
70 Better play equipment and better places to picnic
71
72 Connecting the trails
73
74
75 See above.
76
77
78
79 I would aggressively maintain the current park system, and keep sprawl to a minimum, thus not requiring new parks.
80 More funding for maintenance and landscaping.
81 Food
82 Post history, background information, namesake, and/or neighborhood for park visitors to read interesting tidbits about the location.

connecting them. water, rollerblading trails
We have an outsdtanding park service now.

more benches
Actually do something with the neighborhood parks. Water Tower Park is in our neighborhood and there essentially is nothing there except for two swings - no benches, no nothing).
Having a comprehensive bike trail that connected more of Lawrence with few interactions with cars.
Recycling bins for plastic, glass, etc
nothing. i love the parks.
more shelters and general maintenance

More, better and equal play equipment at all parks

Lighting along trails near residences.

orchards

More clean up of broken glass, etc. More planting of native plants. No pesticides. More natural materials in playlots.
Performance events

More trees, flowers , walking paths,
money committed to develping green spaces into areas that attract and draw people to use them.

Better maintane
small parks in neighborhoods

More diversity in the things that kids can play on.
clean up days.
More accessibility. We have a great walk/bike path that runs along SLT from 6th all that way to the lake, but you can't access it from the neighborhoods that are right next to it.

Safe sidewalks and bike lanes so that people would not drive.
community access to walking trails, swimming pools, and community gardens

126
127
128 more neighborhood focused rec centers/access
129
130
131 More modern play equipment like the stuff by Lawrence High (looks like modern art but my kids love it).
132 It would be nice to have easier access to the parks.
133
134 Keep the parks cleaned and maintained.
135
136
137 Limiting use of glyphosate and 2,4-D herbicides
138
139 More outdoor recreation opportunities.
140
141
142 Eliminate pesticide use completely
143 Updating and maintaining existing neighborhood parks.
144
145 A readily accessable map of the system
146 increase playground equipment
147 A waterfront riverpark to maximize our natural ammenity
148 More trees (replant what's damaged by storms), greater varieties of low maintenance shrubs and perennials
149
150
151
152
153 More use of native plantings. Less mowing if possible.
154
155
156
157 More athletic fields for organized activities. Fewer buildings.
158 Accessibility
159 g. Bike Trails/ Walking Paths and more beautiful landscaping
160 Selling beer at the CLSC.
161 We have a great parks system
162 Bathrooms, water fountains, & community gardens.
163 More diversity among parks to make each one a unique attraction to bring people to all areas of the city. Play areas with natural materials, splash park, other unique amenities
164 more bike trails, extend the Burroughs trail and add similar trails that connect with other parts of town.
165
166 trees, shade
167 An overall freshen up of the space
168 Recreational rentals, food service
169

170 More green space, more parks.
171
172 More trails and bikeways
173
174
175 Picnic Tables
176 More benches/picnic tables/outdoor grills. Being spread out more so every neighborhood has places with kids' play equipment, picnic areas, and places to play frisbee or fly kites.
177
178
179
180 a larger budget
181
182 no comment
183 Investment in property to provide green space in certain development scenarios.
184 More rest room facilities throughout the paths/trails.
185
186 Less expensive to go to Cliniton Lake. Restroom facilities at parks, clean and safe.
187 Better roadways to get and out of the parks
188
189 Events, ease of access, location
190
191 Public artwork.
192
193
194 connecting them much better
195 Community gardens and pools with no entrance fees
196 A splash park!
197 inter-connected
198 Public art.
199
200 bike access
201 More pocket/play parks and small fenced dog parks
202
203 Dog parks
204 n/a
205 more trees
206 Involving volounteers from seniors to youth in development and creative maintenance activities.
207 hiking trails
208 Enforce dogs on a lease law in parks ---- people bring their dogs on a lease then take them off in the park. Not eveyrone likes/trusts dogs
209 More areas with native vegetation. More water fountains.
210 I am satisfied with the current parks.
211 Some parks do not have enough shade. More trees need to be planted when a park is developed.
212 Better weather
213 Complete trail system to connect parks throughout the city
214

215 accessbility.
216 Connections to transportation and to commercial districts
217 Better distribution among neighborhoods.
218
219
220 Provide bus service to Clinton Lake Park (directly, as pedestrians and cyclists haved been injured/killed crossing the busy road between existing route 9 and the lake), and a pedestrian bridge at same intersection
221 More bike patrol, lighting
222
223
224 restrooms, shade trees, and more nature centers
225 Just keeping up the good work.
226
227 Expand Hobbs park to the East, add low water features for kiddos, artist-designed/built benches, bat boxes, etc.
228 signs and bags availalbe for picking up dog refuse
229 can we bring back the old fire engine from south park and make a pay at your owne risk park with antiquated paly equipment... like teeter/totters, merry go-round and the space ship from Broken Arrow. THAT would be cool!
230 Continue no spray
231 Lighted public tennis courts with backboard for practice
232 A rest area here and there with facilities
233 the city does a great job in maintaining our parks
234 I love the parks, but maybe more investment for maintenance.
235
236 Trails connecting cities and lakes to one another.
237 connections
238
239 More options for children.
240 More trails
241 restroom, shelters & gazeboses at the park
242
243
244
245 Bodies of water, more vegetation
246 Build parks with shared use paths to connect to transportation networks for bike/ped access
247
248 More small parks in neighborhoods, well lit builds communities. More community gardens in or near parks and neighborhoods- in vacant lots
249
250 MORE! (Never too much)
251 Additional recreation options - controlled bike paths, climbing walls, boat rental
252
253 Connectivity w/ trails
254
255 More equipment for kids - more options at each park, maybe a small fishing pond park
256

257 Total connectivity (non-vehicular)
258 ?
259 Soft trails - there's too much concrete!
260
261 Buy more land to increase public park lands restore native habitat
262 connectivity
263 Activities geared to increasing physical health at no cost.
264 More volunteer/reward systems - communal gardens
265
266
267
268 Good bike trails
269 More attention to Baldwin, Eudora, Lecompton areas
270 Educational signage
271 acquisition of more parkland
272
273 More parks & more open space
274 Resort and convention offerings
275
276
277 N/A
278
279 parking
280 Please get the Polaris missle OUT of Centennial Park, or label it appropriately so people don't think it is a rocket to the moon.
281 if the trails/paths were extended & connected. Riverfront improvement could make a significant difference
282 More natural area such as the trails north of the river
283 more picnic areas
284 more car parking
285 Make use of natural areas before losing them to development
286 develop a trail system along the Wakarusa River to observe a wildlife preserve
287
288
289
290 trails connecting main ones
291 less sport-focus, more attention to harmony with nature and conservation
292 New play structures at Water Tower Park
293 Picnic Shelters
294 Lawrence does a great job with beautificuation of the parks - the grass, flowers, equipment is great!
295 continued upkeep
296 Bicycle interconnectivity
297
298 More bike trails, less poison ivy and snakes
299 ?
300
301

302 Maintenance enhancements and especially bicycle connections from outlying areas
303 Pedestrian walkways. community garden spots
304
305 Park guide that includes trails, restrooms and water fountain locations
306
307 More green space
308 saftey
309
310 connectivity
311
312 More available, proximity
313 Lawrence has a pretty good parks system. More trails parks in the county & smaller cities may help the county as a whole.
314 better solar-powered lighting, more dedicated green spaces that can't be sold to developers
315
316
317 Decidious trees around play equipment. Connect with linear parks
318 More open space
319 More green space and pedestrian/bike paths separate from automobiles that connect. More green space. More green undeveloped areas.
320 More seating and covered shelter areas with fountains - more walking paths in the parks
321
322
323
324 Mulch that isn't burning hot like at South Park children's area. Suggested times to visit and gather to learn and dialogue.
325
326
327 More vegetation
328 more police presence
329 More experience of nature.
330 They seem fine.
331 Cooperation w/ churches, schools, etc by deeding over unused costly to the city park areas to those organizations. For example Lawrence Heights Christian Church would like to have the part of Peterson Park on sw corner of Peterson & Iowa
332
333 Smaller dog park in town, in addition to the one at Clinton. Zip line in park. Outdoor aquatic center on west side.
334
335
336 I'm really happy with the parks. More picnic table at some of the parks would be nice, especially at South Park. I'd love more walking paths or trails.
337 Parks are very well maintained. Continue inviting landscape and flowers
338 Connectivity between some - not practical for all
339 Connectivity with trails or bike lanes, maybe marked to show the lanes connect parks.
340 walking/bike paths between them. more trees in some.
341
342

343 Preserving more natural areas in a simpler way. Trails, not lawns. Better access to the KS river and education center for it.
344
345 Less manicuring and lawns in areas that don't them, such as Clinton Lake. It would save the city money and make the places more appealing to children and adults alike.
346 Park system is working and should continue to grow as Lawrence grows
347
348 More funding for maintenance of fountains and trails. Expand on support for organic plantings and drought-tolerant and native plantings.
349
350 ?
351
352 More wildflower, bird walks.
353 More walking trails
354 More non-vehicular connection between
355
356 more of them, more trees for shade, more seating options, more play areas, artwork within the parks, water integrated into the parks
357
358
359
360 more benches, small businesses near them
361 How can we get private industry to help support these public projects or how about making sure developers keep green space & walkable sidewalks.
362 Control of invassive species native plants, stream restoration, additional fenced dog parks (in East Lawrence), better maintenance of community centers, more landscaping in small parks, a sculpture park, more exercise machines.
363 Connected by trails
364 A network of wildlife corridors without human infrastructure
365 Connectivity shelters organized activities
366 A small park at the northeast corner of Bob BillingsPkwy and Crestline.
367 More walking paths
368
369 As earlier stated, more natural ungrommed public areas for hiking, riding, etc.
370 Additional venues for concerts and gatherings and artmaking. More murals. Integrate green space into commercial & shopping, not keeping parks separate from other areas.
371 Very satisfied.
372 Very satisfied.
373 Fruit trees in all parks for public picking- healthy food, interactive art pieces- there are so many fun ones that local artists could build for us

22. What would enhance recreation trails?

1
2 nothing. Let the people use them. Oh, or you could force their use by installing toll boths on each road
3
4

5 better public awareness
6 Nothing, it is executed quite well.
7
8
9 Safety education. Bikers do not always respect pedestrians.
10 Less concrete paths and more natural type surface trails.
11 concrete along with soft bed "hiking" trails in the city
12 More of them and more connectivity between community destinations.
13 Trees and other planting including fruit trees. Keeping natural habitat (in other words not overdeveloping in natural areas.)
14
15
16 to much of a user define use
17 Running and walking paths need to be made of some material other than concrete.
18 Mile Markers along all.
19
20
21
22
23 They are fine, but again, we need to switch the focus to support more utilitarian trips.
24 Nothing.
25
26
27 Beautiful landscaping that attracts birds and other animals, safe lighting, connection to "wild places" with information about the history of the area!
28
29
30 Parking
31 Not interested
32 Simply more of them. There cannot be too many.
33 Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, shade structures, places to sit, historical markers and way-finding.
34
35
36 I think they are wonderful, a loop around all of lawrence to equal 26.2 for marathon...
37 motorized access.
38 I'm ignorant here, not in good enough shape to mountain bike or walk on rough terrain. Maybe some recreation trails with sidewalks that are accessible to people with difficulty walking or on scooters?
39
40
41
42 Ask the people more of what they want
43 More trails
44
45 connectivity
46
47

48 Adequate signage
49 Don't know
50
51
52 unknown
53
54
55 Maintance
56 Additional resources for maintenance
57 Connected trlls
58
59
60 An infusion of the tax funds the city commission gave away to the Fritzels & Comptons & etc.
61
62
63
64 Making sure on a daily basis that the trails are clear of glass and trash
65 We need more, well maintained.
66
67
68
69 Bike trails being more widespread and not just limited to the edge of town (clinton lake and levy trails). Bike trails shouldn't just be for recreation but available for commuter traffic and allow them to get off the road.
70 More of them
71 more of them
72 Connecting them
73
74
75 I am not familiar with that many of the trails. But lighting would be good for some of them. People would feel safer walking before sunrise and after sundown.
76
77
78
79 If they connected with each other. I envision being able to run a marathon solely on city trails.
80 More funding for maintenance and landacaping.
81 wider
82 Post rules of etiquette along the trails (e.g. bikes pass pedestrians on the left, and announce your presence before passing, etc.)
83
84
85
86
87
88 connecting them. Having a small beverage stand on the trails so bikers/walkers can stop for a beverage and a rest.
89
90

91 benches
92
93 Keeping them maintained.
94 Plant and name trees and shrubs
95
96 More maintenance
97
98 Connections!
99
100
101
102 Benches and water fountains.
103
104
105
106 Just need more and more connectivity between them.
107
108
109
110
111 more connectivity.
112 restroom facilities
113
114
115
116
117 Having automated vehicles small enough for the paths that would enable all to use the trails and see the plant and animal diversity that is in Lawrence.
118 clean up days. Get he community involved. Make a party out of it. Or at least provide some water and ice cream for afterward.
119 Extend them into the neighborhoods so that you don't have to go to them to use them.
120
121
122 Connectivity
123 wild flowers, natural wetland preservation, interpretation signage on trails
124
125
126
127
128 more of them
129
130
131 Make them wider so there's more room for bike and pedestrians.
132 The complexity of the trails needs to be clearer.
133 More of them!
134
135
136

137 Limiting use of glyphosate and 2,4-D herbicides
138
139 Wider trails.
140
141
142
143 Not interested.
144
145 Keep them clear of trash and plants that puncture bike tires.
146 extend current trail to surround city
147 Stronger interconnections
148 not sure; all good at present
149
150
151 Better bike paths
152
153 Attempt to connect them together.
154
155
156
157 It would be nice to have more of them.
158 Accessibility
159 water supply
160 Good maintained hiking trails.
161 We have great recreational trails.
162 Bathrooms, water fountains, & community gardens.
163 Dim lights at night would be nice to improve safety, maybe they could be solar
164 more of them, create them in loops so people don't have to double back (like the levee trail)
165
166 trees, shade
167 Nothing, the one close to my house is great (the McGrew Nature Trail).
168 Insect control, guided nature walks
169 Why, people still choose to run in the middle of the road
170 More of them.
171
172 More benches and water fountains at various locations along trails
173
174
175 Dim path lights
176 Frequent "rest areas" for people who are trying to improve their health but not there yet! Shaded benches and availability of water refills would make these trails much safer.
177
178
179
180 more of them
181 more connectivity between various trails
182 too much to list
183 Keep them safe, well lit, well marked and look at bike patrols or emergency call boxes for help.

184 See #21
185
186
187 parking lots
188
189 Connectivity with other trails.
190
191 Public artwork.
192
193 more trails
194
195 Historical signs
196
197 more interesting attractions/stops, more trails
198 Better access.
199 More access to water- bottle fillers
200 integration with bike paths
201 The Burroughs Trail is awesome. Love that trail!
202
203
204 defined paths
205 more trees
206 The same as in #21.
207 less muddy
208
209 Additional trail information online, including detailed maps.
210 I have limited experience with the rec trails, so deferring on this question.
211 Don't know.
212 Better weather
213 Multi-modal transportation trails, bikes, strollers, skateboards, walking, running, etc.
214
215 more more more.
216 Not sure.
217 More connections.
218
219
220 More. Make them practical--connect them to other trails. Create a trail superhighway across town.
221 more bike patrol
222
223
224 restrooms, restrictions of wheeled
225 More of them accessible to wheelchairs, etc.
226
227 history, plant and animal signage
228 satisfied
229 A dirt bike riding and ATV trail at Clinton Lake Also a put-put gold arcade and go kart track! like what used to be on South Iowa

230
231 More!
232 Same as above.
233 Keep them maintained
234 Make more
235
236 Connecting trails with cities and lakes.
237 more trails separated from the roadways
238
239 Make sure they're well maintained.
240 More networked connections between them.
241 restrooms & benches
242
243 Extend and link current bike/walking paths to form a circle around the city. Then work on better access to this circle from interior locations. Bike routes that share streets with cars are too dangerous.
244 more trees to provide shade
245 They're good
246 build trails to standards! 10 foot paved
247
248 Extend them so can travel from one end of town to the other (north/south), (east/west)
249 Connectivity w/ other parks and trails
250 Continued maintenance, mile markers in smalle incriments
251 I think they are great!
252
253 Connectivity, esp @ SLT trailhead to east
254
255 Great job at keeping recreation trails clean and neat!! Always feel safe.
256 Diversity, choices
257 Accessibility and materiality. Incorporating artidestinations within the park connectivity.
258 Adopt complete street program in the entire city
259 Gravel paths
260 River trail isn't lit so it's ideally only usable when in broad daylight- not sure I'd use it early in the morning before work or in the evening after work unless it's summer.
261 Regular maintenance & promote use
262 connectivity
263 They are nice.
264 More use
265 More connectivity across town rather than just parts
266
267
268 If money no object paved trail, but not possible
269 Grants to develop in areas outside Lawrence
270 Educational signage
271 connectivity
272
273 Additional water fountains & rest or exercise areas
274 Better maintained trails

275
276
277 N/A
278
279
280
281 Same as # 21
282 separate bike-pedestrian trails from roadways as is done in Sweden. Separate lanes for bikes and pedestrians
283
284 don't know
285 Use existing natural areas
286 separation from streets when possible
287 More of them to get around town easier
288 More of them, intreconnectedness
289
290 running path in addition to biking path (softer)
291 The ability to WALK to them and not have to drive!
292 Maps, adversiting
293
294 a bit wider paths to accomodate both bikes and walkers (with dogs)
295 more connectivitiy - easier access points
296 Bicycle interconnectivity
297 interconnected trails as much of city as possible
298 Less snakes and less poison ivy
299 ?
300
301 Beer
302 completed connections
303
304
305 More of the that link through neighborhoods
306
307 more of them
308 saftey
309 connecting them
310 That they also be for TRANSPORTATION
311
312 They are actually quite good
313 See #21
314
315
316
317 More. Better connecting ... it is fun to walk/bike somewhere where you can also get some work done.
318
319 More green undeveloped natural areas.
320 seating, see above - water stations

321 Greater connectivity with other trails. Connecting with interurban and interstate trails, eg: katy trail
322 Being sure they're maintained and safe for people to walk alone (well-lit & vegetation cut back from the sides of the trail)
323
324 Safety. Nothing secluded. Guides on the trail at certain times so people feel safe.
325
326
327 Connectivity and extension
328 more police presence
329 More of them.
330 As a single female.... am always concerned about personal safety.
331
332
333 Continuing with connectivity. Doing a great job.
334
335 As a runner, I would like another non-concrete trail besides the river trail, levy & lake trail (but also realize it's good for trails to be accessible to all abilities)
336 Sporadic benches or even exercise equipment, like pull up bars. I've seen some with recommended workouts at measured stops. :)
337 Signage encouraging use (more use)
338 marking and grooming
339 Drinking fountains, big shade trees
340 access to parks in a loop.
341 da
342
343 More connectivity, signage, maps, education.
344
345 Leave the wild alone as much as possible.
346 More connected
347
348 More connections and expand throughout city.
349
350 ?
351
352 As above.
353 More connectivity; I don't like to risk my life biking from West Lawrence to downtown
354 More of them
355
356 have them all be connected to each other, have them all be the same material, have them be wide enough, have big trees that provide shade, have outdoor (nighttime lighting) and also seating along the way
357
358
359
360 more
361 Public should be educated that these great parks/trails are not free. People take it for granted.
362 More of them; additional dog wast stations, native vegetation, pet water fountains, pet wast

pickup education program

363

364 Are you going to ask about bicycle transportation anywhere in this plan?

365 More of them longer use with low impact lighting

366 Good, well-maintained surfaces

367 A circular path around the city

368


369 ?

370 Benches along the way- I love the memorial bench I encounter that simply says "rest and renew"...such a delight

371 Very satisfied.

372 Very satisfied.

373 See above. More fishing areas, educational/historic/horticultural/cultural signage.



24. If you only had 1 day to visit Lawrence & Douglas County, what/where would you visit and why?

1 KU museums - if you want culture in Lawrence, you go up the Hill.

2 23 is more push polling for exactly what is stifling progress in Lawrence. I do not grant you a veto. In answer, Black Jack battlefield

3
4
5 KU because of the architectual quality of the buildings Lecompton because of its role in pre Civil War America
6 Downtown. This is due to the great shops and dinning that are located there.
7 Clinton Lake
8 Explore KU and the downtown area.
9
10 Downtown Lawrence because of the diversity of available attractions and one of the three lakes (Clinton, Douglas County or Lone Star) because of the water related recreation available.
11
12 Kansas River Valley becuase it is geologically interesting.
13 Downtown (Massachusetts St) and KU campus
14 Downtown of course
15
16 I would take the local trolley to do a historic review of the city. oh wait we do not have any transportation to promote the history of Lawrence.
17 Downtown for farmer's market, for shopping & for food. Campus for the beauty & architecture. Theatre Lawrence for a play.
18 The Booth KU Basketball Hall of Fame, because I'm a HUGE fan. The KU Watkins Museum for local history and information. The local cemeteries because cemeteries are fascinating places. Downtown Lawrence for the shopping, the history and the locally owned restaurants.
19 Allen Fieldhouse. I am a basketball fan
20
21 Enhancing cultural & public art is important if it is done properly and does not result in the type of gentrification that most often occurs with these projects.
22
23 Mass. Street, South Park, and the KU campus.
24 Downtown and KU. I think these are the major cultural institutions in our community. I would also visit Clinton Lake as this is a huge recreational asset for the community.
25
26 Wells Overlook, Signal Oak Hill, Black Jack Park, KU's Natural History Museum, Spencer Museum of Art, Clinton Lake, Riverfront area, Downtown (Mass. St.)
27 I would visit the campus (Spencer Museum of Art and Natural History Museum), I would check out Downtown and get a meal and I might head out to Clinton Lake if it was nice out or the train station/visitors center for a map of the area and local attractions I hadn't thought of.
28
29
30 Lawrence historically is know for the raid. I would take better advantage of that. We also have many entertainment venues - perhaps more than make sense.
31 KU Museum of Natural History. It's the best attraction in the entire county
32 Downtown Lawrence, Watson Museum, Black Jack Battlefield by Baldwin, KU Natural History Museum, Kaw River and/or Clinton Lake hiking/biking trails
33 Downtown and East Lawrence. I do wish there were better access and recreation options along the south bank of the Kansas River. We should encourage river-based tourism, kayaking, hiking, running etc... Downtown and East Lawrence are fun, quirky, urban, eclectic and have one of everything I need/want. Pretty much everything I like. If we added better access to the river we would also have an excellent geographical feature to add to the history and urban feel.

34
35
36
37 The Lawrence Municipal Airport, because that is the only place in Lawrence where, until the TSA and the BCP and FEMA and the NSA get there, a person's dreams can still actually take flight.
38 I would go downtown for the shopping, eating, and people watching, I would visit Spencer Art Museum for the permanent and traveling exhibits. I would walk or bike the levee and watch the river for its great natural beauty. I would eat at local restaurants that serve local food like Wheatfields and Free State, I would buy local milk and honey at Iwig. I would go to the Farmer's Market, and I would go to a local bar and see a local band and dance. I would go to the Lawrence Barn Dance Association dances.
39 South Park/Mass Street.
40
41 Natural History Museum (first place I ever saw a dinosaur), Watkins Museum (great display about Quantrills Raid), Free State Brewery (beer!), Spencer Museum of Art (the Rosetti), Mass St. (just a great place to hang out)
42 KU-Allen Field House
43
44
45 Trails at Clinton Lake; campus; downtown; east lawrence; Kansas River. Don't know why exactly.
46 Liberty hall, free state brewery, Mass ave, Spenser museum, natural history museum, old west lawrence. You didn't ask about new development. We need a Black Jack visitor's center and a Quantrill's raid visitor's center.
47 city cemeteries for history lesson
48 1. Downtown 2. KU
49 The antique stores along Mass street, because I like antiques.
50
51
52
53 Spencer Museum, Mass Street, riverfront park
54 Downtown Lawrence-to experience the diversity in one place
55 Spencer art museum
56 Downtown Lawrence, KU campus
57 Best survey question so far.....visitor center and Mass St ... History and local flavor
58 KU Campus, Downtown Lawrence, rural Dg County out to Lone Star Lake.
59
60 Allen Fieldhouse, then I'd get the hell out of Lawrence before somebody talked me into the tourist clip-joint know as Mass. street
61
62 KU because I like judge a city by how their educational institutions are maintained. As I stated before at a University or College; is where you'll find entertainment for all ages. You can catch a Play, play kickball on one of the fields, swim, walk around and have a picnic, take pictures, go to the library, museum, you can attend a football or basketball game. The things to do are enlist. Plus now you can eat and enjoy the view at the Oread Hotel.
63 Wheatfields, the natural history museum, the Spencer museum, and the campus at KU.
64 Downtown for the atmosphere and great variety of restaurants, Watkins Museum for their great exhibits
65 Carnegie Center, the installations in the great room and murals in the entry way really tell the

story of our state and our community. Lawrence is a city of rich history that goes unnoticed. Every neighborhood has a story to tell.

66

67 I lived in other cities and came back to visit Lawrence, so I've done the '1 day trip' many times. With one day to be in Lawrence, I've spent almost all of it downtown - meeting clients at downtown offices, shopping, eating, meeting up with friends / neighbors.

68

69

70 Mass Street because that's what everyone talks about

71 the Spencer Museum of Art and the levy trails

72 Mass Street for its unique mix of history, interesting retail, and places to eat

73

74

75 It depends on the season. In the spring and summer, I would visit lakes and ponds. In the fall and winter, I would spend time in Downtown Lawrence and probably visit some of the museums at KU.

76 The farmer's market to see what is locally produced and to see what the community values; Free State Brewery to try beer that is only made right there; if it was winter, the levee or Clinton Lake to see bald eagles; downtown retail establishments that carry locally made goods that can't be found anywhere else.

77

78

79 I would stay at the Halcyon House and visit downtown and the historic neighborhoods.

80 Downtown for its history, walkability and economic vitality. KU campus for its importance to the community as its leading institution.

81 The Natural History or Art Museum at KU

82 Downtown, Mass St. from 6th St to South Park. It's a happening place with interesting shops, great food, great park, interesting sights.

83

84

85

86

87 Mass street and the University campus

88 mass street because I can park and walk to the various businesses

89 Museum of Natural History, Watkins Museum. and Haskell Museum

90

91 Tour KU campus and Spencer museum and stay at the Eldridge Hotel and walk Mass Street to see museum and local color.

92 Would spend day strolling Downtown.

93 I would visit the Natural History Museum and Spencer Art Museum. They are treasures to our community. Unfortunately, the NHM is in desperate need of expansion and remodeling. Lawrence lost an opportunity to solidify its place as an educational destination when Overland Park opened the Museum at Prairie Fire. The inattention to the NHM as a community resource and a tourist draw is Lawrence's and KU's biggest mistake over the past 30 years.

94 Haskell museum and spencer

95 Mass Street for the shopping and food. The new library because it's going to be awesome! The Spencer Art Museum, the Natural History Museum and the Watkins Museum because they are great places to take kids. The pool because the kids love it.

96 Depending on the time of year, I'd suggest going to visit historical sites like Black Jack Battle site or Lecompton. Lawrence's downtown is a great draw, you can't beat walking down Mass St. If it was a nice time of year, going out to the trails on Clinton Lake near the levy and dog park. If it wasn't nice out, visiting Watkin's museum or Free State!

97

98 Downtown Lawrence for its distinctive personality and flavor of our community. KU Campus for its beauty and contribution to our community. The Kaw because it's so Lawrence and the levy trail is easy, scenic walking.

99 Downtown and campus. They are the two unique areas of our city.

100 Downtown, Clinton Lake. Downtown has a lot going on: Park-adjacent, arts, food, shopping. Clinton Lake is nice and relaxing.

101

102 I'd go to Clinton Lake to get a view of the area, visit the south Iowa commercial area, drive across KU campus, visit downtown, view the river, and then look at the hospital and the new Rock Chalk park. I would be attempting to get a feel for the area, see the open spaces as well as the residential, recreational, educational, and commercial areas. My visit would be to familiarize myself with the physical environment rather than the culture or economic aspects of the city.

103

104 I would go see the wetlands because they are ecologically and culturally important. I would go to the lakes (clinton and lonestar) because they are beautiful. I would go to the farmers markets because we have a great rural/ producing community as well.

105 The university. If you're not into civil war history that's about it.

106 Probably downtown Lawrence, including the historical buildings in that area.

107 Downtown (walk around and maybe a KU museum), the KU lands Northeast of town. Why - because downtown is wonderful especially on final Fridays, and the KU lands are beautiful and give a sense of the uniqueness of NE Kansas.

108

109

110 Downtown and University of Kansas

111 Downtown Massachusetts Street because of the architectural and historical density; natural history museum and Douglas County museum; sites that are important to "Bleeding Kansas" and the role of Lawrence in the underground railroad during the early parts of the civil war.

112

113

114 Downtown. It has both historical and eating/shopping/entertainment opportunities.

115

116 the historical museum and art museum

117 Mary's Lake to see the water fowl, the river front to relax by the river and the trees, downtown for shopping, a meal, an ice cream cone and some soda pop.

118 Downtown Lawrence while it was hot out and Clinton lake when it cooled off.

119 Mass Street. I has everything, history, art, food, shopping, parks

120

121

122 Downtown and East Lawrence. A walk on the levee in North Lawrence would also work.

123 can't limit it to just one. would go downtown, Haskell, and KU.

124

125 Mass Street, because it's the center of the community, lots of unique places to visit, love to shop and dine there.

126
127
128 Visitor's Center, Downtown, eldridge, Old West Lawrence, DG CTY museum--anything related to the amazing history that we have here--because it was so instrumental to the civil war
129 Downtown.
130 I take people to the Free State Brewery and a walk downtown. Everyone loves downtown Lawrence.
131 Free State Brewery, Silas & Maddie's, KU, and the Granada.
132 I like the Lawrence Public Library because of its computer classes, wide variety of DVDS and helpful librarians. I like Clinton Park because of the picnic area and eagles. I would visit Liberty Hall for their DVDs and movies.
133 Downtown Lawrence! Food, community, south park, friendship park, the river….
134 Downtown Lawrence, the overlook and Clinton Lake. You get to see the city and what the town is about on Mass, the overlook gives you a beautiful scenery view to show that Kansas isn't flat, lol. Lastly, to Clinton Lake to show that we have some place to go to relax.
135
136
137 Downtown, museums, wetlands, and KU. These areas represent the core nature of Lawrence.
138 Mass Street
139 Downtown and the surrounding core area which offers the most culture, interest and activities.
140
141
142 The University and its environs, especially the museums.
143 I'd visit the museum to get a sense of the community.
144 Campus
145 Massachusetts Street, KU campus-Dyche Hall, Spencer Museum of Art, Allen Fieldhouse.
146 HINU Museum and Spencer Museum along with grounds on both campuses, downtown area and Watkins Museum. I would want to get a sense of the history of the place.
147 Mass St. and KU. They're the only unique places in town and they both have strong architectural quality. The rest of Lawrence, especially 6th Street and Wakarusa, 31st and Iowa look just like Olathe and Topeka. Nothing to see there, move along.
148 Downtown window shopping and restaurants (just to see what's artistically unique and enjoy nutritious meals); hiking Clinton Lake Park or Kaw River levee (to see bald eagles) or Wells Overlook; visiting museums (Watkins History, KU Spencer or Dyke, Haskell Cultural Center); creating art or participating in theatre workshop at Lawrence Arts Center (Van Go); attending theatre at KU, Theatre Lawrence, or other venues; enjoying seasonal events (Farmer's Market, July 4th at Burcham/Constant Parks, Master Gardener tours, Haskell powwows and Art Fair, South Park Arts/Crafts fairs, JCC Blintz Brunch, Christmas tours of Old West Lawrence homes, antique shows, ETC!)
149
150
151 Watkins Museum
152 University, old East and West Lawrence; architecture and history Explore Quantrill raid memorabilia Freestate, everyone loves beer...right?
153 I would try to visit the following: Signal Oak Hill, Rice and Brydenthal Woodlands, Clinton Lake, the KU Field Station, some of our local nurseries, KU's Museum of Natural History, and end up the day in downtown Lawrence at Free State Brewery.
154

155 Haskell Cultural center...because it holds a lot of history...we cannot see the future without looking at the past
156
157 I would visit Downtown because it is the nucleus of the City. Downtown has a great entertainment experience, both day and evening. I also would visit Clinton & Lone Star Lake areas as they are Douglas County's recreational spaces and are beautiful.
158
159
160 KU campus and Memorial Stadium to take in a football game. I love the Arts and support them privately. It should not be put into a public development plan.
161 KU, specifically Allen Field House and the eventual home of the Rules of Basketball. These are the most widely recognized, relevant, iconic treasures we have to market. I am extremely proud of our heritage as a free state, and we do a great job of promoting it, but it is not a priority for future generations of travelers. We should be leveraging the fame and fortune of KU Athletics to promote tourism and economic development.
162 The Arts Center & Clinton lake. 1) you get a taste of downtown Lawrence & get to see great local art from all ages; 2) you get to see the beauty that lies on the outskirts of town, away from the noise of traffic, and out of sight from commercial interests.
163 Downtown and cultural arts district in the summer. That is the area that is unique to lawrence and area is so vibrant and exciting in the summer.
164 downtown Lawrence - it has a mix of entertainment, shopping and dining options; it has the new (and beautiful) Lawrence Public Library; it has the river; and it's close to the Burroughs Trail which is great for longer walks or bike rides.
165
166 Downtown, because it has a little bit of most things that I would want to see, do. I would also visit some of the museums on campus.
167 Downtown, because it offers the most diversity for one day (hotel, food, shopping, arts) in a concentrated environment.
168 Downtown Lawrence would be the first stop. The Eldridge Hotel, Weavers Department Store and the Watkins Museum are the three downtown treasures with the most historic and cultural significance. This plus a walking tour of the homes of old west Lawrence.
169 Eagle Bend. It's become a good golf course because of the head greenskeeper
170 I'd spend my day in the downtown and historic neighborhoods surrounding downtown.
171
172 Downtown and KU campus
173
174 I would visit downtown. It provides access to many different activities and entertainment modes in close proximity.
175 I would travel Massachusetts street to get some good eats!
176 Probably the art galleries and South Park. Maybe the train station.
177 The KU natural history museum and then Allen Fieldhouse. They are special attractions with items not found anywhere else.
178 mass street - lots of variety and activities
179
180 downtown. It is our most interesting feature in my opinion
181 downtown, as it seems to be the most vibrant part of the city outside of the university
182 n/a
183 Would check out downtown, visit KU Hall of Athletics at Allen Field House. My itinerary would

depend on advance planning to learn about Lawrence attractions. I view Lawrence as a participation type of destination, i.e. - playing sports or watching a sporting event vs long walks of historic homes, arts or our small community museum.

184 Downtown Lawrence and the university campus.

185

186 Downtown, for the shopping and people watching.

187 KU History

188

189

190 Clinton Lake offers the best recreational sites.

191 Downtown Arts District, Warehouse Arts District, Spencer Museum, galleries, Downtown Lawrence Outdoor Sculpture Exhibition, shops. Because arts and culture are an important part of any community, and make an area worth living in.

192 I would visit downtown, the museums, the Hill and drive some neighborhoods. That is the best way I can think of to see the different parts of the city.

193 Downtown

194 Mass street: to get feel for life in town, with a walk along the Kaw (currently too difficult on S side of river) Oread Hotel top deck: for the view then a walk through KU

195 Downtown Lawrence because there is a lot to do and great restaurants, and the University of Kansas. Maybe the Natural History Museum and the Douglas County Museum too.

196 Spencer, Watkins, Free State, LimeStone, South Park.

197 Downtown Lawrence, KU campus, Clinton Lake. Each unique and beautiful in it's own way.

198 Mass street and the university - because these areas are the hearts of the community.

199 Bike LRF trail Walk, shop and eat downtown walk Jayhawk Boulevard Visit Clinton Lake Go to movie at Liberty Hall

200

201 Downtown and the river levee trail Very pretty, and I enjoy walking and being outside. The outdoor seating downtown draws me there. I support public art if it's good. If Lawrence invests in public art, they need to fund at a level that attracts high-caliber artists. That red monster in front of the Arts Center is horrible, but because the artist is a big donor I worry that East Lawrence will soon be littered by that level of art. I'd rather have trees and sidewalks.

202 KU campus, Mass Street, Clinton Lake. Equal parts food, recreation and sightseeing.

203

204 watkins historical museum, KU, walk downtown. downtown area is so unique as it is still thriving. city needs to keep its support.

205 downtown town for shops and museum and restaurants, maybe Clinton lake for bird watching and a swim.

206 The library , the historical museum and the downtown parks

207

208 Downtown --- unique buildings and fun small businesses + nice park to sit and relax

209 The KU campus, including the art and natural history museums, and downtown for food and live music.

210 Downtown Lawrence because of the people/vibrance and historical significance. KU because of the architecture and museums.

211 I would visit the museums and art spaces of Lawrence and Douglas County because those are the places that interest me. Also, I would see a movie at Liberty Hall because it is a locally owned theater that shows unconventional movies.

212

213 Mass. Street
214 Mass. Street/Liberty Hall/ Watkins Museum/Court House Heart of the city's personality and history
215 downtown. allen fieldhouse. many of our great restaurants and live music venues.
216
217 I would spend it downtown because of the variety of arts and cultural locations, the varied architecture and the variety of food and beverage choices.
218
219
220 Massachusetts Street and Old West Lawrence. Very beautiful, charming, Main Street Americana kind of feel. The most appealing part of Lawrence to anyone 25+ who doesn't care about sports. The history is really interesting and should be played up more on a permanent basis.
221
222 1. Old north Lawrence. 2. KU 3. Waterfalls by Clinton Lake
223
224 Old West Lawrence neighborhoods, KU campus, and downtown. Why? for the feel of community, historic value and friendly businesses.
225 The KU campus, including the Dole Center and the Natural HIstory Museum and the Art Museum, the Arts Center, the downtown area restaurants and shopping, the historic neighborhoods.
226 Downtown- Massachusetts St, and KU Campus. Both embody the history and "feel" of Lawrence.
227
228 Focus on downtown corridors and KU museums
229 Watkins Museum of History,old train depot in N. Lawrence & KU natural history museum. Then to Lecompton to Lane University and Constitution Hall - I enjoy historic buildings/museums and museums that have timeline of cool engineering developments (civil war=guns=cool)
230 KU, Downtown
231 KU Museums or Mass St. or Parks
232 Downtown - the reputation of being vibrant
233 Natural history museum, Watkins Museum, Allen Fieldhouse and downtown Lawrence and Old West Lawrence.
234 I would visit my friends, and I would get ice cream at Sylas and Maddy's.
235
236 I would tour the local historical sights and universities.
237 downtown & South Park - our signature, the riverwalks - and it possible to canoe...
238
239 Downtown to get a sense of Lawrence as a town.
240 KU Natural History Museum
241 Dole Center, Spencer Museum, Downtown
242 Downtown + Natural History Museum
243
244 Downtown Mass Street because there is dining and shopping. Clinton Lake because it is very pretty.
245 KU campus, downtown area
246 KU, downtown
247 Watkins Community Museum- good location for an overview of Lawrence/Douglas Co. history
248 Downtown - great food options, very walkable Campus - historic buildings, walkable, picturesque Clinton Lake - large "natural" area to explore
249 Downtown, KU, Clinton Lake

250 Downtown, of course!
251 I would want to visit downtown and then see of our major sites - Lied Center, Allen Fieldhouse, etc.
252 KU/Downtown
253 Watkins, South Park, Wells Overlook, Spencer, River Trails, Mass St.
254 KU history, downtown - historic and entertainment
255 Mass St. is has everything in one spot - history, arts, shopping, and dining
256 KU, Freestate, river trail, Liberty hall
257 Downtown, parks, and the University
258
259 Reuter organ - old world craftsmanship, Bowersock Power Co - old style green energy, South Park city band concert
260 Downtown, Mass St, East Lawrence, Old West for the buildings and great food.
261 Ivan Boyd Prairie, Baker Wetlands, Lawrence Public Library
262 Museums & Arts Center & Historic area
263 Cider Art Gallery- Downtown. Because we have some of the best chefs and artists in the nation.
264 Liberty Hall, Historical, beer, entertainment, local businesses
265 Downtown, it's vibrant and where my visitors have most enjoyed
266
267 Dole Center or Lecompton Territorial Capital Historical sites rich in heritage
268 KU, Spencer Museum, Downtown, I love History, quaintness of downtown, KU, seeing art
269 Historic Lecompton sites many original structures where history actually occurred.
270 Downtown because there are places to eat, drink, and have fun
271 East Lawrence and the urban core because it is vibrant and holds so much history
272 The river road and historic sites in Lecompton.
273 Museums and parks for historic value.
274 Natural History Museum, Allen Fieldhouse, Clinton Park
275
276 Lecompton museums
277 Mass St. because it has a diversity of activities.
278 Mass St., KU Campus
279 Mass St. - its uniqueness and diversity it attracts
280 Watkins Museum, Art Center, the Spencer Museum of Art
281 friends
282 KU, Arts Center, Watkins Museum, Free State Brewery
283 Downtown Public library Historical museums
284 KU's natural history museum, Dept Visitors Center
285 Main Street/Clinton Lake. Main Street is so unique. Clinton Lake is interesting to see a large lake in the middle of the USA
286 The KU campus, The KU campus is the flagship development for the area
287 Downtown, Clinton Lake, KU, North Lawrence
288 KU campus, county courthouse, walk downtown! Why- the flavor of the place, the atmosphere, the historic buildings as part of the modern fabric.
289 KU
290 Downtown, South Park
291 Pollinators Mural, wetlands (RIP)
292 Downtown is the best amenity.
293 Downtown both Historic and New available to visit

294 downtown, KU campus, Clinton Lake - 3 very different styles
295 Mass St - unique, local shops and businesses, KU buildings
296 Downtown--for food and entertainment; Wakarusa wetlands
297 Mass St, Freestate Brewing especially historic neighborhoods around downtown and building such as Watkins, community building East & Old West 1800s housing styles. Also KU & some parks such as South.
298 The river trail, restaurants, Clinton lake, the KU art museum, historical museum
299 Downtown, KU mussuems
300
301 Mass St
302 Spencer Museum- art & architecture, Mass St- shopping & lunch with cultural and historic landmarks, KU Biological Field Station- an incredible meditative nature experience in 1 hour!
303 Mass Street
304 Lawrence Visitors Center - walk downtown - to South Park
305
306
307 Liberty Hall - Watkins Historical Museum, Mass St (so expensive. if what this city means -
308 Downtown - its like no other place in the country
309
310 Downtown because it is a nice place to be.
311
312 Downtown or Allen Fieldhouse
313 Museums
314 Spencer Art Museum (isn't it obvious) Douglas County Museum The Library Aimee's Coffeehouse to eat.
315
316 KU's campus. We have a beautiful campus and the natural history museum is great.
317 Downtown, restaurants & activities. It is the only unique place in town.
318 Downtown
319 Downtown/Mass St.
320 1) Dole Center - KU Campus, 2)Museums, etc. Watkins, 3)Watkins, 4) restaurants
321 Kaw River - its the heart of any city, or at least it used to be. Beauty downtown - out of the habit of it. Bridenthal (KU) Natural Area - an amazing old growth forest in Douglas County.
322 Downtown Lawrence
323 Spencer Art Museum, a treasure Kaw River, could be improved with beautiful walkways which would not disturb the nature Lawrence Arts Center, a thriving artistic scene K.U. Music, Dance and Theatre productions Haskel University, the wetlands
324 Senior center/pool/downtown area.
325
326
327 Downtown, because it's atmosphere is both historic and vibrant
328
329 Watkins Museum to gain sense of history of the founding of the place. Walk along Kansas River to gain sense of city siting. Walk across Kansas University campus, the most significant employer in the city; visit Art Museum and Natural History Museum. Eat at Free State Brewing Co. and shop at Weaver's, examples of local enterprises.
330 Haskell University - there's nothing like it anywhere in the country & the information / history it carries is an important part of American History. Dole Institute. Spencer Museum. Sadly, don't

know much about Douglas County other than Lawrence & Baldwin. Don't know what gems are in the smaller areas that I'd find.

331

332

333 Allen Fieldhouse. I'm a sports fan and love the history of that building.

334

335 Bike path by the river, farmer's market, the percolator art gallery because my priorities are nature, local food & neighborhood arts. And downtown of course.

336 Definitely Mass Street: Free State Brewing Company, India Palace, Mass Street Soda Shop. There are so many wonderful places to stop in on Mass Street.

337 West Lawrence & Downtown

338 Downtown Lawrence, Kansas University, Art Museum or art district, Old West Lawrence and dine at a unique Lawrence restaurant.

339 A drive in southern Douglas County (beauty), a drive & meal & shop downtown (amenities, history), a drive through the University (beauty, history), a walk in one of the older neighborhoods (beauty, history)

340 Downtown. It's vibrant and alive area that shows the heart of this area.

341

342

343 Downtown restaurants and Liberty Hall. The Spencer Museum of Art and Art Center- world class. The Haskell-Baker Wetlands - the best natural area close to town, or is was, I should say. The river trails. The new library!! A full day, I know!

344 Mass Street retail and restaurants; Clinton Lake

345 It used to be the wetlands before it had road construction going through it. I would was wanted to visit there because it heartened me that in just a 30-minute bike ride from the urban core, I could find rich diversity of flora and fauna. I loved living in a place the placed a value on the other-than-human life in our community.

346 Mass Street, Spencer Museum, Allen Fieldhouse I would go to these places because you can't go to these in any other town/city. There is only one Mass Street, one Fieldhouse, etc

347

348 I love Clinton Lake and the Park there. I would visit the Natural History Museum, downtown Lawrence, the art galleries, the Watkins Museum. I love the things that are unique to here, to this place. I love the downtown. I was born here and remember going downtown to Weavers and the downtown theater and such. I would try to fit in a walk along the river. Burcham Park.

349

350 Downtown, KU campus, Clinton Lake as they seem to be the most attractive and well developed areas.

351

352 Spencer Museum of Art, Watkins Historical Museum, a Lied Center Concert. (We do not feature enough classical music or theatre for me, and I can no longer travel to centers of art and music.)

353 Constitution Hall & Museum in Lecompton. Have taken many friends & family there. Second on my list is the Blackjack Battlefield

354 The historic sites around the city associated w/ Bleeding Kansas and Lawrence's role in abolition and the civil war.... (but it doesn't really exist yet)

355 Natural history museum Watkins museum Spencer Art gallery They're all great.

356 Downtown, KU Campus area, and Clinton Lake area. Downtown is so unique in that it's an old style downtown area, but that it's still lively and thriving which you don't see often. I'd go downtown because there is eclectic shopping and good places to eat (Final Fridays is a great day

to go downtown with all the artwork). I'd go to the KU Campus area because of the architecture and landscaping - it's beautiful. I'd go to the Clinton Lake area for the outdoor activities - boating, canoeing, kayaking, walking or biking through the trails or just laying on the beach.

357 Natural History Museum

358

359 KU, downtown, old west Lawrence, Watkins historical museum, Lawrence visitors center

360 downtown - food, museum, parks. Haskell - museum

361 Run on a trail, downtown shopping/restaurants & museum at KU

362 You want to know about historic resources, cultural sites, not restaurants, yes?

363 Mass St - variety of activities, places to eat, and architecture

364 Bowersock Mill, historic Haskell Row, Reuter Organ, downtown, Wakarusa Wetlands (pre-destruction)

365 Campus museums, Dole Center, Watkins museum, history of area

366 Massachusetts Street and Allen Fieldhouse

367 Clinton Lake

368

369 KU - Dyche Museum, Mass St. stores & restaurants, Watkins History Museum


370 Mass Street, South Park, Watson Museum, Clinton Lake, Prairie Park Nature Center, Lawrence Arts Center, Spencer Museum of Art (wow- busy day!)


371 Clinton Lake and Downtown. Two biggest assets to this community for tourism.

372 Clinton Lake and downtown. Two biggest assets to this community for tourism.

373 The river, the new Library, the Haskell Cultural Center & Museum, eat downtown at a locally owned restaurant, drive through the oldest neighborhoods, finish up at the Gaslight Tavern listening to local tunesters.

25. How important is the protection of natural resources to our community?





	27. What would you like to see done to protect our natural resources?
1	shifting all future projects toward green and sustainable materials and maintenance
2	Not your role. Dont push poll my personal interest in protection and preservation as a mandate for you to exercise power.
3	
4	
5	Raise water rates on large consumers - the more you use the more you pay.
6	
7	
8	
9	no further commercial development in the wetlands.
10	Enhance protection measures.
11	
12	Identify them first so we know what the protection possiblities are
13	Don't over develop. Don't destroy natural wetlands. Maintain habitat for animals. Concentrate residential areas in order to keep most of the county land less developed.
14	
15	
16	More pesonal involvement by interested groups, not publically funded.
17	Would like to see the river cleaned up & made recreation friendly

18 The most possible without impeding future development. Incorporate natural resources into the development, rather than destroy or replace.
19
20
21
22
23 More infill development and multi-story buildings rather than using more and more undeveloped areas.
24 Nothing further. I think it is already difficult enough to get approval for new development in our community.
25
26 All of the above. It should be a priority.
27 More information about what those are and how to protect them - media and community events and information - ways to get involved (what can we do?)
28
29
30 If I fully understood exactly what you mean I might be able to answer. It sounds like more government money to accomplish an unstated goal.
31 Don't know
32 Smart growth, not growth for growth's sake alone. REAL environmental impact assessment for each project, with actual punishment for violations and a willingness to just say no to projects that will ultimately damage our quality of life.
33 Remove sand dredging on the Kansas River. Be very careful about managing urban sprawl.
34
35
36 Wetlands (natural preserve), the Kaw River (keeping it clean) and Clinton Lake are top on my list.
37 Stop listening to environmental extremists.
38 Clean up the Kaw. Someday I want to boat in the Kaw, swim in the Kaw, fish in the Kaw, and eat those fish.
39 Water rationing during dry years. At least for car washing and grass watering.
40
41
42
43 Sand and rock? Did the Pennys pay for this to be included? Minimize their exploitation.
44
45 well, don't pave the wetlands for one but that is done so we must move on. Stormwater is a big issue. Wildlife corridors are also important.
46 require wildlife/erosion belts along all major streams. Create wildlife corridors. Create a free cat-spading program.
47
48 Doing OK
49 Don't know
50
51
52 the above.
53
54
55 Stop developing natural spaces

56
57 Focus on water pollution and projects that work against invasive species
58
59
60
61
62 See to that they are not exploited
63 Don't let the developers do every single thing they want.
64 Resources dedicated to see that our natural resources are protected
65 Put into place policies that protect our environment.
66
67
68
69
70 Reduce harmful fuel emissions
71
72 Ensure permeable surfaces, reduce use of non renewable energy, encourage use of renewable energy for all
73
74
75 No more development beyond the current sity limits.
76 Implementation of land/historic preservation programs
77
78
79 Leaving a sustainable community for future generations.
80 Slow sprawl into the county
81 Wholesale recycling.
82 Do we have a city arborist? Can we require the utility companies to hire arborists to trim trees near power lines? The company that Westar hired for that purpose this year is mutilating trees and bushes in ways that don't even make sense.
83
84
85
86
87
88
89 Allow them to co-exxist
90
91 Keep green spaces to be owned by city or county
92 Limit sand and gravel operations along Kaw. Limit huge crappy big box development.
93 Water is our most precious resource. Limit consumption and pollution.
94 City limit on residential water use before a major crisis
95 Less building for building's sake. It seems like there are so many new housing and apartment developments being built but no real need for them.
96
97
98 Thoughtful development. Protect prime farmland and open spaces.
99 No more salt used in the winter on roads

100
101
102 A practical approach. The resources are important, but they can't drive every decision.
103
104 Stop the wetlands developments. keep dirty sectors off the river.
105 Re-fit Westar.
106 Planting of native plants and avoidance of herbicide and pesticide to support wildlife. Also create long corridors of natural spaces through the city.
107 Keep the developments from misusing.
108
109
110
111 Keep the use of them managed by green technology interests rather than pure profit-driven interests.
112
113
114
115
116 quite letting cornfield field developers do NO landscaping of both the common areas and the residential lots. Mandate lots and lots of landscaping that is native and drought tolerant
117 Find a way to make people more aware and knowledgeable of the scarcity of resources and the need to use them better.
118 We have to keep some areas wild. Preferably close to the Kaw river.
119 Stop building new further & further out & start rebuilding all of the old crap that's already in place. Iowa south of 23rd is a great example of this.
120
121
122 Restrict roads to two lanes, and reduce speeds.
123 keep your paws off the wetlands and encourage their maintenance and growth
124
125
126
127
128 not sure
129
130 Keep private developers away from Clinton Lake.
131
132 Teaching people to respect natural resources.
133 Build green, if we build at all. Be more thoughtful about development.
134 As much as possible
135
136
137 Stop use of glyphosate and 2,4-D herbicides; make investments in safe drinking water sources; preserve what is left of the wetlands.
138
139 Not build on them. Less sprawl.
140
141

142 I would have liked to have seen no South Lawrence Trafficway.
143 De-emphasize vehicular transportation.
144
145 Strictly prohibit the use of artificial turf in all development.
146 not call them "natural resources"....contain growth of cities/towns in county. advocate upstream prevention of silt into water
147 Prevent development in ecologically important land and prime farmland
148 Stop suburban sprawl! Do what's possible to decrease/stop water and air pollution of Kaw River and Westar electric plant.
149
150
151 Less river dredging
152 utilize more renewable energy
153 Have the city use conservation easements to protect open spaces.
154
155 stop the wetland development now
156
157 Landowners are doing a GREAT job of protecting the natural resources on their private property. Local gov. should not be involved.
158 Educational resources incorporated into these areas (ex. signage, centers, etc.)
159
160 Reclaim water for irigation
161 I think we are a community which values natural resources very highly at this point. This is not an area where we need additional regulation
162 Solar energy should be harnessed on all government buildings.
163 require inclusion of natural green space with developments
164 establish set areas within the county (around North Lawrence, between South Iowa and Lonestar Lake) that are reserved for agricultural uses.
165
166 increase the use of renewable energy sources, solar, wind, water. incentives their use.
167 I'm not a professional in this area, so whatever is recommended for protecting the natural resources works for me.
168 Elimintae possibility for destruction of wetlands. Establishment of re-forestation programs throughout the county. Creation of additional waterways.
169 Our rules and regs are already over the top. We need more common sense
170 Set aside more green spaces for community use.
171
172
173
174 I want to protect them, but I don't want to go overboard either
175 Host a Protect Our Natural Resource parade.
176 Incorporate solar-powered street lighting, especially for parks and trails. Increase recycling and reclamation. Adjust zoning to make building non-traditional, energy-efficient, "green" housing possible without difficult-to-obtain permits.
177
178
179
180

181
182 to preserve and educate all of our city about what some areas can provide
183 I think the city has zoned protection and preservation well enough.
184
185
186 Use federal money
187 Farm land is not a natural resource a better definition on natural resources
188
189
190
191 Stop using pesticide, herbicides and other harsh chemicals that go into our land and waterways.
192 It would depend on what people define as natural resources, but they should be recognized and conserved to a point, but not such that we kill development all together. Also, putting soil above all else adds to the image of not being business friendly.
193 protect natural areas that people can visit including native american sites
194 support residential solar power in town, solar and wind energy in rural areas
195 A minimum LEED certification level for all new construction and environmental impact assessments performed for new construction
196 Stop building roads over protected lands.
197
198 Halt the sprawl of suburban development.
199
200 Think seven generations...
201 Building and development with sustainability in mind
202 Use of open space (encouraging but not punitive), integration of parks.
203
204 unclear
205 please do not develop Clinton Lake try and keep poison farm run off out of Kaw
206 Reduce encroachments of roads and intrusive developments
207 less littering
208 More trees planted in neighborhoods (shading and soil erosion)
209 Greater use of renewable energy and green building, especially for public buildings.
210 Ensure that critical resources and their protection are part of this plan (and that it is enforced appropriately).
211 I would love to see a ban on pesticides and lawn chemicals in Douglas County. Education/public awareness could be raised about the conservation of water.
212
213 Sustainable development of riverfront, creative management of growth
214
215 continued to not fuck with our ecosystem.
216
217 Zoning to protect them.
218
219
220 Conservation of wildlife areas, more water-efficient standards for new construction and remodels, more investment in less-polluting methods of energy production, incentivation for off-grid power supplies
221

222 There is much diversity on chemical use, oil extraction, etc. Must we wait a thousand years for agreement?
223
224 restrictions on large company growth
225 Proper zoning and planning.
226
227
228 Development regulations to protect these resources from strictly corporate interestes
229 more in recycling, less building, more repurposing vacant homes - community sergice or chain gangs cleaning up the side of the roads, picking up trash, etc...
230
231 City or County funded recycling programs. Investment in alternative energy and LED street lighting.
232 Steps should be taken but not at the expense of growing business and jobs for the citizens.
233
234 Stop selling them out for big developments.
235
236 Better recycling program
237 additional work on water returned to the river sensitive lands "set asides"
238
239 Protect Clinton lake and the surrounding environment and also the Kansas river.
240 Keep dredging out of the Kansas River.
241 don't cut down existing trees in new developments just because they are old. don't plant trees under utility wires.
242
243 What in the world does the question "Using natural resources....to support future development" mean???
244 More awareness of what our natural resources are. I am not sure I could name most important resources in Lawrence and Douglas County
245 Appropriately isolate them when necessary
246 Support for green energy, -local foods, -less sprawl, more open space, -less concrete
247 Encourage more public transportation and denser development
248 more parks with protected area (marshland, prairie, etc.)
249 Balance of creating opportunities to wisely use NR and incentivising land owners to protect NR
250 Focus on North Lawrence. Make better use of River & Clinton Lake to heighten awareness of value
251 I think this is important but has been too much of a concern in the past.
252 1) protect rural and ag lands from urban sprawl development
253
254
255
256
257 Development being respectful (as feasible) to maintain natural resource areas or utilize local resources
258
259 Slow down the massive development projects
260 Ensure that the protection requirements for developers are enforced and those that don't compy are penalized. I've lived places where this happends and everyone says "oh well"

261 Education
262 Water protection green spaces protected and increased
263 Fine corporations for polluting the river.
264 conservation designation
265 Preserving them whenever possible
266
267
268
269 direct expansion to decaying parts of city before expansion outward
270 Stop building towards Clinton Lake!
271 environmentally oriented planning
272
273 More effort in using more of our natural resources & passing laws for their protection.
274
275
276 Keep the Federal government out of our business. Let locals set stds.
277 Zoning that recognizes the agriculture treasure of the Kaw River Valley. Landscape architecture that acknowledges and addresses Lawrence as an urban heat island - foilage shading and drough tolerance
278 Natural resources should be used wisely for the benefit of the whole community
279 make it a critical element of any new or renewed development, especially commercial and industrial tracts of land it impacts
280
281
282 develop more trails & possible camping north of river and west of the bridges. Avoid destruction of particularly attractive natural areas (such as the wetlands!)
283 Stop building highways through wetlands
284 Eliminate urban sprawl
285 Be aware of any pending changes that would impark the above
286 Provide incentives. For example, trade opportunities to secure land for trails and parks along the Wakarusa in exchange for development opportunities along Hwy 59
287
288 We need to be really careful about the rivers and wetlands - they are dynamic systems. I'd advocate for sufficient buffer regions in zoning.
289
290 Planned growth and limiting industrial business to Douglas County
291 Adopt the environmental chapter and impliment it! Enforce protection and sensitive area/land
292 Density, transit options, water restrictions, increase energy efficicency requirements
293 Good judgement
294 Allow some freedom to developers - with encouragement to protect natural resources, especially to get past zoning, etc.
295 Protection ordinances for our valued resources must be put in place and held to- granting a variance for everything elminates the effectiveness
296 Emphasis on muscle powered transportation infrastructure; Expand and connect current conservation preserves, parks and wild areas
297
298
299 The older buildings that used materials found locally such as walnut, limestone, etc are still the

best construction we have in our city. start using and incentivising renewable energy on all buildings.

300
301
302 Identify/set aside smaller, genuine pockets of resource areas and be willing to devote public funds to those while allowing freer development of less significant pockets of resourc area. Possible create a "natural resource" or "park land enhancement" fee
303
304 Protect the Kaw as a recreational source
305
306
307 Less reckless development
308 not sure
309 Protected corridor along river, wetlands, buffer zones
310 Better land use planning, fewer parking lots
311 Stop building for awhile an fix our streets and parking lots.
312 Awareness to impact on native species, rivers, creeks, lakes, etc. Green energy initiatives. Promoting public and bicycle transportation.
313 Require a high level of scrutiny as to potential adverse impact to our natural resources particularly to sensitive areas such as watershed areas, north Lawrence, and north of north Lawrence.
314 Clean up the Kaw, limit chemicals on farms draining to the river
315
316
317 Open space - wetlands/river are special resources that are under utilized. Nice trail system like KU Biological Preserve north of airport and Clinton trails... it would be nice to have some close to town, eg arboretum in West Campus, work w/ various group
318 Using more land undeveloped, when we should be filling in.
319 The importance of undeveloped natural aeas need to be recognized. The environmental and health contributions of these areas need to be recognized. More natural/undeveloped areas
320 Keep community aware of what we have - why we need to respct it. (ex. Type 1 soil). Work with other agencies to buy or setup programs to save/preserve natural resources
321 Water rationing; incenvitize small farms that grow food for humans; stop urban growth outwards completely; more prairies and Caegts in conservation easements; education about natural Douglas County from early age for students;
322 Continuting to encourage the placement of rural properties and land into trust to protect plant and animal species for generations to come.
323 Making it a priority in all development considerations.
324 Water conservation and breathability.
325
326
327
328
329 Collectively agree to sacred lands and waterways not available for development.
330
331
332
333 Corporate responsibility in sustainable business practices, including building projects.

334
335 Recognize the need to limit growth - we cannot continue to grow exponentially and still preserve our natural resources
336 I'd like to see us continue to care for our beautiful old trees and continue to plant more for the future.
337 Plant more trees/water conservation
338
339 Develop vode to support the Environmental Chapter in comp plan, more land conserved for open space and agriculture
340 education what is at risk so steps can be taken to preserve and enhance.
341
342
343 Work harder to support clean water efforts through groups like Friends of the Kaw.
344 prevent approval of development projects with high-density residential complexes; prevent and large-scale strip mall development with excessive impervious surfaces and more hotel space than necessary
345 Less emphasis on road building and more emphasis on maintaing what we have and on mass transit options. Tax incentives to those involved in local organic agriculture to ensure local food security in the future.
346 A review of current policies and make any updated changes that reflect the current times especially as it relates to water.
347
348 Ensure enough green spaces. Plan building that takes into account floods, maintaining wetlands, not building in certain areas of flood plains.
349
350 Treat this issue like a high priority.
351
352 Avoid big development projects, especially in floodplains and on farm land.
353 Integrating development into natural areas appropriately; less development in more sensitive areas; more development where there are fewer natural & cultural areas of significance
354 Reduce vehicle traffic
355 I don't really understand what c and d mean.
356 I don't know
357
358
359
360 more paths and paths connecting them so people use them more
361 Keep recycling program! Make it easier to recycle electronics, etc. Right now too damn cumbersome
362 Fund the protection of all remaining native prairie sites in the county, protect historic woodlands, protect agricultural soils, develop with density and infill to limit sprawl, use less land, & to create a more walkable, transit serviceable city & county
363 Green requirements for new buildings - natural light, CFLS, waste
364 Groundwater protections from fracking, sand pits, and nitrate fertilizer infiltration. A tree preservation ordinance with heavy penalties, removal permits, and replacement requirements
365 Clean up and utilize increase awareness
366 Better erosion prevention and very limited use of herbicides and pesticides. More use of native plants. Encourage landscaping that uses plants requiring less water.

367	No heavy industrial parks!!
368	
369	Connectivity between natural areas. Preserve natural areas in developments, incentivze preservation on private lands - more "Natural" parkland. Take steps to reduce sprawl. Mass Transit
370	I wish I knew what to say here, because it's quite important! Preserving resources is easier than regenerating them!
371	Placing too much emphasis on conservation will limit the amound of land that can be devoted to new commercial, industrial, and residential development. Market should dictate where development is located.
372	Placing too much emphasis on conservation will limit the amount of land that can be devoted to new commercial, industrial and residential development. Market should dictate where development is located.
373	

	28. Moving forward, what is the most important way the community can enhance its sustainability?
1	
2	Creating more jobs so as to sustain its interests
3	
4	
5	we need to look at conserving our water uses
6	Ensure we utilize the best technology to enhance sustainability
7	Good Paying Jobs.
8	
9	
10	Don't base sustainability on econonmic and population growth.
11	
12	Enhance economic development for with less and less jobs there is less and less community to sustain.
13	Emphasize sustainability rather than growth. Develop the concept of Optimal.
14	
15	
16	Control housing costs
17	Provide good jobs for young people - both high school & college grads
18	Focus on infrastructure and in-filling population. Focus on the blighted districts and stop building out on the edges. We'll end up with a hollow hole in the middle.
19	
20	
21	Water infrastructure; incentivizing affordable housing
22	
23	By taking steps to decrease its reliance on fossil fuels.
24	Educational efforts.
25	
26	
27	Solar and hydroelectric power - more affordable options - enegy efficiency programs and resources - how-to / do-it yourself classes or information fairs - home tours

28
29
30 Exactly what is a sustainable community???
31 Give up the current and past mindset, listen to the public. No community ever folded because they added to what they already had.
32 Support established local businesses in ways similar to how we throw money (tax incentives and other support) at large new developments, consider long-term consequences.
33 Encourage redevelopement and infill developement rather than sprawl.
34
35
36 continue to provide public transportaion, sustanible yards, housing and businesses- work with Douglas County schools KU to help teach sustaniblity to student body
37 Water and sewer and roads
38 Meet the needs of the people who are here, and not try to turn Lawrence into Johnson County or KC.
39 Water is/will be a huge issue--we need to talk about it more and educate people.
40
41 Promoting non-automobile transportation, preserving greenspace, denser growth not sprawl
42
43 A very green building code, more dense zoning requirements, real money (instead of token amounts) for pedestrian and bicycle ways, and creative public transit
44
45 buy local
46 stronger energy standards for new development. Create incentive for zero net energy buildings. Free and ubiquitous public transit.
47
48 Think!
49 Don't know
50
51
52
53
54
55 Enhance environment/natural
56 Support renewable energy options, neighborhood focused development, walkability/bikeability
57 Dump brown back
58
59
60
61
62 Education and a good law enforcement-keep the drugs out-stop crimminalizing marijuana and support local beer makers
63
64 Getting businesses in town that pay good wages and provide good benefits
65 Develop policies that promote creative approaches to development.
66
67
68

69
70 Use local resources and reduce trash output, more recycling
71 bike and walking paths, urban garden spaces,
72 Make it so everyone who wants it can use wind, solar, geothermal energy
73
74
75 Quality health care for the mature and education for the young.
76 Food security.
77
78
79 Don't allow developers to dictate what gets built and where. Keep them to the same codes and zoning laws that govern the rest of us.
80 Growth management.
81 Recycling, new housing that is energy efficient. Solar powered street lights.
82 Set up requirements to incorporate sustainable, green, environmentally friendly building practices and features in any new construction within the community.
83
84
85
86
87
88
89 More job opportunities
90
91 Get citizens involved and enthusiastic
92 Build and develop in such a way to limit dependency of cars.
93 Disallowing GMO crops. Incentivizing green energy production at the household level.
94
95 Encouraging recycling, home gardening and biking& Walking.
96 Don't let making money become more important than living in a sustainable, green space.
97
98 Appropriate policies and staff whose job it is to help monitor and be the voice for sustainability.
99 Encourage cycling and walking
100 I can't believe it took us until 2014 to get curb-side recycling through the city.
101
102 Make the city more attractive economically while preserving its livability.
103
104 Not destroy our wetlands, encourage organic agriculture.
105 More middle class jobs.
106 Build more densely and support walking, biking, and public transport.
107 By thoughtful use of existing lands, resources with progress for all Lawrentians.
108
109
110 It should provide a diversity of jobs and provide a safe, crime free environment
111 balance growth with preservation of unique culture.
112
113
114 encouraging of participation and making options easy

115
116 make developers replicate the neighborhoods that people in older parts of Lawrence love
117 Promote diversity.
118 Using more permaculture-esque principles in its development.
119 Make Lawrence more accessible & bring in more businesses/jobs
120
121
122 Restrict roads
123 moderate development, keep things local and provide small business friendly policies and protections
124
125
126
127
128 not sure
129
130 Renewable energy sources.
131
132 I like the Douglas County Extension Center. They have gardening classes for people in all walks of life. I would like to see more opportunities for extension center.
133 Water usage, green building.
134
135
136 jobs
137 Encourage "green" building codes (specifically to commercial development). Find ways to incorporate solar projects (Solar Roadways).
138
139 Improve what we do have. Redevelop and remodel. Don't allow unnecessary retail. Recycle. Grow local. Create new energy resources.
140
141
142 Stop playing to the pocketbooks of reckless developers
143
144
145 Very active recycling program, a campaign to prohibit littering directed toward KU students
146 increasing solar energy use and more efficient transportation, rewarding sustainability in arch/building/historic preservation
147 Make it the centerpiece in all aspects of our development.
148 Recyle, reuse, reduce (especially electronics)
149
150
151
152
153 Enact wise public policies to encourage sustainable practices: recycling, efficient transportation, open space preservation.
154
155
156

157 Sustainability should be attained through the planning of access to utilities.
158 Not duplicating services and combining resources
159
160 Curbside recycling with glass. Not haveing a house on every 5 acre tract.
161 Attract and support entrepreneurship and employment opportunities.
162 Solar energy, wind turbines, & planting more trees... especially along 6th street and 23rd street.
163 improve walkabilty
164 a developed bike commuter system
165
166 increase the incentives for the use and incorporation of alternative energy sources. Increase community food gardens.
167 Correct the tax base, where commercial and industrial taxes carry the homeowners, instead of the other way around as it stands today.
168 Community gardens and more alternative housing choices that lessen use of natural resources
169 Common sense
170 By encouraging sustainable building.
171
172
173
174 Have good modes of public transportation and an employment base spread out within the community so that people can live close to work
175 Crack down on crime and reinstate homeless/unemployed into society.
176
177
178
179
180 dredge Clinton Lake
181
182 n/a
183 Protection of water resources, i.e. - lawn watering restrictions, investment in home conservation measures.
184 Living in a community that is affordable without constant tax increases to support questionable projects that can be put on the back burner.
185
186 Plan
187 More industrial business
188
189 Improve alternate modes of transportation besides automotive.
190 using/converting to renewable energy sources
191 Make sure that whatever actions are made that we are able to sustain the community, the nature and livability of the area.
192 Recognize that sustainability is not just about food, but all aspects of life and business.
193 self sustaining homes and businesses
194 enforce better insulation codes to reduce energy use, improve recycling
195 More renewable energy deployment and more locally grown food sold in Lawrence
196
197 Less apartments, and more homes
198 Densify the city, increase public transit, create a quality system for bicycling, increase

sustainability standards for new works of architecture - take advantage of the architecture school's presence
199
200 Tax the hell out of products that waste our natural resources, e.g. anything "disposable."
201 Encourage environmental building, sidewalks, walking & cycling
202 Secure a reliable water supply. County regulation of non-agricultural uses. Not a major city concern.
203
204 energy efficiency of renovations, new construction. recycling of old materials
205 making recycling easy especially paint, pesticides etc
206 Focus on resources for youth and families as well as the rapidly increasing senior/retired populations.
207
208
209 Continued support for greener transportation options including public transportation and improved paths for biking and walking.
210 Protect and secure the water supply (Kaw and Clinton Lake).
211 See my answer to question 27.
212
213 Economic sustainability
214
215 recycling. better power options.
216
217 Work toward the transition from the automobile to walking, bicycling and public transportation
218
219
220 Get off the gas pump! Encourage the use of alternative fuels. Set an example by committing to replace city vehicles as they break down with alterative-fuel, electric, and non-motorized vehicles.
221
222 Educate people, especially about water. Why water your lawn when rain is prevalent?
223
224 Wish I knew
225 Planning!
226
227
228 Quit gobbling up prime farmland and wetlands. We could be the truck farming hub for the midwest in that part of our culture was protected and enhanced
229 Up number of community gardens, focus on repurposing/remodeling vacant/abandonded houses and old buildings (would really like to see some "re-birth" in East Lawrence (reduce Hispanic gangs and meth!!)
230 Encourage "Buy Local"
231 Provide local employment to decrease commuting, provide better retail options.
232 Increase the availability of jobs
233 Don't put so many road blocks up for new business to come into town. Jobs create a bigger tax base and helps everyone
234 Make recycling easier. How about recycling dumpsters for all apartment communities and recycling bins for all houses?

235
236 Continue to support education and the arts. Promote lakes and build more trails.
237 eat more local fruits and vegtables
238
239 Regulate large commercial/industrial development.
240 Make Lawrence less dependent on cars.
241 create jobs so people can work and live here
242 Having a PLAN!
243 Allow wholly modern buildings--architecture and features--to coexist with historic buildings.
244 Increase public awareness of sustainablity programs and plans
245 More recycling options downtown and on parks. More solar panels
246 promote biking and walking, recycling
247 Supporti recycling, property taxes discourage maintenance of older properties and those of lessor income
248 Focus on enhcnaing what we already have, our strenghs
249 Employment opportunities. Balanced tax base
250 Focus community on value of sustainable energy development
251 Preserving opportunities for economic development that matches the desire for amenities
252 Protect/Improve aging area of city
253 Reduce care travel within and in/out
254
255
256 Higher quality jobs, few big industry, promote downtown, tax breaks/incentives for local business owners
257 Maintain a growth pattern that encompasses the current diverse and creative bedroom community feel.
258 Things like complete streets - arts- to continue to attract people because they want to live here
259 Slow traffic by not expanding streets - encourage more gardening for food
260 Recycling. As a renter I have to cart it all somewhere else and this is after findinf someplace in my small apartment to collect it all.
261 Empower minority voices, promote amenities like Lawrence Public Library and Martin Park, Prairie Park
262 Job growth culture enhancements
263 Jobs
264 Urban farming and communal gardens, supporting local bus, creative affordable living
265
266
267
268 Provide jobs and good homes, keep taxes low
269 more light industrial activity
270 Support local energy, food, and fuel initatives
271 save our soil for food production and protect the water table by limiting industrial use of water for irrigation
272 An understanding that economic development is important for residents to live in the lifestyle they desire. This means all agricultural land cannot be preserved.
273 Increasing employment opportunities. Preserving historic sites and values. Providing more green space.
274 Provide good leadership and listen to people

275 By attracting businesses
276 More high paying jobs
277
278
279 preserve options to growth, adoptability of the overall infrastructure
280 Energy saving for exterior lighting. Conservation of water usage
281 more affordable housing, more jobs; more & better cared for (as city responsibility) sidewalks, more attention to older parts of town, connected trails
282 Keep this an interesting, stimulating, enjoyable place to live
283
284 Stop giving away the store to every developer. AND, charge realistic development fees to new projects
285 Tell the world what lawrence can offer.
286 Dont get locked into one policy mantra. develop policies that allow flexibility and problem solving options. Civic leadership and staff should put themselves in a position to consider scarce development projects that can improve the area and create jobs
287
288 Get a vision, stick to it. Focus growth wisely
289 good clean jobs that pay well
290 Planned, managed growth
291 Get people out of their cars and walking - on bikes. ROAD DIETS!
292 Reliable bus route to KC; require xeriscaping on all city land; affordable inter-generational housing
293 Affordable housing, jobs
294 Apply incentives
295 Slow our fringe growth - I don't believe more apartme complexes at the outskirts of town is beneficial. Increase public transit opportunities. Support initatives such as recycling/grey water for landscape, etc.
296 Qualitative development and increased green space.
297 Concentrate on basic nfrastructure improvements generally well paying local jobs, affordable housing for workers including inclusionsary zoning and accessory housing
298 More bike trails = less car and destruction of roads and area
299 RENEWABLE ENERGY
300 Ask more open ended questions on this survey
301 More bike stuff
302 Profound incentives that demand profound preservation methodologies
303 Stop building highway through wetlands
304 Since we have so many elementary schools - tie in recycling/sustainability to each school
305
306
307 Access on affordable housing for families and households and transitional living - focus on our low income & seniors
308 community involvement
309 people need to have decent jobs with livable salaries and safe affordable housing in Lawrence, with appropriate amenities and schools in their neighborhoods
310 Allow people to be less auto dependent by making it safer and more efficient to do something else
311

312 Focus on ecological and environmental impact of all development.
313 Require development & proposals to demonstrate sustainability long term and improve the quality of the area. Refuse to approve growth for growth's sake proposals.
314 capitalize on the recycling, solar panels on city / county buildings
315
316
317 single-stream recycling (and availability of trash/recycling around town). Denser, more efficient growth. Bike/trail system
318 We need another outdoor swim facility. This is obvious if you drive by pool downtown in summer.
319 Move to support less polluting energy sources in autos and other energy sources. Support alternative energy and move away from traditional fossil fuelage, support solar, geothermal, walking, biking
320 Keeping creative, productive people and businesses here! Use its unique agricultural environments to become a "showcase" of what innovative people can do with great soils, decent climates and access to markets
321 Stop growing the city! Stop driving & owning CARS. Energy audits and deep energy retrofits for all houses & businessees
322 Historical architectural presrvation. Preserving/Including green space in new development site's and in remodeled neighborhoods (including the Warehouse Arts District)
323 Supporting education and training, integrating bicycle pathes into the everyday life of Lawrence, widespread organic farming, leaving room for green spaces,
324 Community gardens and agriculture.
325
326
327
328
329 Protect water supply, not grow beyond water supply.
330 Jobs are always an issue - they are all over the country, obviously. I make my living doing 2 jobs. Am self employed as I couldn't find a regular full-time job. Not unusual anywhere in the U.S. right now.
331 Allow market forces to dictate without artificial restrictions being imposed
332
333 Appropriate infill projects. Planned growth that promotes primary jobs. Attracting high-tech firms that require a variety of employee levels
334
335 Look to other communities that are leading the way, make it a priority, stop letting enormous apartment complexes into the city
336
337 To maintain a diverse and welcoming culture
338 Continue its unique character offering a quality of life very few communities can match
339 Create & maintian walkable neighborhoods close to employment
340 ensuring reasonable green building codes/preserving green space/trees and encouraging recycling become a part of our community without pricing out new development.
341
342
343 Protect and preserve our water and soil resources! Educate!
344 maintain/increase agricutural use; increase incentives for solar energy and other environmentally

	sustainable energy
345	Create a outer belt/limit for growth and maintaining natural and agricultural areas.
346	Grow the city using smart growth strategies, good public transportation, density, connectivity
347	
348	Understand ecology and integrate into planning. Support local food and businesses, creative reuse, support alternative energy, recycle.
349	
350	Community gardens/kitchens.
351	
352	Consult citizens more openly about large construction projects.
353	Not getting caught up in the moment; see where all proposals fit into the long term picture
354	Reduce waste created by built environment by implementing real green strategies, not just "LEED-ish" checklists
355	Recycling, more solar and other green power technologies.
356	I don't know
357	
358	
359	
360	build up not out
361	Community engagement (like these meetings) as town grows. Do not let developers have the upper hand on how neighborhoods develop
362	Develop dense, walkable neighborhoods, provide energy efficiency assistance
363	Extend recycling services to new developments, especially apartment buildings on west side of town
364	Think and plan for ECOLOGICAL sustainability, NOT sustainable development or sustained growth (both of which are impossible on a finite planet)
365	Protect and increase connectivity and diversity
366	Use locally grown foods. Find ways to produce electricity that relies less on coal.
367	Waork with the neighborhoods that are involved instead of trying to push a preplanned agenda for developers. Working together will work smoother in the future.
368	
369	Be more selective with types of development. Be mindful of destroying native habitats. Educate the public on various aspects of sustainability. Community gardens - walkable neighborhoods and bike lanes
370	Working together and coming to consensus to grow mindfully, knowing that good growth is important- we do need to attract commercial and industrial business to enable use to do other things we want to do.
371	We need to grow our tax base. A more prosperous community will lead to higher tax revenues, which will provide more public resources to spend on parks, open space, and conservation.
372	We need to grow our tax base. A more prosperous community will lead to higher tax revenues, which will provide more public resources to spend on parks, open space and conservation.
373	Broadening our decision making, codes, etc to embrace green methods, thinking long-term, supporting grass roots efforts already in the community.

	29. Are there things about Lawrence/Douglas County that you really like and would like to see more?
1	more small shops. Mass Street used to be interesting, now it's just bars and restaurants.

2 downtown
3
4
5 the mix of people & ideas that KU brings to Lawrence
6 No
7
8 more family entertainment; miniature golf, drive-in theater, etc.
9 KU involvement with the community. Supporting social services, volunteering, fundraising, inviting families to enjoy KU events.
10
11
12 Be a community that allows the people therein to reach their economic potential.
13 Medium sized community, college town, up to now, good educational system and city amenities
14
15
16 festivals, fairs, community things for all citizens.
17 Pretty accepting and inclusive. I like to see new local businesses open up, such as coffee shops & bike shops
18 Majority of townsfolk are friendly and engaging. Open minded and willing to try new things.
19
20
21
22
23 Excellent parks, good schools, strong sense of community and shared destiny.
24 More commercial and industrial development, which will create new jobs and economic development opportunities.
25
26
27 Art, Art, and more art - the more I see the more I want. Final Fridays should be all incompassing! All retailers should have a resident or monthly featured artist and provide refreshments and a social atmosphere.
28
29
30 The availability of KU
31 Stand behind the claims already made, do not make it so hard for homeowners to renovate their homes and stop passing on the taxes to the public when the new businesses can afford them.
32 The thriving arts community has been a true pleasure the past few years, but my most favorite thing about this community is the amount of outdoor recreation it offers. It would be nice if, for example, sidewalks were maintained and kept clear.
33 I really like Clinton Lake and I really hate the idea of a convention center/hotel or other commercial uses there. I would like to see the type of trail system that Clinton has happen along the south bank of the Kansas River.
34
35
36 I love the flowers and sculptures downtown, I love the stores downtown and the different kinds of classes offered by the parks and rec
37 Love the airport. Would like to see runway 15/33 extend to 7,000 feet someday.
38 Parades downtown! We've got the cutest Downtown in the world, I'd like to see another high

wheel bicycle parade.
39 Love the efforts being made to improve our community from a health standpoint. Woudl love to see us qualify as a Blue Zone.
40
41 Downtown, parks, walking paths
42
43 In spite of all my bitching, Lawrence is still a good place to live (and needs to protect that). Even the bad guys wear white hats.
44
45 Pedestrian and bicycle activity. Families walking.
46 Political activism. Unique local services that cultivate larger markets.
47
48
49 Not really
50
51
52 open space protected thru conservation easements.
53
54
55 Taking care of what we have
56 community events, support of the arts and education, parks and rec
57 Connected paths = connected people
58
59
60
61
62 Churches Chicken
63 The nurturing and encouragement of local agriculture is great. Let's see nurturing of back yard agriculture (gardens, chickens, beekeeping) and. Let's see reductio of herbicides and pesticides in residential lawns. Education is everything.
64 The rural-ness of Douglas County be supported and valued
65 I like our downtown, our parks and our great neighborhoods. I would love to see the Arts District expanded and become a place that draws art lovers.
66
67
68
69
70 Mass Street-like places
71
72 Mix of history, culture, diversity, innovation
73
74
75 Why assume "more" is good? If I like Downtown Lawrence, why should more of it be good.
76 Basically, the things that you can only find here, the things that make this place unique. To do that you have to support the PEOPLE that do/make those things.
77
78
79 I like the historic nature of our city and county. I would like to see more developments like the

Poehler Lofts.
80 Healthy existing neighborhoods and commercial districts.
81 High end restaurants
82 Yes. I like the idea of community gardens, and would love to see a food park developed here in Lawrence, something along the lines of the Beacon Food Forest in Seattle.
83
84
85
86
87
88 public art sculpture and historical preservation
89 Band Concerts, Farmer's Market
90
91 Yes, community spirit
92 Many things I like, too numerous to mention...
93
94 Interest in sustainability
95 More community activities and festivals.
96 Effective trails within city limits. More community gardens or green spaces
97
98 Businesses that are responsible, local, aesthetic, generous, good employers, contributors.
99
100
101
102 I like the way the city/county work together to preserve what we have while endeavoring to improve our opportunities for the future.
103
104 I love the environmental diversity and those who protect it. I would love to see more organic agriculture and educational developements
105 very friendly
106 Lawrence Art Center, library, youth sports complex, parks, outdoor activities, downtown shops, neighborhood gardens, farmer's market
107 Jazz offerings.
108
109
110
111 nice people
112
113
114 the size of the communities; the variety of the communities
115
116
117 Cultural and architectural diversity.
118 I love final fridays. I think the Free State Festival looks very interesting and am excited to see it. I like the Art Walk. I like the bike path in East Lawrence and I love the levy pathway and Clinton Lake.
119 Clean, well kept neighborhoods & parks
120

121
122 Downtown has been very successful as well as the Prarie Park nature center and the Bouroughs Creek trail
123
124
125 Yes! Natural beauty, trees, walking paths and trails...
126
127
128 not sure
129
130 Bike friendly areas.
131
132 I want to see more community computer classes.
133
134
135
136
137 Small, local businesses, preservation and promotion of historical areas/information.
138
139 Grocery stores where needed and of moderate size.
140
141
142 More neighborhood access to locally-grown, fresh produce and more community gardens
143
144
145 More owner-occupied residences in the older neighborhoods around KU.
146 interest in becoming a "Food Hub" and increasing sustainability in action and advocacy
147 Spread the public arts program throughout the community and county, not just Mass St.
148 Community-wide events that bring us together (e.g., July 4th).
149
150
151
152
153 The ability of the commissions to work in a non-partisan way for the betterment of the city and county.
154
155
156
157 Personal property rights.
158 Our efforts to maintain good asthetics on our buildings, public areas and enhancements
159
160 City expanding our infrastructure in an responsable way. Waste water and potable water treated in a green way.
161 Of course! It is a fabulous community. I would like to see more of everything. Downtown should expand to the other side of the river, up 9th Street and all the way down 23rd.
162 I like downtown, the bike/walking trails, & dog parks.
163 embracing the unique population and continued value of the arts
164 trails like the Burroughs Trail, expanded programs like Common Ground

165
166 I love the diversity and would love to see more cultural centers.
167 Retail options.
168 The downtown, old west Lawrence and KU are all unique sub-areas with their own individual culture. We need to create the same unique feel to areas of new construction.
169
170 It's character.
171
172 Preserving vistas and great views of lands. More access to Kansas River
173
174
175 I really like the free Holcom Recreational Facility. I'd like to see more improvements to it.
176
177
178
179
180
181
182 n/a
183 Like the ability to transition from urban community to rural landscape in a few minutes.
184
185
186
187 more industrial for workers in this area
188
189
190
191 Artwork and protection of culture.
192
193 love the historical homes, farmers market, art, south park activities
194
195 Downtown restaurants, historical signs
196
197 parks, trees, more city sponsored activities (downtown festivals/concerts)
198 The communities overall attitude, farmers' markets, somewhat dense residential neighborhoods (older part of town).
199
200
201 Our parks system is wonderful!
202 Keep current landscaping and tree requirements, don't expand upon.
203
204 saving the old buildings in east lawrence. ensure new construction blends with existing neighborhood
205 Green spaces
206 Expanded library resources across the county--satilite libraries
207
208 Focus on family neighborhoods, farmers markets, small businesses
209 I love all the public support for the arts including events; art installations; murals; etc.

210 Yes - more small and independent/start-up businesses. A true market economy would work well here.
211 More diversity of businesses, housing, etc.
212
213
214 Concern and support for people in great need. Support & honoring of arts and history. More support/interest in ALL neighborhoods
215 i love our community. continue to be open minded to alternative forms of transportation and the wellness of our community.
216
217 The variety of cultural opportunities, music, art, drama, history. Also the variety of architecture both public and private.
218
219
220 The bus system here is astonishing for a small midwestern city. More comprehensive coverage would be fantastic--longer hours and Sunday routes would be just great.
221
222 Farm markets. Open farm visits in fall. And of course a few in-town dog parks.
223
224 buildings and new businesses building in styles that fit the surrounding residences and old feel of Lawrence
225 More bus service! Let's cut down on the number of cars that need to be on the streets.
226
227
228 More maintenance free neighborhoods for seniors
229 I think the shops in North Lawrence are great. The Lecompton community has really pulled together in the last 2 years through PRIDE. I would like to see help from Douglas County to remodel the community building
230 Outside dining, Emphasis on Quality of Life
231 Diversity of culture, but need much more.
232 The friendly atmosphere and the diversity of the culture.
233 I would like to see more blue collar jobs in the area. I would rather not have to have so many of our residents drive to Topeka or KC to work. Keep the jobs local.
234 Community partnerships, like those between non-profits, churches, goverment agencies, schools, universities, and other groups.
235
236 Cultural events programs
237 the Burroughs trail, garden sites, original townsites neighborhoods revitalized
238
239 I love living in a college town, access to Clinton lake and the river and our downtown.
240 I like the people, who are public spirited, kind, and intelligent. They are here for the long haul.
241 i like the theatre Lawrence, the lied center - I like the museums - see the cultural activites such as the mexican fiesta by St. Johns
242 I would like to see Lawrence development be driven by smart thinking not developers.
243
244
245 N/A
246

247 More public transportation to KC and Topeka // When I first came to Lawrnece one could take a bus to Royals games
248 active downtown, arts scene, COMMUNITY EVENTS
249 Infill development that fits in w/ the existing character of the area
250 Again - Waterways are vastly under-appreciated - Kaw and Clinton
251 I think a major change is coming with regard to technologies and education. We need to be able to retain our workforce and our communty as technology advances. Without an infrastructure for this we will lose opportunities.
252 large scale development
253 Development of more parks along rivers
254
255 Unique business and art throughout the city and county
256 Parks, activities, small business
257 More walkability with a creative (art) music or economic noodles
258 Caring people - good government
259 Green space! Organic (grass roots) community events
260 It has a sense of place and a sense of community that I'd like to see maintained. I love all the old houses so ensuring their protection and perhaps some incentives to help owners maintain and rehab them would be nice.
261 Wetlands
262 Community activities, cultural & arts @ LDC & LHDS
263 I love the new focus on arts and commerce.
264 Unique local businesses
265
266
267 Garden areas - community
268
269 like active downtown area. Final Fridays
270 Local farms
271 open spaces, protection of the urban core
272 The sound planning that has taken place over the years
273 Downtown Lawrence is quite charming and it would be carried throughout the city. Many communities in Douglas Co. are unique & charming & should concentrate on that.
274
275
276
277
278 employment opportunities
279 More variety in restaurants! Like seafood. More police and first responders
280 really great job with city landscaping, benefits to small businesses
281 ethnic diversity
282 Parks & Rec. does a good job. Most of the county is rural-agricultural. Farmers markets are a big hit.
283 More enforcement to clean up blighted areas, roundabouts at major intersections, buses
284 Excellent city airport, nice riverfront
285 Everything appear's to be fairly well balanced in all areas, more growth tell the world what lawrence can offer.
286 more diverse employment opportunities in Lawrence and Douglas County, I want Lawrence to

become a FREE STANDING city.
287 I love how we support local businesses
288 We are fortunate to have a friendly, walkable downtown where there is access to arts events, historic places and places to meet friends, enjoy a meal, etc. We just need to be sure whatever other growth we have does not detract from that.
289 historic preservation
290 Community Planning. Health policies. Following Complete Streets
291 Open space, outlying farmland, quirky neighborhoods, public art
292 Festivals, Parades, Art Walks
293 Preservation of open green space and farmland. Also, opportunities for input is great and important
294 More positive proactive growth - its inevitable so why not structure it to be more positive
295 Support small local businesses. Continued connection of community to the university
296
297 less gentrification that not all residents can afford. More emphasis on affordable hsouing. more enterprenueal approval and encouragement of local business that cultivates Lawrence such as good wages like Freestate Holdings
298 Bike trails & outdoor activities, live bands
299 better access to the river and across it for exploring, pedestrian bridges. preserve existing affordable housing around downtown
300 Keep the downtown pool open til midnight once a month in the summer time
301 More bike stuff
302 Genuine high-quality museum development
303 Small family owned businesses
304 community gardens, school gardens
305
306
307 green space - focus even more on local artists, musicians, creativity that is our not manipulated by corporates for their own interests
308 local small businesses
309 variety in neighborhoods
310 More Multi-use paths connection, downtown like development
311
312 The focus on controlled, well planned growth is important. (To avoid an Overland Park type disaster)
313 It has good urban qualities but tries to maintain its rural roots and character.
314 Downtown Lawrence,
315
316
317 I like art, music, historic work at current level. More outdoor (bike/walk trails!)
318 Vibrant downtown extremely important
319
320 More cooperation w/ county-city-university. The great restaurants w/reasonable prices
321 Public natural areas, Kaw River, Unique neighborhoods, bike paths, community orchards, small farms that produce local foods
322 Parks & walking trails. Improvement of the appearance of the North Lawrence corridor as it leads into downtown, before you cross the bridge
323 Love downtown with its mix of arts, film, dining, library.

324 Neighborhood schools.
325
326
327
328 lower speed limits when there are no sidewalks, 5 to 10 mph
329 City-maintained parks and trails.
330
331 Variety of restaurants is here. Would like to see more variety encouraged. For example, encourage an Elephant Bar franchise to open a store here, a Red Robin to open here, etc
332
333 Recreation opportunities. Biz dvlpmt projects that are happening around the downtown core. Warehouse Arts District.
334
335 The arts are strong and the local food system is strengthening - these are positives
336
337 Downtown events. Dog days. JoCo buses
338 Planning development well with conseration for transporation, integrating unique character, quality of construction, green spaces. Following the plan and not allowing developers to change the agreed plan.
339 Bike/pedestrian facilities, outdoor swimming opportunities, neighborhoods with porches and alleys, newer commercial areas that are well designed and landscaped
340 Shifting to a more community/walking/biking friendly environment. If i wanted JoCo, i'd have moved there.
341 sad
342
343 I think I've mentioned them all - food growers, arts, history, outdoor recreation
344
345 The town and gown relationship and the business opportunities it creates. The close proximity of natural areas. The abundance of locally grown food. The emphasis on health and outdoor fitness opportunities. Parks to gardens. The healthy downtown.
346 Keep increasing the arts & culture. Keep downtown growing and prospering
347
348 We have folks in city government working toward more sustainable practices. We support our heritage. We are integrating arts and culture into our community even more.
349
350 N/A
351
352 The downtown, cultural resources although we could use more, senior services.
353 More downtown events that let people from here and elsewhere enjoy themselves
354 Yes! The ability to experience natural rural life then engage in culture w/ a worldwide perspective. Protect that.
355
356 More events at KU and The Lied Center and downtown, more festivals, concerts, etc./ more retail shopping options / more restaurants / more parks - green space / more jobs
357
358
359
360 food and arts

361 I've said it all! Lawrence rocks! Keep it that way.
362 Trails, stream restoration, historic preservation
363 Like the community gardens! Would love to see some outside of downtown
364 Our open-mindedness and sense of inclusion, our agricultural heritage, our participatory democracy
365 More community arts events
366 Newer sidewalks are very good. Sidewalks should be improved in the neighborhoods around the University.
367 Community college/trade/tech school. Research facilities - not industrial parks.
368
369 Love the diverse makeup of people. Love the rich history & the impact of the university on the town. Locally owned stores & restaurants - great parks & roadside landscaping
370 Lawrence/Douglas County is really beautiful. I love that we can still see the stars at night, and that it's to walk and bike and enjoy being outdoors. I also love the cool architectural projects undertaken by Dan Rockhill's classes, etc. Green building.
371 Growth of retail choices that will improve our retail pull factor. Excited about future projects, which will help me spend more of my money in the community.
372 Growth of retail choices that will improve our retail pull factor. Excited about future projects, which will help me spend more of my money in the community.
373 Smart, fun people, easy access to outdoor public spaces, more color, less beige, compassion towards people who are disenfranshised.

30. Are there things you don't like and would like changed?

1 more small shops. Mass Street used to be interesting, now it's just bars and restaurants.
2 23rd street
3
4
5 we're not an industrial hub so less emphasis on industry and more emphasis on creating white collar employment
6 No
7 Yes, the sidewalks in my neighborhood are very dangerous. The kids and I trip at least once on every walk
8
9
10 Too many small National chain retail stores.
11
12 Don't stifle entrepreneurship. Better bike and ped transportation options. This is improving.
13 Too much suburban sprawl. Public transportation could be much better (including connections to other cities in Kansas and Missouri.
14
15
16 Why continue to hand out money to special interest groups when the budget is suffering. Let the citizens support what they want to have.
17 Still quite a few vacant strip mall locations although that seems to be decreasing.
18 Less big power brokers of developers influencing path forward -- the Fritzels, Schwadas, Comptons, etc.
19

20
21
22
23 Spawling development dominated by fast food restaurants. This reinforces sedentary living and poor diets.
24 Reversing the perception that Lawrence is hostile to new development and growth.
25
26
27 I want more sidewalks and better lighting in all areas of town. Just to keep everyone safe - possibly build better pedestrian areas around 23rd street and Iowa (Iowa is pretty good between 23rd and 15th).
28
29
30 Small groups driving what we do
31 Quality and delivery of water is terrible, need more law enforcement personnel and more facilities for them, need a bigger and better animal shelter, quality and maintenance of roads are terrible, need more community facilities for indoor sports, need mor
32 The community remains focused on the individual driver of automobiles. Many close calls with drivers who just don't see walkers or bikers make me want to see enforcement of existing crosswalk laws and etc.
33 I'm afraid of letting residential developers gobble up land to build cheap housing. We should incentivize redevelopement in existing neighborhoods. Redbud lane area for example. This area seriously needs some attention.
34
35
36 another grocery store on the east side of town
37 The police state mentality, the big government mentality, the LPRs and other warrantless invasions on ordinary citizens
38 I'd like some doctors to move back toward downtown. Why do they all have to be on Wakarusa?
39 I don't like the plethora of unhealthy restaurants--there are more going up all the time.
40
41 Sprawl! Westside of Lawrence is pretty awful.
42
43 Government decision making is pathetic. A handful of developers and Chamber-types run rough shod over common sense. City staff and elected officials seem incapable of gathering data, expert opinion, and then analyzing options, before acting.
44
45 too much traffic. Bring on the SLT and don't have any stoplights on it. People will stop; we don't have to force them.
46 development community domination of planning process.
47
48 Ignoring land-use plans
49 Another movie theater (cheap movies), less sports bars, a Costco, better paying jobs.
50
51
52 More cooperation between city and county and between Lawrence and Lecompton, Baldwin City, and Eudora.
53

54 I'd like to see us consider a different political process in which we have a consistent mayor rather than a revolving door
55 Development of northwest Lawrence
56
57 Disoraganized road construction projects....
58 I don't like the constant handouts to the already wealthy developers. Businesses should shoulder their own risk, stop socializing the risk while privitizing the reward.
59
60 Stop giving away tax breaks to the Fritzels & Comptons & etc.
61
62
63 Developers make ugly neighborhoods. Developers are making downtown more ugly.
64 Too much expansion - stop doing it
65 The sidewalks are pathetic, we must improve them. Traffic intersections dangerous for pedestrians and bike riders.
66
67
68
69
70
71
72 Too many tax incentives for big developers without requiring something in return
73
74
75 I have never understood why we pay our school teachers less than they do in the surrounding towns and areas, e.g. Blue Valley Schools. Raise teacher pay. WE lose good teachers because of low pay, and quality education is essential to a town.
76 Yes, development of prime agricultural property for industrial and/or retail or uses other than agriculture.
77
78
79 Most of the sprawl west of Kasold is the same old humdrum development that you can see in Anywhere USA. Get back to square blocks with alleys.
80 New unneeded subdivisions and commercial centers that sap the economic vitality out of older neighborhoods and commercial districts.
81 Bad sidewalks and streets in some neighborhoods....seems like East and North Lawrence never get repaired.
82 Although I like the fact that we have a hazardous household waste center, I wish we didn't have to call ahead and make an appointment. I wish we could just come during hours of operation and drop our stuff off.
83
84
85
86
87 Property taxes are out of control
88 I hate roundabouts!
89
90

91 Negativism by some citizens at public meetings or in media
92 Slightly off subject but really not - get rid of our poor, regressive, anti-KU, State Governor.
93
94 Low wages
95 Over building
96 The restrictive ideas about where art should and should not be and what is or is not art.
97
98 Ugly businesses, like some of those on South Iowa (Payless Furniture) that pull our community down while not contributing anything. Walkable sidewalks everywhere!
99
100 Stop building unnecessary huge buildings downtown. Stop allowing so many track homes and large apartment complexes to be built in West Lawrence. More varied types of housing.
101
102 I'm concerned about growing blight and crime. Lawrence is not as safe as it was.
103
104 destroying the wetlands
105
106 Maybe too much growth too fast to the west. Too car-dependent. Also a school system that loses its best teachers due to low pay.
107 Rampant commercial development, including housing
108
109
110
111 Less reliance on developers to determine the landscape of the area
112
113
114 city often appears to be favoring certain builders; monthly utilities rates increase; influence of trends instead of what may be the best solutions to issues or concerns
115
116 get off that sports are the end all and be all for anybody who lives here.
117 The way that a few people own so many properties, rent them out and then don't keep them up and the way that a few companies keep getting all the new construction bids.
118 I really hate that we lost the Wetlands.
119 More even distribution of basic shopping & other necessities (gas, groceries, etc)
120
121
122 There should be a walkway/pedestrian mall along the south side of the river
123 23rd street needs to diversify to allow both commercial and green spaces. the same with Iowa. I would love to see a Walmart next to a park not next to a Target, Best Buy, and Home Depot. Less cement and more green space.
124
125 Poor sidewalks
126
127
128 not sure
129
130 Bike hostile areas.
131

132 I hate multifamily, poorly built apartment complexes without yards. I want to see more affordable single family houses with yard.
133
134 Try to save trees and wildlife as we move forward
135
136 jos, and crime
137 The use of glyphosate and 2,4-D herbicides; the current and future development in the wetlands; no grocery store in East/North Lawrence.
138
139 I would love for the city to follow city guidelines and codes and have fewer variances and exceptions to them. Say "no" more often.
140
141
142 More safe pedestrian and bike through-ways and more recycling access of more items (though curbside in October is a big step, thank you!)
143 Mood swings between business and residential.
144
145 The iron-fisted control developers, landlords, and non-resident property owners have over the City Commission
146 insufficient news coverage in print/TV, etc...need community radio
147 Bland, generic, corporate, thoughtless architecture that detracts from our community, making us look just like everywhere else in Topeka/KC
148 SLT destruction of Wakarusa wetlands (done deal). Rock Chalk Park and other west Lawrence developments may create yet another stormwater disaster of Yankee Creek watershed unless mitigated in advance..
149
150
151
152
153 Too much ownership/control by one developer.
154
155
156
157 I think the Environmental Chapter in Horizon 2020 is an over-reach of government's authority.
158
159
160 Pan handlers and dead beats downtown. Yard sprilklers watering the street.
161 We need more strong leaders with a vision of a vibrant, healthy economy. We spend too much time debating the protection of our current treasures, and not enough building future ones.
162 We need more trees along busy streets like 6th, 23rd, & Iowa.
163 suburban development west
164 better access to the river, more connected trails along and over the river, more development along the river.
165
166 I don't like that there are residences for rent that are unsafe for habitation.
167 There are parts of our community that look blighted. Let's clean up 23rd St, and keep the medians and parks and other public areas mowed, let's encourage residents to take care of their properties, and let's enhance the entrances to our town.

168 23rd Street between Iowa and Mass is an eye sore and needs overall planning and re-development
169 We are ruled by an excess of academic diarreha
170 Lack of career opportunities.
171
172
173
174 I would like to see more turnover in the management of City/County government. Change is a healthy thing. We bring too many people up from the ranks and don't bring new ideas (ie current city mgr)
175 I don't like seeing pan handlers on streets who ask for charity.
176 Require apartment buildings and other multi-unit housing to provide on-site recycling bins as well as the standard dumpsters.
177
178
179
180
181
182 n/a
183 Get a new city manager that is professionally trained in city management and a political hack
184 Too much special interest to specific neighbornoods, i.e. Old Lawrence, East Lawrence district.
185
186
187 less government rules
188
189
190
191 Funds going to developers rather than artists and others who are making our community better and more attractive through culture and art.
192
193
194
195 The bike lanes end abruptly in many places and need to be extended properly.
196
197 City bus system, less apartments, street quality
198 Most of the development in western Lawrence, all of the soulless big box development along Iowa, 6th Street, and 23rd Street.
199
200
201 Traffic planning seems bizarre. Tired of fighting for every little thing in regard to pedestrians, and the construction this year is very poorly planned.
202 Environmentally sensitive lands regulation is over-burdensome.
203
204 new downtown construction does not blend with existing downtown. buildings too tall. adds more issues to solar energy usage (but i am keeping my tall trees)
205 Big development close to downtown
206 I need more time to think.
207 more inclusive of lower in come

208 Putting money into things that are used only by a small number of wealthy residents --- focus on things that will improve the are for more/all residents
209 Some of the commercial stretches are both ugly and hard to navigate, particularly 23rd street and the east part of 6th.
210 Local entities are convinced that it is critical to "foster" eco-devo. The role of the city/county should be to provide appropriate infrastrucure and a manageable tax burden - not pick winners and losers.
211 Commercialism, sprawl, profit being valued above people and the environment.
212
213 Electrical substation at waterfront should be moved.
214 Lack of affordable houseing and efficient and durable transitional housing. Local elected government officials who give support to developers who have little interest/regard for the unique/rich history and character of Lawrence.
215 if you drive a car often it is not the easiest to get across town.
216
217 The concentration of retail stores and large, boring areas with huge parking lots. This invites driving miles for every need.
218
219
220 Stop prioritzing high-volume car traffic in road construction. If you build it, they will fill it up. We're adding lanes this year and will have to again in 5 years unless some pretty radical city planning changes occur. There's only so much space.
221
222
223
224 modern architecture=option to vote on design of new public buildings ie: new library....
225 Sprawl. Excessive building of apartments. Lack of concern for infrastructure of older parts of the city (sidewalks, streets).
226
227
228 The need for the city commission to follow the plan. Listen to the community and no be so connected to developers and special interests such as contractors, profit-oriented groups.
229 The way Lawrence spends $. I feel like the town builds because it can because there is apparently extra $. I would like to see less new construction and more make what already exists better
230 Growing importance of money in politics - too much deferrence to developers
231 Insufficient nursing home beds for the needs of Lawrence, which will increase as the population ages and the city attracts retirees.
232
233 They city takes too much time getting new businesses open. There are too many delays. This should not be happening!
234 We need less expensive housing that doesn't all cater to students.
235 Too much government now
236 The struggle between motorists and cyclists on HWY 1055
237 the bike lanes on Louisiana needs remarking with the bicyclist going contra flow, cut the trees hanging over the path
238
239 Too much traffic congestion.

240 Lack of marked parking spaces on my street (Ohio St. in Oread neighborhood)
241 Don't like the idea that growth is not important. i've come here so we should help sustain Lawrence so the next group can move here!
242 23rd street and 6th street. Ugly and not "user friendly". Would like Tenn or Ken to have no parking and have a clear and usible bike lane. We have the oportunity to make Lawrence a pedestrian friendly place and we have not done much to improve it.
243
244 There should be a better recycling program in town. There should be more street lights (especially for the student ghetto). I don't like having to drive 25-30 miles to go to a mall. A mall would be useful.
245 N/A
246
247 Better use of public transportation
248 grocery stores in/near comunities so more accessable to all
249 Collaboration of individuals w/ diverse perspective to find common goals/values
250 Tendency towards sprawl is not pastural.
251 Less focus on agriculture and natural resources
252 Do not like deterioration of older areas of city
253 dry-vit
254
255 Gateways into our city. Need improvement to future "Lawrence" character. Public should have "ah ha" I'm in Lawrence when drive into any gateway.
256 Fewer box stores, less apartments, less commuters
257 The disconnective nature of west Lawrence to east Lawrence
258 A little less concrete downtown - more green space
259 We are letting large developers walk all over us, giving them tax breaks and other incentives and getting little or nothing in return
260 Some intersections are dangerous and I hate trying to turn left with no turn arrow (Iowa/19th heading east on 19th turning left onto Iowa) and Iowa/Bob Billings heading west on Bob Billings heading west on Bob turning left on Iowa)
261 Dangerous roads like S. Lawrence Trafficway
262 Increase connectivity
263 The resistance to change and economic growth. The legislators, the Kansas "budget".
264 Sprawl. Growth doesn't need to be horizontal
265 I don't like the suburbian sprawl
266
267
268
269 I feel there is an attitude in Lawrence that only the interests of the City of Lawrence matter, not the whole county!
270 All the building towards Clinton Lake!
271 sprawl, destruction of the wetlands
272 This may not be a planning item, but few of the people I am aquanited with like the roundabouts
273
274 Better travel through Lawrence - SLT should help
275
276
277 I am very distrubed by how little the lcoal decision makers adhere to the plan and public input.

Rock Chalk Park should have gone to the public as a ballot measure.
278 Better traffic flow. Less cumbersome regulations for land use
279 More transparency. More commitment on basic services, utilities, fire/police, etc.
280 the eyesore of the missle in Centennial Park
281 strongy wish Rock Chalk Park had never happened - but too late to change that - less pandering to lying, greedy developers. I don't like the riverfront is ignored.
282 Long term plans seem to work until a deverloper wants an execption. We (rep the City Commission) should respect the plans more.
283
284 stricter controls on deverlopers. Lawrnece Police and Sheriff should be merged
285
286 I dont want to see a stream of cars leaving Lawrence every morning for workand shopping in KC and Topeka. We need to stop the "BEDROOM" community syndrome.
287 More pedestrian Downtown, fewer turn in's off 23rd St
288 Ugly apartment buildings filling whole "neighborhoods". I know we need places for people to live, but why can't the developers put in a little effort at quality and character.
289 zoning changes that permit thigns that don't fit
290 Economic Development going completely to real estate and not diversified
291 Stop Building and widening roads - it increases speed of cars and impairs saftey
292 Fast Drivers!
293
294 The politics - its all over town. So are hidden agendas - the walls need to come down.
295 Loarge commercial developments are not necessary. People do not live in Lawrence for it's convenience or big-box shopping opportunities
296
297 less gentrification that not all residents can afford. More emphasis on affordable hsouing. more enterprenueal approval and encouragement of local business that cultivates Lawrence such as good wages like Freestate Holdings
298 We need to increase the level of pay and less communting to other cities
299 no more tall buildings downtown
300
301
302 Watkins and Carnegie aren't strong enough to garner widespread interest (weak tourism features)
303 Sprawl - especially on south Iowa and west 6th St
304 no solution, but the panhandlers scare visitors to our city
305
306
307 See above
308 - separation between east and west Lawrence. -support for mental health/housing
309 Let's make Lawrence the place we would be proudest of... reasonable wage job opportunities, safe, affordable housing in vibrant neighborhoods, innovative business, active arts and culture scene. No one would want to leave.
310 Roads to wide to walk across, sprawl style development
311 Door downtown that seniors could get into.
312 More focus on ped/bike accessibility, increased focus on repairing and maintaining E Lawrence, allow more bars/non-food places on Mass, rezoning school district boundaries in a more sensible fashion.

313 Slow down the urge to build up downtown with high rises.
314 willingness to let developers drive the train at the expense of the environment.
315
316
317 Suburban "Anytown, USA" feel
318 I am not opposed to grwoth, just thoughtless growth. We shouldn't let developers determine what Lawrence looks like.
319
320 Overall, I'm pretty happy and glad I live here.
321 Developers own the city council, usually. Stop giving abatements to big corporations (walmart) that don't provide a living wage, change city council to a proportional democracy.
322
323 Building of sterile neighborhoods on the west side that have no character
324 Concrete and western expansion.
325
326
327
328 lower speed limits in residential areas 5 - 10 mph
329 Squandering and destruction of ecosystems such as the Wakarusa Wetlands.
330
331 Faster work done on street repair and construction. Work should be completed in days and at most week and never months.
332
333 Less territorialism. More collaboration
334
335 Ugly (and mostly empty?) apartments, continued growth outward, and not very interesting or local growth inside the city (Marriott)
336 I'd like to see increased walkability and bike-ability.
337 High percentage of teenage/college drinking
338 The way developers are sometimes allowed to change the plan/zoning for an area.
339 The apartment complexes out west (massive and not attractive), lack of street connectivity, very few parks out west
340 ensuring major avenues (31st, 23rd/Clinton, Bob Billings, 6th, Iowa, KY, TN) support the move through city traffic, while other streets are more people friendly.
341
342
343 Get a handle on sprawl and unnecessary retail and grocery development and redundancy!! Do we need six grocery stores within two miles of one another really?
344 Developers in the pocket of KU and vice versa. Projects need to be properly vetted and go through proper approval processes
345 I don't like that people do not fully appreciate the wealth of knowledge and opportunity provided by academics at KU. I would like to see the city explore business and industrial opportunities with KU to develop "green" businesses based on research @ KU.
346 I don't like the current way Lawrence is growing (ie strip malls, low density). There has also been no thought in all the developments that are being built.
347
348 We need to support better community dialogue and help people be a more integral part of decisionmaking. I understand the challenges with this. More careful planning and strictures on

	development that are carried through. Example: Rock Chalk sports complex
349	
350	N/A
351	
352	I would never have voted for Rock Chalk Park and think that it is reprehensible to accept only one bidder. Big downtown structures are also offensive. I would not want another mall with big, out of town stories
353	Build on the planning process we have; involve the development community so they see the value of conservation; involve the conservation folks so they can see the importance of integrating development in conservation
354	The transformation toward Johnson County suburban development as the city streets west. This has to stop or Lawrence is finished
355	
356	better options for retail shopping / better transportation - thoroughfares through the city / more bike lanes / more parks - green space with trees and seating areas / higher standards for architecture and landscaping - residential and commercial
357	Too many WalMarts
358	
359	
360	sprawl toward lake
361	Pandering to develoeprs. Increase minimum wage for service workers. Do not develop the prime farmland northwest of Lawrence.
362	Allow alternative, reasonable construction practices. Ensure high-quality architecture and public spaces
363	Am looking foward to the K-10 bypass
364	Fossil fuel based industrial growth economy
365	
366	Leadership that bases growth and development on sound planning principles and not cronyism and economic expedience.
367	Island annexing of land! You learned your lession. No island annexation!
368	
369	Would like more locally owned businesses & fewer big box chains & 23rd Street type development
370	Only that we tend to think small sometimes. It's time for us to recognize this is a place where people enjoy living, and more people will enjoy living here too. We will have the capacity and the capability to do big, amazing things and set examples for ot
371	Negative attitude towards growth. Tired of the use of offensive words like "sprawl". We need to embrace a diversity of housing and commercial options and not control development through once size fits all restrictions.
372	Negative attitude toward growth. Tired of the use of offensive words like "sprawl". We need to embrace a diversity of housing and commercial options and not control development through one size fits all restrictions.
373	Smugness, I am embarassed by the smugness about the coolness of Lawrence I hear everywhere.

31. Are there any other comments that you wish to be taken into consideration regarding the Comprehensive Plan Update Process?

1	

2 see above
3
4
5 Everywhere I go I run into KU grads who say they love Lawrence but they had to move away because of the lack of good paying professional jobs. Housing is expensive, and warehouse/industrial jobs will not pay the wages necessary to attract homebuyers to Lawrence.
6
7 Please fix the sidewalks in Monterey Estates. They are very dangerous and a liability to the city. My kids trip all of the time. They are sideways with many parts of the concrete elevated.
8
9
10 Don't let economic growth guide development.
11
12 No
13 I would like to see Lawrence dedicate itself to basic sustainability principles, thus removing the pressure of perpetual growth. Growth can occur in various dimensions economically. By this I mean prosperity can be defined in many ways– some not necessarily materialistic. Clean water will allow us to prosper, for example. Old Indian proverb: "Indian build small fire. Stay warm by sitting close. White man build large fire. Stay warm by cutting wood." In the end, it is all about the carbon.
14
15
16
17 I would like to see more efforts to combat the crime rate. Auto & home burglaries seem way up.
18
19
20
21 The current survey often asks for a 1-5 or A through F rating without any room for explanation to qualify your choice. This leaves too much room to misinterpret data. For example one can support the arts but not the cultural arts district as currently proposed.
22
23
24 I am very disappointed in the wording of some of the questions, which seem to be attempting to guide the participant towards a somewhat skewed view of growth and development. It is clear that the group that drafted the questions had a negative bias towards suburban development and vehicle-based commuting. I would only hope that this process is not being hijacked by a vocal minority to impose artificial restrictions on growth and development.
25
26
27 The city should look for additional resources from the state and government (and participate in initiatives) that build better communities. Social Services needs attention and full staffing/funding and better public school system (it is not that bad - but could be better).
28
29
30
31
32 This community is poised to capitalize on an aging Boomer population (the next one coming up is not small), but to do so there will have to be active engagement with what will attract these

folks, who will be much healthier and more active in every way than their parents were, and possibly also have more spending capability. They'll want lifelong learning, arts and culture, high quality yet inexpensive housing on one level without stairs, with wide enough doors. Such people could be a huge resource for the community in many ways, but public transportation and affordable quality housing are issues. The medical infrastructure is already in place, KU and Haskell are here to offer lifelong learning opportunities, the arts and culture options are growing and improving all the time. Provide the other two items and aging could become a growth industry for Douglas County.

33 Better bicycle facilities in the county. Wide shoulders, etc...

34

35

36 Keep accessibility in mind for housing, walking, transportation it does make a difference

37 I'd hate to see Turner Hall at Ninth and Rhode Island become condemned and destroyed. It's a grand old building, but the cost to maintain it has been too high for the current owner. I'd love to see it become what it was originally - think of it as another park if you will, or community center. There has to be a way, and it has to make economic sense. Think harder!

38 no

39

40

41 I have another home in another city where I plan to retire. The other city has a real aggressive plan to improve and in the plan it includes emphasis on non-automobile transportation, including a real emphasis on pedestrian access. This has been sorely lacking in Lawrence. It really gets old walking in the streets to get anywhere.

42

43 It does all seem a little futile. These plans are proposed and then the developers go to work making money by gaining exceptions to them.

44

45 i need to review the comprehensive plan before I can make any other comments.

46 Find ways to support participation by poor people and people with disabilities. Transparent procedures. Truly representative steering committee, not just the usual suspects. You need to address the strong distrust felt by people outside the development community. Nonrepeat players almost uniformly feel overpowered when they encounter the development juggernaut.

47 no

48 The plan is one thing... adhering to it is another

49 Nix the rental inspections!

50

51

52

53

54

55 Take care of our natural resources

56

57

58

59

60 Why? They're just going to be ignored like comments the citizens make at Lawrence city commission meetings

61

62 Community College Health and Well-Being Marijuana Research / Decriminalizing of Marijuana
63
64 Thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinions.
65 Please keep in mind that there are many people who walk in this city. They walk for a variety of reasons, enjoyment, economics, concern for the environment, and health. They need to feel safe when they venture out.
66
67 This survey was really, really open-ended. It's hard to tell if my comments are helpful or even on topic. I can't imagine that you'll be able to get much useful data out of this.
68
69
70
71
72 Lawrence needs to resist pressure to be "just like the rest of Kansas". We are different, and what makes us different is what makes many of us stay when frankly living in a less red state looks better and better all the time. If Kansas loses Lawrence, there may be no way to ever counter the destructive forces of ultra conservatism that are sweeping our state. Keep Lawrence Weird!
73
74
75 I have said it throughout, but why consider growth a good thing? We have limited space and natural resources. If you thought of a town as a space ship, you would focus on sustainability rather than growth and development.
76
77
78
79 I hope that the document improves, but am satisfied with the present document for the most part. I hope it actually guides our commissioners to develop our city and county in a sustainable way, and protects our Class 1 and 2 soils.
80 Representation on the steering committee is poor. Active organizations such as LAN and LWV are not represented while the real estate industry has multiple representatives. Efforts were taken to had a member to represent the health industry, but when LAN and LWV called for representation, it was rebuffed.
81
82 Thanks for giving me the opportunity to speak up about this plan.
83
84
85
86
87 City government has said that they want to attract seniors to retire in Lawrence. They also want to attract business to move to Lawrence/DG Cnty. Yet the property taxes in Lawrence continue to rise every year. Who wants to come to an area where costs are going out of control. If we want to fund new things and put them on the ballot, use sales taxes to do it, so that EVERYONE pays their share. That would make all people pause and think about approving things if they really have to pay for them. The streets and sidewalks and curbs in my neighborhood are a sorry excuse for a city. Yet this is the first place I have ever lived that did not fund these neighborhood improvements by using a benefit district to spread the cost to the people who use and benefit from the improvement. Funding it this way would let these repairs and improvements happen quicker and we would fairly share the costs.

88
89
90
91
92
93 As the footprint of Lawrence grows, it would be nice to make sure we have some large nature preserves.
94 Establish minimum wage and address the well being of low income workers who keep our city going. Negotiate low cost housing options with private real estate owners.
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102 I can see the city growing to the northwest. I think the eastern leg of the South Lawrence Trafficway will bring economic and residential development to the southeast, which will help East Lawrence economically. I'd like to see North Lawrence become more economically stable and attractive for residential growth. For the last 20 years I have had to commute out of the city to maintain the level of income I had before I moved here. This factor reduces Lawrence/Douglas County's attractiveness for new residents, and can be overcome by attracting major employers who want a workable transportation system, educated workforce, progressive business climate, and favorable economic and regulatory environment.
103
104
105
106 I am thrilled that there will be increased inspection of rental units. I hope that codes are enforced.
107 Call upon people from the Extension Office, the public places, like the library, to get their input
108
109
110 There is an anger happening with the longtime residents as we watch the governing groups of Lawrence provide unnecessary perks for a few, and not for the majority.. For example, only a few will use a skate board park, and the Rock Chalk park is not open to all Lawrence citizens just for an elite few. The New library will enhance all of our lives and the new police headquarters is necessary.The kid gloves that the city is using with the Fritzell group is alarming and is the focus of Many,many informal conversations I have had. Would also like for the city to monitor the student ghetto areas of Kentucky St. And Tennessee St. There are beer bottles, trash houses left to rot. One last thing. North Lawrence needs it's own police station and fire department.
111 Please listen to all perspectives from all walks of life, not just those with financial incentives to the city.
112
113
114 To please take all age groups into the decision making; older adults need certain considerations as well as children but are often not in the discussion of how developments are laid-out, maintained or changed. The number of students at KU affects many aspects of the Lawrence community but should not dominate the decisions. Relations have definitely improved but the

city and county should work more closely in decisions as each effects the other but often it seems that Lawrence is the only town in the county and dominates the image of the area. Yes, it's the largest but should not dominate the county.

115

116

117 No

118 We need to think about the things that set us apart from other towns. Our art scene immediately comes to mind. If we place an emphasis on environment and sustainable growth (as opposed to short-term profits), on community gardens and alternative energy, that would make us unique from other Kansas towns (and much of the US, as well). If we consider 100-200 years into the future, then we will be doing our grandchildren and great-grandchildren a favor.

119 Please think carefully about the logistics of multiple projects. The current array of road construction makes it nearly impossible to get from one end of town to the other in a remotely timely fashion. everything is closed at once. There has got to be a better way to get all this work done.

120

121

122 There needs to be more thought to promoting safe walking/biking routes to schools and throughout the community.

123 Neighborhood groceries, shops, services amid residential and green spaces. Places where people can walk to do their shopping and feel safe walking down their streets. Phase out big mega stores and concentrate on local, small, friendly, sustainable, and community-based development.

124

125 The Community Health Assessment conducted by the Lawrence-Douglas County Health Department obtained input from more than 1500 community members, and key issues/ priorities included: -Access to healthy, affordable food -Physical activity -Poverty/ jobs -Access to mental health services -Access to health services More information can be found online here: http://ldchealth.org/information/about-the-community/community-health-improvement-plan/ and http://ldchealth.org/download/Information/About%20The%20Community/Community%20Health%20Improvement%20Plan/Community%20health%20assessment%202012%20for%20printing.pdf Thanks!

126

127

128 no

129

130 Please, no luxury hotels at Clinton Lake.

131

132 The traffic crossing lights do not stay lit enough for a handicapped person to safely cross the street. Also, the cracked sidewalks in the community discourage people from getting out and being active. This would help people of all ages participate fully in the community.

133

134 I understand that things change but please remember that mother nature is our friend. If we are going to destroy it we should think about this and the impact it has on the wildlife. I understand that humans have the right to consume everything with no thought but we are just passing by on this earth, let's make sure there is something for our children and their children besides concrete!

135

136
137 Address food deserts in Lawrence. Locate grocery stores in North Lawrence and East Lawrence
138
139 Use established US facts on the benefit of tax abatements and other tax breaks to private development. We have many research departments available at KU....use them.
140
141
142 Pay attention to the unique character and history of our town. Say NO to developers who just want to turn fields into new housing for students. Increase the quality of construction and management of student-aimed housing so they don't fall to pieces in five or ten years. Invest in older neighborhoods to draw families and students back to housing stock there. Increase walkability and bikeability of our community so people who choose to bike or walk CAN easily reach commerce areas for groceries and other sundries. Consider continuing to improve mass transport so it is a viable option for commuters. Protect our natural resources, including agricultural, so we DO have a sustainable future as a community.
143 The update process should have started with a vision, mission, and goals developed by the community. Development should follow our vision, not the other way around.
144
145 The City of Lawrence needs to be dedicated to keeping neighborhoods from becoming slums through the uncontrolled avarice of landlords, non-resident owners, and the acts of feral student/tenants and others. This means an active and vibrant Code Enforcement staff who travel throughout the community to identify violations and proceed to remedy them.
146 Douglas County and Lawrence have the tremendous possibility of KU and HINU and Baker being of more support in very practical ways of improving living in the region. There is a need to seriously address the preservation of the ecosystem, etc. in county and to advocate such in policy at city, county and state.
147
148 We need to work proactively to combat human-made climate change (droughts, floods, tornadoes?) by persuading local utility monopolies to practice social responsibility for long-term human health. Investigate escalating EMF radiation from "smart" utility meters, cell towers, etc. (see emfsafetynetwork.org). Tax local corporations higher than residential property owners and very small businesses to maintain and sustain infrastructures, public health, and schools. Do not assume drastically increasing population growth and plan instead for relatively stable population base.
149
150
151
152
153 I appreciate making this survey open through the internet in addition to public meetings.
154
155
156
157 Horizon 2020 has been continually updated over it's life. As a result, it is kept somewhat updated already. I think the emphasis of the Update Process should be to reduce burdensome regulations and focus on streamlining ORDERLY growth. We ARE GOING TO GROW. Let's plan for it instead of assuming the update process is for the purposes of ADDING regulations that limit growth.
158

159
160 It should not favor one side or the other. We need new development, but it should be smart growth that allows/encourages infill development. More dense developments utilize the infrastructure better. The not in my backyarders need to be told no, this is the way we want to develop. Just because a new resident says there is too much traffic on her street doesn't mean we should not let a good development with good tax dollars slip away. There needs to be a mix of housing types in all sections of town. You can bus the service personel over to the west side. A larger sidewalk (say 20%) on both sides of the street should be allowed to be built after the improvements/structure are made. A larger sidewalk than what would normally be required. Less chance of it cracking.
161 I believe that it is important to have consistently applied standards and laws, but that private property rights and entrepreneurship should be at the core of our community. Lawrence has a look and feel which wise developers will to continue to respect, reflect and use to promote their projects, but ultimately it must be left up to those who are taking the risks and putting up the capital to make the right decisions.
162
163
164 an economic development strategy focused on turning DougCo and Lawrence into a retirement community is short-sighted. making our county better for retirees should be only one piece of a broader strategy. other aspects can build on existing community assets - like research capacity at KU, unique soils and agricultural niches, natural resource beauty, proximity to larger urban areas (KC, Omaha) and a long-standing reputation and commitment to arts and artists - to attract more young professionals.
165
166 Unsure
167 Please help make our community sustainable. We cannot continue to increase sales taxes and property taxes to carry the services that we have and need. What we need is more growth, and the right kinds of it, to carry this burdon!
168 Lawrence has the opportunity to not only be the leading city in the State of Kansas but also one of the top 50 small towns in America for culture, diversity and overall live-a-bility. We must protect our history and our values but, at the same time develop our outer periphery so that the community becomes more affordable and the tax burden shifts from the individual to the industrial base. We also must recruit business to relocate here to increase the number of higher paying jobs in our community.
169
170
171 Get a central location for law/court/jail facility.
172
173
174
175 I am very excited to see Kansas City developing Fiber Optic infrastructure through Google fiber. I would like Lawrence to jump onto the High Speed internet bandwagon. I fully support Wicked Fiber and wish they continue to grow as a company.
176
177
178 there needs to be discussion / planning around creating more entry level homes and reduce the number of apartments.
179

180 I am not a fan of the statute regarding trailers, cars, campers, and boats needing to be parked on improved surfaces on one's property. I understand you cannot have a property turned into a junk yard, but of the yard is well maintained, I see no harm. I guess I am frustrated that I see people getting away with it all over town, yet I happen to live by someone who has reported me to the city for this 'violation'. It's like, I can park a trailer in my yard for months on end, as long as I live in the 'right' neighborhood. I would just like the wording changed so that as long as the area around the object is well kept, it's fine to have a trailer in your yard.

181

182 no

183

184 Put together a 'bucket list' and it's priorities and take into consideration the overall impact of real estate tax increases, as well as other taxes.

185

186 I question whether it will really impact any decisions

187 The comprehensive plan is a guide and should be used as that. It should not have to updated each time someone has a better concept that the plan shows. This is a huge waste of time and resource to update the plan each time.

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195 Please consider ways that Lawrence could be more progressive towards companion animals. This includes more financial support for Lawrence Humane Society and a new, larger, more centrally located shelter, as well as a community-wide feral cat trap-neuter-return program that will humanly manage feral cat colonies in this county (see publications by Dr. Julie Levy at the University of Florida Veterinary School and the Operation Catnip program model of Alachua County, FL). Lawrence is progressive in many ways, but it pales in comparison to nearby Kansas City MO in regards to progressive programs for community cats and No Kill shelters for homeless pets. Thank you for your consideration.

196

197

198

199 I would like to see a conversation about the county-city both funding the public library in the future.

200

201

202 Do not attempt to redraw the map on nodal and area plans. Integrate into new plan only. Do not over emphasize arts and culture, just enforce the laws on the books today. Industrial design guidelines are a negative to new companies, in certain instances. Emphasize job creation and planned growth.

203

204 streets. bike paths, sidewalks that one doesn't trip on in the dark. sidewalks need to be level and enough street lights so one does not fall. alleys are a mess

205 Please try and keep East Lawrence a neighborhood for the families that have chosen to live there and raise their families,and grow old and not an extension of Downtown and a fun zone for the

art center and big developers.....

206
207
208
209 It would be nice to see a followup survey with questions about specific proposals under consideration.
210 We need to be honest and determine whether this Plan is an actual guideline or just a document. Obviously no Plan can cover every circumstance faced by the city/county in the next couple decades. Continuous improvement should always be an option. However, if we continue to create exceptions to the Plan it serves no useful purpose and we should not invest time pretending that we are creating a useful Plan.
211 The west side of Lawrence looks like Johnson County. I have no reason to go to that side of town and that makes me sad because I want to love every part of this city.
212
213
214 The community would appreciate a commitment with affordable/transitional housing and great regard for Lawrence in regard to escalating gentrification
215
216
217 I would want public hearings where the results of these surveys were presented and the issues defined. On questions where 1-5 answers were asked, I wanted opportunity to explain using 2, 3 & 4 as responses.
218
219
220 Encourage intermodality! Build park and ride lots for bus commuters. No more giant warehouse stores. A municipal minimum (living) wage. Improve services for the homeless--get them health care (medical and mental), get them jobs, get them homes. No more gigantic tax breaks for gigantic developers--give them to the little guys, instead.
221
222
223
224
225 Efforts should be made to gather diverse opinions--perhaps random questionnaires at places like schools, grocery stores, doctors offices. They should not be too lengthy--perhaps focussing on only one topic at a time. I suspect the people who bother to respond to this survey will not be an averagely diverse group.
226
227
228 Also, Lawrence needs moderate and lower cost housing
229 I would like to see transportation access through busing to Lecompton without new industrial or housing growth in this area. Lecompton is a unique community without much crime or drama - and I would like it to stay that way.
230 There should be stricter enforcement of Zoning & Codes with real penalties for violators.
231
232
233
234 Please, please, please take the need for affordable housing seriously. Also, is there more we could do to support social services? Also, is there a way we could support a year-round farmer's

market on a larger scale than the one at Cottin's Hardware?
235 More consideration to private ownership rights. Less to big gvt like zoning office -urban growth area
236 I would love to see a sidewalk/bike path connecting Baldwin City to Douglas County Lake. This would enhance the living experience in and around the community.
237
238
239
240 Continue to pursue green energy technology where it is feasible.
241 it is bold for an average citizen to know what this is about and to know what to comment on. it might be easier to comment on specific ideas rather than think of new ideas. Somehow balance those that don't want sprawl, with those that oppose infill development.
242 Write a smart plan and stick to it.
243
244
245 N/A
246 Please include bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in site design
247 Large events and venues generating a crowd should be accessed by public transportation // example - the Douglas County Fair- people could pack downtown and take the "T" bus to the fair
248 No
249 These types of structured events on an ongoing to receive input from the community and help w/ future development beyond this review period.
250 More focus on North Lawrence and waterways. Walkability (per downtown) expanded.
251
252
253
254 I really appreciate and enjoy the view of the city when approaching from the South (US 59) or East (10/70). Gateways to the city are important. Skylines are important.
255 Perhaps make a suggestion to developers that they contact the community to show an interest in Lawrence/Douglas County as well as making an investment in our community.
256
257
258 Hang in there - KDOT stopped the Burroughs Trail - but we can do on our - connect north and east Lawrence to the downtown area
259
260
261 Fix your website to allow completing survey online - I was unable to do this online because after filling out the first page it didn't accept my answers it said I had done it before but I had not yet.
262
263
264
265 As an active cyclist it is dangerous and scary on the roads. Increasing bike lanes and making sure they are visible. Some lanes the lines are barely visible even on a bike. the bicycle connecting to North Lawrence cyclists are forced to the sidewalk which is not meant to be multi-use. So more consideration to cyclists.
266
267 Affordable housing for all Small business incentives to encourage neighborhood shops
268 What will it cost us as people

269
270 This survey is excessively long please shorten it in the future. I am unfamiliar with Horizon 2020 and no effort was taken to educate me on its goals. It would have been nice to know the city's plans instead of being asked my opinion on something I don't know about.
271
272 I feel the area along the farmers turnpike is a prime location for industrial development. I do feel the area further north of the turnpike is a unique pristine area that I hope can be preserved
273
274
275
276
277 Do not create a cookie-cutter plan. Traditional chapters ignore crossover concepts, such as interaction between transportation and ecological systems or the impact on transportation systems of putting the homeless shelter outside of downtown. If an issue is important to Douglas County give the issue its own chapter and explore all facets of the issue, including housing, transportation, economic development, ecology and so forth.
278
279 Mandatory updating every 7-10 years.
280
281
282 Developing in a way that enhances energy efficiency is a must. Avoid destruction of prime agricultural land.
283
284 We must insure future water supplies, even if it retards growth
285
286 This plan should allow land use category flexibility in order to take advantage of the capital outlay for the expansion of Hwy 59, the South Lawrence Trafficway and expansion of the sewer treatment system. The opportunity to attract diverse commercial, manufacturing, and technological development should be sold by civic leaders and staff to help pay for this infrastructure.
287
288
289
290 Projects reworking older neighborhoods and buildings like Pohler lofts are better than new, urban sprawl. They make Lawrence unique
291 The process thus far seems flawed - ALL public comments/submitted should be received and made part of public record. Taskforce appointees represent a bias towards development.
292 Establishment of "Areas of Change" and "Areas of Sustainability" so development is predictable; dense, diverse, sustainable and protective of historic structures, limit development on the fringes
293 Please keep community informed as decisions are made and have open forums like today for input to help guide and direct the committee.
294 There are some people in Lawrence that want it to remain the same - they need to realize it's just not going to happen - it's similar to the human body, it doesn't stay the same either.
295 Growth is going to happen. However, growth simply for the sake of growth is not appropriate for Lawrence. It must be carefully considered and always taken in context with what our community is about. A few steps down that slippery slope and there is no turning back. Let the big companies and stores stay in JoCo and Topeka - we will gladly drive to them if needed in order to keep our lovely Lawrence character.

296 Thank you for making this an open process!!!
297 The diversity between per capita income and cost of living is really limited growth. Diversity of neighborhoods, retail jobs and especially affordable housing types could aid that
298 More bike trails & paths
299 Our historic core is our best and most affordable housing stock. Take care not to destroy it through gentrification
300 Bike paths that go through neighborhoods Change the name of William Burroughs Trail. That dude was a creep.
301
302 1. Consider in your display/boards articulating the profoundly negative implications of not having a comp plan. 2. Consider articulating 2 or 3 of the most problematic aspects of the previous plan 3. Consider expanding the "About the update process" board statement, paragraph 3, "there is opportunity to confirm certain concepts.." in other words, for example.
303 Housing options for low income residents
304
305
306
307 Again - emphasizing affordable housing. We need local and proactive attention for the future of the economic, social and environmental welfare for all of Lawrence, KS
308
309
310 -Bike/ped wise Columbia, MO is making strides as are even many communities in Kansas and other communities in the midwest. Boise, Idaho, Sacramento, CA and many other communities are making strides, communities I like - Madison, Boulder, Portland, Fort Collins is okay.
311
312 Stay green, folks! At all costs, avoud overcrowding retail like OP! Think like a bicyclist
313 I reside outside N Lawrence and was involved a bit with development- Ch 7 revisions, and development of the NW sector plan. I believe the limitations for commercial/industrial development should be maintained and the protection of the class I & II soils should continue.
314 Include a "no basis to rate" response for the forced-choice questions or allow me to leave them blank. Forcing me to make a decision on something I've never experienced is not good research. Offer the meetings on line in real time, not everyone can get back into town for the meetings and not everyone has (or wants) WOW. Along with the real time streaming, allow real-time interaction via webcam.
315
316
317
318
319
320 Perhaps ask/give neighborhood groups and organizations this info - ask them to rate (or rank) what is important to them. We are NOT taking advantage of a great natural resource - our river. San Antonio for example.
321 Promote hiking, camping, bicycle camping. NO development on class 1 & 2 soils. This whole survey is based on the assumption that the city will, and needs to grow. I don't believe that growth is in the best interest of the city. If we plan for growth when do we say stop. Maybe there should be an absolute threshold that we can't grow beyond. URBAN sprawl an MEGA-citys are a sustainability nightmare. Developers will not get rich with a zero growth economy. But we might all be happier and able to survive in an age of climate catastrophe.

322 Continue research & planning on the development of residential and limited commercial developments around the North 2nd Street corridor, especially around Johnny's Tavern and along the river - could continue residential, recreational and commercial somewhat like the San Antonio Riverwalk. Let's be forward thinking.
323
324 Flooding considerations; community tornado shelter education.
325
326
327
328
329 I appreciate the transparent process. City of Lawrence staff do excellent jobs informing the public of meetings, information, and services available, as well as managing and running those programs.
330
331
332
333 Would like to see a broad-based, comprehensive community visioning process focused on a multitude of issues. I think there are other areas of community development that affect our comprehensive planning that should be part of that process.
334
335 Attracting outside business is not the answer and has been proven to not increase jobs long-term. Focus on nurturing local business and prioritizing sustainability and preservation of natural resources.
336
337 Continued diligence to make it easy and positive to get information: websites, social media, public forums
338 No opinion.
339 Would like more in-depth discussion on key issues and trade-offs re:density. Especially in terms of quality of daily life!
340 Obviously, everything's a balance, but growth for growths sake will cause more headaches and could undermine what makes the area special. If keeping Lawrence unique and a desirable place to live (not just sleep before going to KC or Topeka) is the end goal, planning should support that and find ways to plan and encourage growth that don't disrupt that.
341
342
343 Please, look beyond the next 20 years in terms of preserving our soil, our water, air, natural areas. This is what will sustain us and make all the other wonderful things Lawrence has to offer possible.
344 It is somewhat incomprehensible to understand why this process is even necessary. Members of the community and city commissions spent incredible amounts of time and energy to create a vision and plan for Lawrence. To dismantle this is an insult to their work. Horizon 2020 is a contract the city created for what they wanted to achieve in this time, and to dismantle this is basically a breach of said contract. It is improper for the city commissions to want to change the rules so that they can accommodate the wishes of developers and other interested parties. They should insist that development is made along the lines of H2020 and what the city has envisioned for itself. If changes are to be made, then this is the time to start working on the NEXT plan, starting in 2021 for the next 20 years, taking current ideas and population and citizens' input into consideration. Don't belittle all the work that came before, just because you don't agree with this

vision.

I will never understand how a city can have a theater (where people might want to go out to a nice dinner then the show) be surrounded by fast food restaurants and a car wash. It seems the city is just letting anything be built anywhere. Why are there not nicer restaurants, high density shopping, other cultural activities surrounding the theater. There needs to be more thought in where businesses are located.

Develop a cadre of mediators/facilitators that work with community groups to build better, more productive dialogue. Support all kinds of housing, including more transitional, etc.

I'm not sure that we need an expensive coordinator of the arts. We have lots of local talent.

I think it would be good to hire professional facilitators to help the various interests to agree as much as they can; learn about each other; and then fight over anything left unsolved. Don't fight over everything.

Who provides oversight if plan is not followed? A plan is only as good as who implements it or requires it be implemented.

I think Lawrence and Douglas County have a real opportunity to keep Lawrence growing and grow in a fashion and direction that keeps it's unique, local, identity alive and still allows for beautiful, thoughtful development and growth.

Look at the future - local food, high quality of life thru trails, green space, cultural opportunities - all of this attracts highly educated residents with discretionary income. Industry is important, yes, but how can we make sure those spaces are also attractive and don't gulp up prime farmland.

Urban design is important

Will this plan incorporate the K-10 bypass and the environmental protections of the wetlands?

Give transportation considerations much greater emphasis. Petroleum accounts for about half of US fossil fuel use. The vat majority of that is single-occupancy autos. Those are one of the largest contributors to greenhouse gases. Incorporate into the Comprehensive Plan all the recommendations from the Lawrence Peak Oil and the Lawrence Climate Plan.

Keep seeking input


Planners and elected officials should meet with neighborhood groups. KU officials and students should be included to hold them accountable for degrading the quality of life in neighborhoods.

It seems like the developers are in charge of the plan instead of the people of Lawrence. Now that the land institute has property in NW Douglas County you need to be very careful in deciding what should go in this area of the county. You cannot put heavy industrial parks in this part of the county or it will be detrimental to the surrounding area.

I'll keep thinking but I can offer some suggestions for reading :) Christopher Alexander's "A Pattern Language" Jan Gehl's "Cities for People"

372 I would just urge the steering committee to embrace diversity and free market dynamism in growth and development. Not every resident desires the same type of housing and retail options. Ultimately, local government should not control the type and amount of growth and development with arbitrary restrictions. Downtown must be revitalized and protected, but the important South Iowa retial corridor and the new areas around the Rock Chalk Park have the potential to create retail destinations that will attract residents form other communities and keep more residents shopping locally. Some residents want more dense housing options and many love traditional suburban development.

373 Please pay attention to the views of the League of Women Voters, They do the lard, boring work, non-partisan & are able to think long-term.



	33. Is there anything we could do to improve the open house meetings?
1	
2	stop presuming that you are the solution
3	
4	
5	More meetings
6	
7	

8
9
10 No
11
12 No
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Solicit actual oral comment in a town meeting setting
22
23
24 Survey could have been drafted without biased and leading questions.
25
26
27 shorter! I like the questions - but it took me 30+ minutes to complete.
28
29
30
31
32 Have been unable to attend one thus far, but do plan to.
33 Some Free State beer would be nice. Just one!
34
35
36
37 Sorry, I'm not qualified to answer.
38 make sure I hear about them... I don't get the paper, perhaps through neighborhood facebook pages?
39
40
41
42
43 Mandate public participation.
44
45 no comment
46
47
48
49 No
50
51
52
53
54 this is the first time I've seen it--you might try to leverage individuals to help promote responses

55
56
57 Shorter... Publicize
58
59
60
61
62
63 I do not know about these. Please advertise these prominently in the newspaper and in city emails.
64
65 Perhaps have more opportunities.
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75 ?
76 Some survey questions should have had a "don't know" response option
77
78
79 No
80 Assure people that there will be ample opportunity to have input. It is not clear from a set of boards that the issues such as growth management will be addressed.
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89 No
90
91
92 haven't been to one, yet.
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

101
102 I have not attended but will put the dates on my calendar.
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111 No
112
113
114
115
116
117 No
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132 The time and accessibility of the meeting places need to be imporved.
133
134 LISTEN
135
136
137 N/A
138
139 I appreciate the effort!
140
141
142 More opportunities to weigh in in this manner for those of us who are time and transportation limited.
143 More detailed coverage in the news. It's difficult for me to attend meetings. Maybe, televise discussions?
144
145 Include neighborhood concerns and issues in the comment and planning process.
146

147
148 For those who can't attend, I hope that notes from all respondents may be posted on respective websites.
149
150
151
152
153 No -- haven't been able to attend one.
154
155
156
157
158
159
160 I am afraid the open house meetings information will be graded as more important than the survey.
161
162 Make the presence more known via social media.
163
164
165
166 Do more to advertise them
167 I haven't been to one yet, hopefully I can make it soon!
168 Make sure everyone's voice is heard and encourage people to participate by using non-traditional means such as local digital and social media
169
170
171 Don't know never knew of meeting
172
173
174 It would be nice to be able to comment after every question. Most people won't but many of these questions have caveats to a simple numerical answer.
175 Please announce them in advance to media.
176
177
178 some of the questions are rather vague
179
180
181
182 locations that are easy to get to via bike
183 I hadn't heard a thing about the open house meetings until informed by a colleague.
184
185
186
187 Have not been to a open house meeting
188
189
190

191
192
193
194 have never attended
195 N/A
196
197
198 Better advertising.
199
200
201
202
203
204 have not attended
205 not sure
206 Provide more examples of other progressive communities, ways in which they have incorporated new ideas affecting quality of life for all.
207
208
209
210 Survey submitted online, but very much appreciate the open house opportunities.
211 Don't know.
212
213
214
215
216
217 Publicize them.
218
219
220
221
222 I'm new in town. Where do I find current philosophy and policies.
223
224
225 Advertise widely. Make more accessible.
226
227
228
229 Mail out the questionaire to residents, I'm sure everyone in town has an opinion but they are too busy or lazy ot unable to get around very well to come to an open house meeting
230
231
232 I would have liked to see a presentation where by the public could engage in conversation with a spokesperson and ask questions.
233 Make sure the dates and times are correct for the meetings! The website said 5-7 and its from 6-8.
234

235
236 All the materials and peoiple were great. More information/advertising leading to the event would be great.
237
238
239
240 Publicize them on public radio.
241 dissapointed in turnout - is it worth coming to read 4 poster boards?? What inspires the public to come?
242
243
244
245 Light music?
246
247
248 No
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256 Promote/advertise better!
257
258
259 They could go to places where people are already gathered - churches, downtown, events at parkts
260 Survey is long but I understand its importance. More interaction with people or board may be nice.
261 Announce there w/ everyone's water bill. Too few citizens knew about this at all
262
263
264
265
266 The overview was very general. More specific info or examples would have been helpful. I was expecting a presentation and then a conversation with participants.
267
268 It's fine
269 Figure out how to get more participation. Good luck!
270 Educate me on plans and current projects before seeking opinions.
271
272 I think its great you came to Lecompton
273
274
275
276
277 More analytical information would inform answers on this survey.

278 Low turnout. How to interpret some questions?
279
280
281
282 a small group discussion would have helped me hone my ideas
283
284 Have a welcome statement at the start of the meeting.
285
286 At the next meeting, provide update (handout) on any policy ideas that have been generated by this open house meeting and survey.
287 Too much paperwork!
288 There are great questions here. I would have liked an opportunity to speak with other citizens in a moderated way about them. If each steering committee memeber ran a small discussion group around each of the signs with questions and people rotated
289
290
291 Allow time for public to speak, record all commetns
292 This only touches on critial planning issues. "How important is sustainability?" really- Do you need to ask that question? I don't think so. What is the goal of this questionnaire? Can this limited exercise provide a starting point?
293 As things progress, committee members share verbally at a short summary
294 Haven't developed enough yet - I look forward to the presentations
295 More process information. more staff interaction.
296
297 Real Town Halls
298
299 If you use specific examples regarding industrial development questions, it might help to answer the quetsions
300
301
302 Take-away item...pen, or pencil or paperclip or something as a reminder to stay tuned and stay involved
303
304
305
306
307
308 better advertisement
309
310 More publicity it would be nice to reach more people
311 Talking to people.
312 Think @ having some tunes playing in the survey room
313 not at this time
314
315
316
317
318

319
320 Wider spaces on these lines - perhaps have the questions online or in the paper so can reflect on questions prior to meeting.
321
322 The questions on this survey could be published in advance of the actual meeting - in the LJW and on county and city websites; also posted in advance of the public library. That way the public could have a chance to consider how to express their wants, ne
323
324 I do not know.
325
326
327
328
329 Perhaps provide a bit of conversational orientation and introduction, rather than only items to be read.
330 Didn't know open house meetings even occured in this town. Tough when using the LJW as my only news source. Probably just didn't see the notices in the paper.
331 Have mini ipads to complete survey. All these surveys now have to be transferred into digitial form by city cost. Why not have us do the typing onto an ipad and have it be digitally entered by us.
332
333 We're missing a huge opportunity by not actually talking to people. While surveys are easy & quantifiable, you get much better info & build more trust into the process by engaging in dialogue with citizens. I didn't get any added value by coming to this.
334
335
336 A weekend meeting so more people can attend.
337 A graphic of current development and zoning
338
339 More info on the plusses and trade-offs for different developers and options in the community.
340
341
342
343
344
345
346 No
347
348 See above comment
349
350 Keep promoting them via all media channels including social media and postal mailers.
351
352 Publicize them more. I am not aware of these opportunities.
353 Not really. Enjoyed the snickers bar!
354 Additional background reference asnd how existing plan has been implemented or not.
355
356 N/A
357

358	
359	
360	
361	I apprecaite the opportunities. Later in evening would be helpful!
362	Make the survey available online in order to allow more time to consider answers to the questions
363	Play music - I would be less inclined to whisper. :-) Food would be a perk, but not essential.
364	
365	
366	Don't refer to them as "meetings." They are comment opportunities. "Meeting" implies and exchange of views.
367	Flexible times
368	
369	
370	
371	
372	This was great. Very comprehensive survey. Can't wait to see where the process goes and continue to provide input.
373	Chocolate was a great idea. It's always awkward for all concerned I think. Look for better models that are working in other communities.

	34. Do you have a suggestion for the new plan's name?
1	
2	Bucket o' Red Tape
3	
4	
5	the name is ok
6	Horizon Lawrence.
7	
8	
9	
10	No
11	
12	No
13	
14	
15	
16	The minority Plan
17	Lawrence Tomorrow
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	I like non jargony names. How about 2045 City/County Growth Plan?
24	Horizon 2050.
25	

26
27
28
29
30
31 Douglas County 2015
32 Just change the number, but review it a LOT more often. Things change annually, let alone over 10, 15, or 20 years.
33 Greening Lawrence 2040
34
35
36
37 Horizon 20/40 - not very original, but people would know what it was all about.
38 Sustainable Lawrence by 2030
39
40
41
42
43 "Yet Another Futile Effort To Rationalize Planning for the Future"
44
45 no
46
47
48
49 N/A
50
51
52 Plan 2040
53
54 no, but a focus group to brainstorm this might be a good idea
55 Protect resources
56
57 Oh geez if we don't come up with a clever name then you will hire a consultant for BIG bucks....ummmm Connect Lawrence
58
59
60 Meet the new boss, same as the old boss
61
62 Reaching Above Expectation
63
64 Quality over quantity
65 Into the future.
66
67
68
69
70
71

2020 Plan for a Sustainable Future

The Future Is Now
I am indifferent to the name; the content is what is important.

No

no

Horizon 2050 (This provides continuity while moving the focus into the future)

Lawrence in the 21st century

Lawrence/Douglas County 20 years from now....we did think about it in 2014....
Organic Lawrence:People for Lawrence

Jayhawk Nation

No

Lawrnece Area Wellness Revitalization Encouragement and New Community Enterprises (L.A.W.R.E.N.C.E) 2030
Lawrence Future Vision
Something that will instill pride in our city.

Lawrence For The Win 2040!

Lawrence/Douglas County 2040 Community Plan

Keep same name to avoid confusion.

No.

Develode and beyond
Vision 2050
Re-Envisioning Sustainability in Lawrence

Lawrence growth and sustainability plan

167 No.
168 Lawrence Tomorrow
169
170
171 No
172
173
174 Joint City/County Long Term Strategic Plan
175 No
176
177
178
179
180
181
182 no
183 Tribute to Dave Corliss' Vision
184
185
186
187 no
188
189
190 Leading by Example
191
192
193
194
195 N/A
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204 no.
205 no
206 "Our Whole Lives" A plan for a diverse intergeneraltional, culturally diverse community
207
208
209
210 Not anything better than "Horizon..."
211 No.
212
213
214

215
216
217 Community Plan 2040
218
219
220
221
222 Rise and Shine
223
224
225 Lawrence for Tomorrow
226
227
228 Vista 2050
229
230 Keeping Lawrence Lawrence
231
232
233
234
235
236 Douglas County Comprehensive Plan
237
238
239
240 No.
241 2030 Guide to Planning
242
243
244
245 No
246 Vision Lawrence!
247
248 No
249 Suggest not using a specific year in the name.
250
251
252 No year in name
253
254
255
256
257 Encompass Lawrence
258
259 Something that emphasizes sustainability ala "green future"
260
261
262

263
264
265
266
267
268 Lawrence Has it All
269
270 Seems irrelevant as long as the goals are good and achieveable.
271 Resource protection plan
272
273 Time Marches On
274
275
276 Douglas Co. Improvement Plan
277 Ask grade schoolers to offer names in a competition. The plan will build the Lawrence & Douglas County that will be theirs.
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286 Lawrence: Open and Inclusive
287 Project Awesome
288
289
290
291 Just DON'T pay a consultant to name it!
292 Blueprint Lawrence
293 Horizon 2040 or 2050 - however far out projecting
294
295
296 "Designed for Health"
297
298 Steve
299 Using Our Past to Guide Our Future
300
301 Darth Vader
302 Bright Future Plan, Generation 2030, Incomprehensive Plan (yuk yuk)
303
304
305
306
307
308 Dorothy's Dream
309 the over the rainbow plan

310
311
312 Live Lawrence Development Plan, My Lawrence Plan
313 no
314 Horizon 2030 or 2040
315
316
317
318 Moving Inward
319
320
321 Keep-Growing-No-Matter-What-Cost-2020
322 Horizon 2050
323
324 Livabililty and Affordability in Our Reach
325
326
327
328
329 2050 Vade Mecum
330 No
331
332
333
334
335 Vision Lawrence. A Smart Tomorrow. Smart Community. Vision Do.Co. Tomorrow Together, Bright Future, Planning Together
336
337
338
339 Lawrence Douglas County Preservation and Development
340 Living Lawrence
341
342
343 Beyond the Horizon
344 Horizon 2020 2.0, because who cares about that first version
345
346 No
347
348 Lawrence/Douglas County Comprehensive Plan. Not imaginative, but tells what it is.
349
350 Something that speaks to the promotion of self-reliance, fostering community health, and the idea that Douglas County could develop our local resources, skills and strengths to keep dollars in the area.
351
352
353 Together 2050
354

355
356 something with the word Freestate or Firebird in it
357
358
359
360
361 Keep Lawrence Local
362
363
364
365
366 Lawrence-Douglas Co. - 2020 and beyond
367 It is pretty upsetting when a developer can clear cut 160 acres of wooded land in the county without some regulations. We are reactory instead of proactive!
368
369
370 Growing for Good or Good Growing.
371
372 Vision 2050
373 I think we should sell a sponsorship (like renaming Rock Chalk Park). How about Verizon 2040?

3. Survey Instrument & Survey Boards

Comprehensive Plan Update
Open House Meeting Survey

Please answer the following questions as you move through the stations:

County – The unincorporated areas of the county have a unique character. The following questions address issues reflected in planning for the county's long-term future.

A. How would you describe the character of Douglas County?

_____
_____
_____

B. Are you satisfied with the character of Douglas County?

Satisfied Not Satisfied
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

C. If you are not satisfied with the character, how would you want to change it?

_____
_____
_____

D. How important is it to maintain or expand agricultural uses in the county?

Very Important Not Important
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

E. Why is it important or not important to maintain or expand agricultural uses in the county?

_____
_____
_____

F. What are two issues facing Douglas County that should be addressed in the updated comprehensive plan?

_____
_____
_____

Comprehensive Plan Update
Open House Meeting Survey

Please answer the following questions as you move through the stations:

Vision – A comprehensive plan expresses a community's desires about the future growth of the community. It provides the foundation and framework for making physical development and policy decisions as future populations are accommodated.

1. How would you describe the character of Lawrence?
   _____
   _____
   _____

2. Would you like that character to change, and if so, how?
   _____
   _____
   _____

3. Describe your vision for Lawrence and Douglas County in 20 years?
   _____
   _____
   _____

Growth Management – Lawrence has grown 22,305 (34%) over the last 20 years. The comprehensive plan helps guide and manage where, when, and how development occurs.

4. As Lawrence has grown over the last several decades, how satisfied are you with the type and quality of development?

   Satisfied Not Satisfied
   5----------4----------3----------2----------1

5. I believe Lawrence should grow in a denser fashion to aid in growth management.

   Agree Disagree
   5----------4----------3----------2----------1

6. Give us an example of a city you have lived in or visited where you think growth has been managed well?
   _____
   _____

7. What did you particularly appreciate about that city?
   _____
   _____
   _____

Comprehensive Plan Update
Open House Meeting Survey

Residential Development – Lawrence and Douglas County have traditionally been strong and desirable residential communities. As growth continues to occur it will be important to guide how and where residential areas develop.

8. How important is it to mix housing types in neighborhoods (single-family, duplex, multi-family)?

   Very Important Not Important
   5----------4----------3----------2----------1

9. Which of the following do you believe need to be improved as it relates to residential development? (circle as many as you like)
   a. Pedestrian connections
   b. Street connectivity
   c. Mix of housing types
   d. Sense of place unique to each neighborhood
   e. Inclusion of neighborhood commercial uses
   f. Higher architectural quality for apartment structures
   g. Higher architectural quality for single-family & duplex structures
   h. Inclusion of parks, trails, & open space

10. What do you like best about your neighborhood?
    _____
    _____
    _____

Commercial Development – Commercial uses support a community's needs and provide funding to deliver services. As population grows, there will be demand to provide additional commercial (service and retail) developments.

11. Which of the following types of commercial development would you prefer to see as the community grows? (circle as many as you like)
    a. Commercial along a street corridor (e.g. E. 23rd St., S. Iowa St.)
    b. Commercial in a distinct node at a major intersection (e.g. Clinton Pkwy. and Kasold Dr.)
    c. Commercial integrated into neighborhoods at a smaller scale

12. Downtown is a mix of employment, residential and shopping/eating/entertainment uses. What would enhance Downtown and its relationship with the rest of Lawrence?_____
    _____
    _____
    _____

Comprehensive Plan Update
Open House Meeting Survey

Industrial/Economic Development - Over time, the City of Lawrence and portions of unincorporated Douglas County have experienced business and industrial development and growth. As Douglas County continues to grow, there is a recognized need for more industrial and business development in order to provide local job opportunities and contribute to the regional economy.

13. How satisfied are you with the following as it relates to industrial development in the community:

    a. Physical compatibility with commercial and residential land uses

Satisfied Not Satisfied
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

    b. Location

Satisfied Not Satisfied
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

    c. Diversity of types of employment

Satisfied Not Satisfied
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

    d. Architectural quality of development

Satisfied Not Satisfied
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

14. Which of the following do you believe will do the most to improve economic development opportunities? (circle as many as you like)

    a. Greater availability of industrially zoned property
    b. Increasing the skilled workforce
    c. Stronger public investment into attracting employers
    d. Less process and regulation as projects are developed
    e. Stronger public investment nurturing new and existing small businesses
    f. Creation of various types of employment incubators (like KU's bioscience incubator)
    g. Other_____

Comprehensive Plan Update
Open House Meeting Survey

Transportation – As the region grows, multiple modes of transportation will be necessary – vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit(bus). A healthy transportation network is necessary to accommodate future growth.

15. How important is it that development provide pedestrian, bicycle and transit options?

    Very Important Not Important
    5----------4----------3----------2----------1

16. How important is it to be able to walk/bicycle to work?

    Very Important Not Important
    5----------4----------3----------2----------1

17. If money were no object, what transportation improvement would you make in the next 20 years?_____

18. How satisfied are you with vehicular roadway options when traveling across town?

    Satisfied Not Satisfied
    5----------4----------3----------2----------1

Parks, Recreation and Open Space Areas and Facilities – As Lawrence grows, newly developed areas will require recreational opportunities.

19. How satisfied are you with the following types of parks:

    a. Mini/Play-lots(e.g. Ludlam Park & Chaparral Park)

    Satisfied Not Satisfied
    5----------4----------3----------2----------1

    b. Neighborhood (e.g. Deerfield Park & Lyons Park)

    Satisfied Not Satisfied
    5----------4----------3----------2----------1

    c. Community (e.g. South Park & Watson Park)

    Satisfied Not Satisfied
    5----------4----------3----------2----------1

    d. Regional (e.g. Clinton Lake)

    Satisfied Not Satisfied
    5----------4----------3----------2----------1

e. Linear (e.g. Burroughs's Creek Trail)

Satisfied Not Satisfied
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

f. Dog Parks

Satisfied Not Satisfied
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

g. Bike Trails/ Walking Paths

Satisfied Not Satisfied
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

20. Which of the above types of parks would you like to see more of as the community grows?_____
_____

21. What would enhance the parks system?
_____
_____
_____

22. What would enhance recreation trails?
_____
_____
_____

Historic Resources – Historic and cultural resources play a vital role in our day-to-day lives, not just economically, but also in more subtle ways. Lawrence's older structures literally provide a structural foundation for the City's development, both past and future. The preservation of the City's important visual history and the review of new development ensure that Lawrence remains unique.

23. Rank the following in terms of importance:

a. Protecting Historic & cultural resources in the city and county

Very Important Not Important
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

b. Enhancing the cultural arts in Lawrence and Douglas County (e.g. integrating public art into projects, supporting cultural arts districts)

Very Important Not Important
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

c. Appropriately integrating historic places into new development

Very Important Not Important
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

24. If you only had 1 day to visit Lawrence & Douglas County, what/where would you visit and why?

_____
_____
_____

Environment – Horizon 2020 contains goals and policies related to water resources, natural resources, and sustainability in the human/built-environment. Environmental protection is of value as the community grows.

25. How important is the protection of natural resources to our community?

Very Important Not Important
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

26. How important are the following to you, as the city grows:

a. Conserving agricultural lands

Very Important Not Important
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

b. Integrating natural resource protection into all types of development

Very Important Not Important
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

c. Incentivizing the protection of natural resources past a minimal threshold

Very Important Not Important
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

d. Using natural resources, such as sand and rock, to support future development

Very Important Not Important
5----------4----------3----------2----------1

27. What would you like to see done to protect our natural resources?

_____
_____
_____

Comprehensive Plan Update
Open House Meeting Survey

28. Moving forward, what is the most important way the community can enhance its sustainability?

    _____
    _____
    _____

29. Are there things about Lawrence/Douglas County that you really like and would like to see more?

    _____
    _____
    _____

30. Are there things you don't like and would like changed?

    _____
    _____
    _____

31. Are there any other comments that you wish to be taken into consideration regarding the Comprehensive Plan Update Process?

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

32. How satisfied were you with this public open house meeting?

    Satisfied Not Satisfied
    5----------4----------3----------2----------1

33. Is there anything we could do to improve the meetings?

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

34. Do you have a suggestion for the new plan's name?

    _____

Thank you for your time!



Welcome to the Open House

At today's open house, you will be asked to give input on various topics regarding the vision for our growing community. These topics will be presented in a series of stations that ask you to provide your thoughts through a series of questions on a corresponding survey. This open house is designed to be a self-guided experience, and in order for your comments to be recorded and presented to the Steering Committee **your comments must be written**.

There are no wrong answers. Comments will be shared with the Steering Committee.

Staff will be present to answer any questions that you may have.

Topic Stations



- **Background**
- **Vision**
- **Growth Management**
- **Residential Development**
- **Commercial Development**
- **Industrial / Economic**
- **Transportation**
- **Parks, Recreation, & Open Space**
- **Historic Resources**
- **Environment**



How Long will this Take?

30+ Minutes

City *of* Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES





What is a Comprehensive Plan?

What Does it Do?

The comprehensive plan is a policy guide that describes in text and displays in graphics the **community's vision** for directing future land development. A plan includes several components:

It is a **policy plan**, stating the community's desires for directing land use decisions through the identified goals and polices. It must be flexible to adjust to changing conditions.

It is long-range, considering Lawrence and Douglas County's **expected growth in the future**. Future land use maps graphically display potential development of the community.

It is comprehensive, considering issues such as **demographic, economic and transportation factors** that have shaped and will continue to influence land development in Lawrence and the unincorporated areas of Douglas County.

Why Do We Need it?

"Why" we need one: it becomes our road map. It provides the community's vision for accommodating increasing population growth in the coming years and how we want to get there.

Using data about population growth, city infrastructure, and the needs & desires of the community, the **vision for the future** of Douglas County & Lawrence is created.

How is it Used?

The city and county use the comprehensive plan to:

- **Evaluate** development proposals
- **Coordinate** development at the fringes of the county's cities
- Form the **foundation** for specific area plans
- **Project** future service and facility needs
- Meet **requirements** for federal and state grant programs





History of Horizon 2020

Adoption

Started in 1992, *Horizon 2020* was adopted in **1998** as the first comprehensive plan to govern both unincorporated Douglas County and City of Lawrence.

Amendments

Since *Horizon 2020's* formal adoption, the document has been amended **46 times,** or about **3 times per year.** Through these amendments, many whole chapters of Horizon 2020 have been added or rewritten to ensure it is keeping with the trends and times of the community.



What's Changed?

In the 16 years since *Horizon 2020* became the guiding document for the community, both Lawrence & Douglas County have **experienced changes** in population growth, evolving community facility needs, and many new visions for our community. Some of these were anticipated, others were not.





About the Update Process

Why the Update?

Some of the changes in Lawrence and Douglas County since *Horizon 2020* became the guiding document 16 years ago, especially in population growth and facility needs, were anticipated; others were not.

Given the plan's age, recent efforts with water and wastewater master planning, and with the recent 2010 Census data, staff believes a more comprehensive public review is appropriate.

Because the plan has been continuously amended to address changing conditions since adoption, a major rewrite of the plan is not necessary. The recently added and amended chapters, and incorporated sector plans, were developed with significant public input and compromises. The basic tenets of the plan are sound, but there is opportunity to confirm certain concepts or discuss new trends and concepts for future growth and development.

Steering Committee


The Steering Committee is a **10 member advisory board** appointed by the City and County Commissions. It is comprised of **city and county residents** with the primary focus to guide the process for amending *Horizon 2020*. This includes public education, issue identification, and prioritization of issues to submit to the Governing Bodies of the City and County for review, and reviewing the draft and final plan product.

- Chair (City): Mike Amyx
- Chair (County): Nancy Thellman
- Planning Commission (City): Stan Rasmussen
- Planning Commission (County): Clay Britton
- Neighborhood (City): John Gascon
- Business Community (County): Scott Zaremba
- At-Large (City): Bill Ackerly
- At-Large (County): Lisa Harris
- Real Estate/Development (Joint): Kyra Martinez
- School District: Dr. Rick Doll

Thank You!

Your input today is the most valuable guidance anyone can give in this process! Make sure to follow up with the plan as it proceeds to completion.




City of Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



Update Process Timeline

February

Douglas County and City of Lawrence create the **Horizon 2020 Steering Committee** to oversee and guide the process for reviewing the draft and final plan products, including public education, and issue identification and prioritization.

April - July

Open House Meetings throughout Douglas County and Lawrence to gather input, ideas, and comments about the future of our community.
Public Input Opportunity

Winter/Spring

Development of the **Issues Action Report** for Steering Committee and other governing bodies. Planning Commission, City Commission, and County Commission will adopt the report.
Public Input Opportunity

Fall

Horizon 2020 Steering Committee will review the **Draft Comprehensive Plan** against the **Issues Action Report.**

2014

Spring/Summer

Meetings with the **Community** and **Stakeholders** to get ideas, thoughts, and input on the future of Douglas County and Lawrence.
Public Input Opportunity

Fall/Winter

Horizon 2020 Steering Committee and **Planning Staff** will collect and study the comments and suggestions to understand the issues and needs of the community.

2015

Throughout 2015

Planning Staff will work on writing and developing the identified plan revisions, with guidance from the **Horizon 2020 Steering Committee.**

Fall/Winter

Draft Comprehensive Plan will be scheduled for consideration by the **Planning Commission, Lawrence City Commission,** and the **Douglas County Commission.**
Public Input Opportunity

Winter 2016


Adoption of the **Comprehensive Plan**
Public Input Opportunity






Background Studies

Lawrence's Growth: 1930 to Present



Growth & Demographics Today




	Douglas County	Lawrence
Total Population	110,826	87,643
Median Age	26.7	28.4
Age 65 +	8%	9%
Labor Force	65,623 (59% of Total Pop.)	52,702 (60% of Total Pop.)
2013 Avg. Unemployment	5.3%	5.6%
Owner-Occupied Housing	49%	44%
School Age Children	22,096 (20% of Total Pop.)	16,943 (19% of Total Pop.)

KU Enrollment: 24,435 HINU Enrollment: 1,000+ Baker Enrollment: 940

(All as of Fall 2013)

2011 Employment Inflow/Outflow Analysis



Source: U.S. Census Bureau





County

The unincorporated areas of the county have a unique character. The following questions address issues reflected in planning for the county's long-term future.

Question A: How would you describe the character of Douglas County?

Question B: Are you satisfied with the character of Douglas County?

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

5 Satisfied

1 Not Satisfied

Question C: If you are not satisfied with the character, how would you want to change it?

Question D: How important is it to maintain or expand agricultural uses in the county?

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

5 Very Important

1 Not Important

Question E: Why is it important or not important to maintain or expand agricultural uses in the county?

Question F: What are two issues facing Douglas County that should be addressed in the updated comprehensive plan?





Vision

A comprehensive plan expresses a community's desires about the future growth of the community. It provides the foundation and framework for making physical development and policy decisions as future populations are accommodated.

Question 1: How would you describe the character of Lawrence?

Question 2: Would you like that character to change, and if so, how?

Question 3: Describe your vision for Lawrence & Douglas County in 20 years.

City of Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES





Growth Management

Lawrence's population has grown by 22,035 (34%) people over the last 20 years. The comprehensive plan helps guide and manage where, when, and how development occurs.

Question 4: As Lawrence has grown over the last several decades, how satisfied are you with the type and quality of development?

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Question 5: I believe Lawrence should grow in a denser fashion to aid in growth management.

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

Agree — Not Agree

Question 6: Give us an example of a city you have lived in or visited where you think growth has been managed well?

Question 7: What did you particularly appreciate about that city?

City *of* Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES





Residential Development

Lawrence and Douglas County have traditionally been strong and desirable residential communities. As growth continues to occur it will be important to guide how and where residential areas develop.

Question 8: How important is it to mix housing types in neighborhoods (single-family, duplex, multi-family)?

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

5 Very Important

1 Not Important

Question 9: Which of the following do you believe need to be improved as it relates to residential development?
(Circle as many as you like)

A. Pedestrian connections
B. Street connectivity
C. Mix of housing types
D. Sense of place unique to each neighborhood
E. Inclusion of neighborhood commercial uses
F. Higher architectural quality for apartment structures
G. Higher architectural quality for single-family & duplex structures
H. Inclusion of parks, trails, & open space

Question 10: What do you like best about your neighborhood?





Commercial Development

Commercial uses support a community's needs and provide funding to deliver services. As population grows, there will be demand to provide additional commercial (service and retail) developments.

Question 11: Which of the following types of commercial development do you prefer?

A. Commercial along a corridor (e.g. E. 23rd St., S. Iowa St.)

B. Commercial in a distinct node at major intersections (e.g. Clinton Pkwy. & Kasold Dr.)

C. Integrated into neighborhoods at a smaller scale

Question 12: Downtown Lawrence is a mix of employment, residential, and shopping/eating/entertainment uses. What would enhance Downtown and its relationship with the rest of Lawrence?





Industrial/Economic Development

Over time, the City of Lawrence and portions of unincorporated Douglas County have experienced business and industrial development and growth. As Douglas County continues to grow, there is a recognized need for more industrial and business development in order to provide local job opportunities and contribute to the regional economy.

Question 13: How satisfied are you with the following as it relates to industrial development in the community:

Physical compatibility with commercial and residential land uses

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Location

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Diversity of types of employment

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Architectural quality of development

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Question 14: Which of the following do you believe will do the most to improve economic development opportunities? (Circle as many as you like)

A. Greater availability of industrially zoned property

B. Increasing the skilled workforce

C. Stronger public investment into attracting employers

D. Less process and regulation as projects are developed

E. Stronger public investment nurturing new and existing small businesses

F. Creation of various types of employment incubators (like KU's bioscience incubator)

G. Other (explain)





Transportation

As the region grows, multiple modes of transportation will be necessary – vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit (bus). A healthy transportation network is necessary to accommodate future growth.

Question 15: How important is it that development provide pedestrian, bicycle and public transit options?

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

5 Very Important

1 Not Important

Question 16: How important is it to be able to walk/bicycle to work?

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

5 Very Important

1 Not Important

Question 17: If money were no object, what transportation improvement would you make in the next 20 years?

Question 18: How satisfied are you with vehicular roadway options when traveling across town?

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

5 Satisfied

1 Not Satisfied





Parks, Recreation, & Open Space

As Lawrence & Douglas County grows, newly developed areas will require recreational opportunities.

Question 19: How satisfied are you with the following types of parks:

Mini/Play-lots (e.g. Ludlam Park & Chaparral Park)

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Neighborhood (e.g. Deerfield Park & Lyons Park)

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Community (e.g. South Park & Watson Park)

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Regional (e.g. Clinton Lake)

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Linear (e.g. Burrough's Creek Trail)

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Dog Parks

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Bike Trails / Walking Paths

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1
Satisfied — Not Satisfied

Question 20: Which of the above types of parks would you like to see more of as the community grows?

Question 21: What would enhance the parks system?

Question 22: What would enhance the recreation trails?





Historic Resources

Historic and cultural resources play a vital role in our day-to-day lives, not just economically, but also in more subtle ways. Older structures literally provide a structural foundation for development in the county and city, both past and future. The preservation of important visual history and the review of new development ensure the county and the city remains unique.

Question 23: Rank the following in terms of importance:

Protecting historic & cultural resources in the city and county

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

5 Very Important — 1 Not Important

Enhancing the cultural arts in Lawrence and Douglas County (e.g. integrating public art into projects, supporting cultural arts districts)

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

5 Very Important — 1 Not Important

Appropriately integrating historic places into new development

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

5 Very Important — 1 Not Important

Question 24: If you only had 1 day to visit Lawrence & Douglas County, what/where would you visit and why?





Environment

Horizon 2020 contains goals and policies related to water resources, natural resources, and sustainability in the human/built-environment. Environmental protection is of value as the community grows.

Question 25: How important is the protection of natural resources to our community?

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

Very Important — Not Important

Question 26: How important are the following to you, as the community grows:

Conserving agricultural lands

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

Very Important — Not Important

Integrating natural resource protection into all types of development

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

Very Important — Not Important

Incentivizing the protection of natural resources past a minimal threshold

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

Very Important — Not Important

Using natural resources, such as sand and rock, to support future development

5 — 4 — 3 — 2 — 1

Very Important — Not Important

Question 27: What would you like to see done to protect our natural resources?

Question 28: Moving forward, what is the most important way the community can enhance its sustainability?





What's Next?

2014

February

Douglas County and City of Lawrence create the **Horizon 2020 Steering Committee** to oversee and guide the process for reviewing the draft and final plan products, including public education, and issue identification and prioritization.
Public Input Opportunity

April - July

Open House Meetings throughout Douglas County and Lawrence to gather input, ideas, and comments about the future of our community.
Public Input Opportunity

Spring/Summer

Meetings with the **Community** and **Stakeholders** to get ideas, thoughts, and input on the future of Douglas County and Lawrence.
Public Input Opportunity

Fall/Winter

Horizon 2020 Steering Committee and **Planning Staff** will collect and study the comments and suggestions to understand the issues and needs of the community.

2015

Winter/Spring

Development of the **Issues Action Report** for Steering Committee and other governing bodies. Planning Commission, City Commission, and County Commission will adopt the report.
Public Input Opportunity

Throughout 2015

Planning Staff will work on writing and developing the new comprehensive plan, with guidance from the **Horizon 2020 Steering Committee.**

Fall

Horizon 2020 Steering Committee will review the **Draft Comprehensive Plan** against the **Issues Action Report.**

Fall/Winter

Draft Comprehensive Plan will be scheduled for consideration by the **Planning Commission, Lawrence City Commission,** and the **Douglas County Commission.**
Public Input Opportunity

Winter 2016

Adoption of the **Comprehensive Plan**
Public Input Opportunity

Name this Plan

A new plan certainly needs a new name! We welcome your suggestions on what this plan for the community's future should be called.

What Happens Next

These meetings are the foundation for ensuring the new comprehensive plan includes the community's thoughts and vision. Staff will take all the input received, and with the help of the Steering Committee, will prioritize the issues. After prioritizing the issues, a draft Comprehensive Plan will be developed.

Email

If you think of another idea later, you can email us at:
CompPlanUpdate@lawrenceks.org

On the Web

Find more information on the Plan's website
lawrenceks.org/pds/horizon-2020-update-process

Stay Up-to-Date

Would you like to be notified of upcoming Plan Events? Get email notifications at:
http://lawrenceks.org/subscriptions


Thank You!

Your input today is the most valuable guidance anyone can give in this process! Make sure to follow-up with the plan as it proceeds to completion.

City *of* Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



Comprehensive Plan Update



Public Input Analysis Report

City *of* Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Executive Summary

Overview

With two survey instruments of varying methods and inputs captured, this report is intended to provide a quick overview of the key findings of both surveys. While both surveys were completed with differing goals and methods, there were consistent issues that were readily apparent in both results.

ETC Survey

This survey was conducted by the ETC Institute in the spring of 2014 of residents of unincorporated Douglas County and also residents within the City of Lawrence. With the intent of capturing a statistically valid finding, the ETC Institute conducted a random sample of households throughout both the Lawrence and Douglas County that returned 1,046 surveys. The sample and survey was constructed to ensure the findings were both consistent with the socio-economic construct within the community and that the findings were quantitatively measurable.

Open House Survey

To provide a forum for written input, gain more open-ended comments, and compliment the findings of the ETC Survey, the Horizon 2020 Steering Committee and Planning Staff conducted a series of Open House Forums to supplement the quantitative results with qualitative input. This survey was gathered over the course of four months, both during the nine public forums as well as online.

Results

Both surveys resulted issues that the community felt was the most important. As a way to concisely identify the key issues, this report was created to provide a list of 16 of the key issues. The following analysis includes questions on both surveys that highlighted these topics, the chapters in *Horizon 2020* that speak to those issues, and staff's professional opinion of how strong the existing *Horizon 2020* document addresses these issues.

Issue	Policy Strength in *Horizon 2020*
1 Create Employment Opportunities	High
2 Downtown Stability	High
3 Quality Housing for All Incomes	Low
4 Managing Future Lawrence Growth	Medium
5 Better Protection of Natural Resources	High
6 Sidewalks/Trails/Walking Paths	High
7 Arts & Cultural Amenities	Low
8 Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety	High
9 Utilizing Existing Retail Space	Medium
10 Small Neighborhood Retail	Medium
11 Major In-Fill Redevelopment	Medium
12 Increasing Height/Density	Low
13 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	Medium
14 Preserving Historic Buildings & Structures	Medium
15 Expansions of Downtown Retail	High
16 Maintaining Agricultural Uses in Douglas County	Medium

Issue 1: Create Employment Opportunities

Analysis:

Description: Throughout both the Open House survey and also the ETC Survey, employment/job creation was the major issue that was a constant concern throughout Douglas County and Lawrence.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 13c, 14

ETC Survey: Question 1m/2, 3i/4, 5i, 16d

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use, 12: Economic Development

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **High** || *Horizon 2020* devotes an entire chapter to this issue. The main focus of existing policies and goals is principally oriented towards attracting and growing existing businesses through ensuring the availability of appropriately zoned land and other similar land use related policies, stressing the need for diverse categories of employment uses. One area, however, that could be better represented in the plan is options for funding economic development.

Issue 2: Downtown Stability

Analysis:

Description: Expressed in both the write-in sections as well as the questions themselves, this topic was a principal concern throughout the Open House process.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 12, 24

ETC Survey: Question 1c/2, 1h/2, 3f/4, 3g/4, 5o/6, 12, 16f, 15a

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 6: Commercial Land Use, 11: Historic Resources

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **High** || The prominence of Downtown Lawrence as a commercial and cultural commodity is strongly worked into *Horizon 2020* at present, especially its place as the dominant commercial and cultural center for Lawrence. Chapter 11: Historic Resources is in need of updating with respect to the utilization of historic resources to enhance economic development and to foster our sense of place by the identification, evaluation, documentation, and preservation of historic resources.

Issue 3: Quality Housing for All Incomes

Analysis:

Description: The concern most commonly expressed regarding this issue was availability, but also geography in the community was also significant.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 8, 9c

ETC Survey: Question 1c/2, 1e/2, 3h/4, 5g/6

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4 (partial): Growth Management, 5 (partial): Residential Land Use

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Low** || While the current plan does have a chapter on residential uses, affordable housing has a minimal appearance (Chapter 5: Policy 4.6). With some of the recent situations within the national and local economy, affordable housing is an issue that is both a concern within Lawrence, but also throughout Douglas County.

Issue 4: Managing Future Lawrence Growth

Analysis:

Description: This was a main concern during the creation of *Horizon 2020*, and a strong concern for both residents within Lawrence, as well as those outside of it in survey responses. This issue also dovetails with the desire to maintain agricultural uses in the county.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 4, 5, 6/7, 26a, 27

ETC Survey: Question 1c/2, 1o/2, 3p/4, 3q/4, 5d/6, 5k/6, 16b, 16e

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4: Growth Management, 5: Residential Land Use, 6: Commercial Land Use, 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use, 8: Transportation, 12: Economic Development

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Medium** || The significance of this issue has not declined and it showed in both surveys. While *Horizon 2020* does contain significant goals and policies towards managing growth, revisions and additions may be necessary to bring them more in-line with best practices, the current state of the economy, and the physical reality of the community.

Issue 5: Better Protection of Natural Resources

Analysis:

Description: An issue that received strong responses in both surveys, which is also seen to be of interest for both residents within the rural and urbanized areas of Douglas County.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 5, 25, 26a, 26b, 26c, 26d, 27

ETC Survey: Question 1a/2, 1l/2, 1o/2, 3j/4, 3q/4, 5d/6, 5n/6, 16a, 16e

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 16: Environment

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **High** || The recent creation of Chapter 16: Environment provides up-to-date policy language, giving *Horizon 2020* a strong stance on this topic.

Issue 6: Sidewalks/Trails/Walking Paths

Analysis:

Description: In both surveys, residents expressed the need for more bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 9a, 9h, 15, 16, 19e, 19g, 20, 22

ETC Survey: Question 1f/2, 1i/2, 3d/4, 5c/6, 7e/8, 7f/8, 7g/8, 7h/8, 7i/8, 7j/8

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 8: Transportation, 10: Community Facilities, 16 (partial): Environment

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **High** || Through the incorporation of T2040 in Chapter 8: Transportation, an importance is placed on the development of infrastructure for multiple modes of transportation. New efforts related to multi-modal issues were incorporated in T2040, leading to new policies for developing complete streets and other initiatives in the City of Lawrence.

Issue 7: Arts & Cultural Amenities

Analysis:

Description: A major topic of concern and/or interest within the Lawrence & Douglas County community, even though there was not a high number of questions dedicated specifically for this topic.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 10, 23b, 29

ETC Survey: Question 1j/2, 3u/4, 5a/6, 5l/6

Reference: N/A

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Low** || While there are a few indirect policies that have an effect on this issue, there is not a set of direct policies that address the concerns and issues expressed by the respondents regarding arts and culture.

Issue 8: Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety

Analysis:

Description: While many responses see the availability of facilities as an issue, an equal, if not stronger, concern is the safety people feel while using bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 9a, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 29, 30

ETC Survey: Question 1f, 1i/2, 3d/4, 5c/6,7e, 7f, 7g, 7h, 7m/8

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4 (partial): Growth Management, 8: Transportation, 10: Community Facilities, 16 (partial): Environment

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **High** || Chapter 5 of T2040 (Chapter 8: Transportation) devotes a considerable number of policies that speak to the safety of both modes of transportation.

Issue 9: Utilizing Existing Retail Space

Analysis:

Description: While not as clear in the response from the surveys, there is considerable strength in the views and desires of a sizeable portion of respondents to encourage the use of existing retail spaces before creating new space.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 12, 28, 29

ETC Survey: Question 1q/2, 3p/4, 15a, 15d, 16b, 16c, 16e, 16f

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4 (partial): Growth Management, 6: Commercial Land Use, 12 (partial): Economic Development

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Medium** || There are currently many policies that speak to a more general set of policies and goals, but specifically prioritizing the utilization of existing retail space over the creation of new spaces may need to be addressed.

Issue 10: Small Neighborhood Retail

Analysis:

Description: Responses indicated that residents wanted the inclusion of small retail centers within their neighborhoods.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 5, 9e, 11c

ETC Survey: Question 3s/4, 5b/6, 15c, 15d, 16c, 16g

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4 (partial): Growth Management, 6: Commercial Land Use

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Medium** || While the framework for inclusion of small neighborhood retail centers exists, locational and prioritization policies may need to be incorporated into the update.

Issue 11: Major In-Fill Redevelopment

Analysis:

Description: The topic was mentioned in both surveys in terms of importance to the community. Promoting major in-fill development utilizes existing land resources before developing undisturbed areas.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 5, 11, 12, 28, 30

ETC Survey: Question 1q/2, 3p/4, 3s/4, 11/12, 15d, 16

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4: Growth Management, 5: Residential Land Use, 6: Commercial Land Use, 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Medium** || Policies exist that encourage and accommodate in-fill redevelopment, but may need to be reviewed to give them strength.

Issue 12: Increasing Height/Density

Analysis:

Description: Respondents of the survey indicated that they were willing to accept developments of increased heights and density.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 5, 28, 30

ETC Survey: Question 1q/2, 3p/4, 15a, 16b, 16e, 16f, 16g

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4: Growth Management

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Low** || Some policies exist to allow for developments of increased height and density as an effective growth management strategy. More policies are needed to address how and where they are located.

Issue 13: Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Analysis:

Description: Provisions for parks, recreation and open space contribute to the overall livability of a community.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 9h, 19 a-g, 20, 21, 22, 24

ETC Survey: Question 1f/2, 1n/2, 3c/4, 3d/4, 3t/4, 5h/6

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 9: Parks, Recreation, Open Space Areas and Facilities, 10: Community Facilities, 16 (partial): Environment

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Medium** || The promotion of and provision for parks, recreation, and open space are included in the comprehensive plan but may need to be updated to reflect current amenities, trends, and future needs.

Issue 14: Preserving Historic Buildings & Structures

Analysis:

Description: An issue for both Douglas County as well as the City of Lawrence, ensuring the structures and landscapes that help define both the history and character of the community are kept for future generations.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 9d, 23 a-c, 24

ETC Survey: Question 1b/2, 5j/6

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 5 (partial): Residential Land Use, 6: Commercial Land Use, 11: Historic Resources

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Medium** || Chapter 11: Historic Resources is a chapter that is completely dedicated to this issue; however, it is in need of updating and revision.

Issue 15: Expansions of Downtown Retail

Analysis:

Description: In a similar line as the stability of Downtown Lawrence, the concern with the mixture of the commercial uses, with other uses, within the core is also a notable concern among a larger portion of survey respondents.

Input: Open House Survey: Question 11, 12, 30

ETC Survey: Question 1h/2, 3f/4, 15a, 15d, 16f

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 6: Commercial Land Use, Chapter 11: Historic Resources

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **High** || The stability, and ensuring the prominence of the Downtown within the community is addressed, by encouraging and supporting the development of a broad mix of land uses, with an emphasis on retail as a major land use, the provision of parking facilities, improved accessibility, and the expansion of Downtown Lawrence while maintaining the integrity of surrounding neighborhoods.

Issue 16: Maintaining Agricultural Uses in Douglas County

Analysis:

Description: This item entails both the preservation of prime agricultural soils (Type I & II), and ensuring that the historic land use that has been the predominant feature of Douglas County for many decades is not permanently or inappropriately lost to development.

Input: Open House Survey: Question D, E, F, 5, 26a, 27, 28, 29, 30

ETC Survey: Question 1a/2, 1o/2, 1q/2, 3q/4, 5q/6, 16a, 16b, 16e

Reference: *Horizon 2020*: Chapter 4: Growth Management, 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use, 9 (partial): Park, Recreation, Open Space Areas and Facilities, 16: Environment

Horizon 2020 Policy Strength: **Medium** || Due to agriculture's place and prominence in the county, there is similar prominence given to it throughout various chapters of the existing comprehensive plan. Chapter 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use and Chapter 16: Environment both contain policies that address preservation of high-quality agricultural soils, but the plan may need to incorporate more policies regarding growth management/sprawl that address the economic importance of agriculture to the community.

Public Forum Analysis Report



Comprehensive Plan Update

ATTENTION ALL
DOUGLAS COUNTY RESIDENTS

Are these issues important to you?

- Job Creation
- Downtown Development
- Quality Housing
- Agricultural Uses
- Growth Management
- Retail Development
- Parks, Recreation & Open Space
- Arts & Cultural Amenities





November 5 | 6-8 p.m.
Lawrence High School Cafeteria
Topics for Discussion: Downtown Lawrence Issues, Quality Housing for all Incomes, Maintaining Agricultural Uses in Douglas County and Growth Management

November 12 | 6-8 p.m.
Lawrence High School Cafeteria
Topics for Discussion: Creation of Employment Opportunities, Retail Development Issues, Parks, Recreation & Open Space and Arts & Cultural Amenities

Each forum will be divided into four, 20-minute discussion sessions with a moderator. Your thoughts on the future of Lawrence and Douglas County is valued and important! Visit our Comprehensive Plan update website at *lawrenceks.org/pds/horizon-2020-update-process.*

Connect with Us!
lawrenceks.org • (785) 832-3150

City *of* Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Public Forum Analysis Report

City *of* Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



Public Forum Highlights

Facilitators

November 5, 2014

- Bill Ackerly
- John Gascon
- Kyra Martinez
- Lisa Harris
- Mike Amyx
- Nancy Thellman
- Rick Doll
- Scott Zaremba

November 12, 2014

- Bill Ackerly
- Charlie Bryan
- Clay Britton
- John Gascon
- Kyra Martinez
- Mike Amyx
- Scott Zaremba
- Stan Rasmussen

Total Attendance: 72

- November 5th: 37
- November 12th: 35

"Name that Plan" Suggestions

1. A Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas conversation and guide to the future of our community.
2. City and County View - a Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas conversation and guide to the future
3. Dorothy's Dream
4. Horizon 2030
5. Sense of Place
6. Sustainable Growth is an Oximoron
7. "TFIN" : The Future is Now 2050
8. 2040 Vision
9. 2080 Douglas County
10. Ad Astra Exaspera
11. Destination: Lawrence
12. Douglas County – Feel the Bounty
13. Horizon 2.0
14. Lawrence Ahead
15. Liveable Community
16. Our Town 2040

Public Forum No. 1

November 5, 2015

6pm to 8pm

Lawrence High School Cafeteria

1. **Downtown Lawrence Issues (6th St. to 11th St., Vermont St. to Rhode Island St.) (NOVEMBER 5)**

---

1. **What are we doing right? (e.g.: events/parades, variety of uses, historic quality)**
    1. Active, vibrant, walkable
    2. Walkable, variety, diversity of restaurants/eatery
    3. Infill development – living/working
    4. Vertical
    5. Events, Final Fridays, Runs
    6. Farmers markets
    7. Locally-owned downtown retail/eatery
    8. Library – destination
    9. Parking – downtown
    10. South Park
    11. Arts Corridor/Murals
    12. Variation/balance of business
    13. Community involvement – young population a plus
    14. Mass. St. doesn't seem to struggle
        1. What effect does new commercial have on Mass?
    15. Mass. St. vibrant and attractive to new residents
    16. Distinctive from north and south
    17. Christmas Parade
    18. Enjoyable parking ticket experience

19. New garages are assets
20. Lighting – safe for early walking
21. Sidewalk dining good = vibrancy
22. Like it the way it is
23. Maintain
24. Prime example of placemaking – cluster development
25. Diversity – mixed use
26. Affordable Housing
27. Series of events
28. Parks and Recreation upkeep/planters
29. Parking spaces starting to keep up with demand
30. Mix of uses (so many businesses)
31. More residential – key to vitality
    1. Balance how tall we go?
    2. Identify right places for height
32. Events – draws own residents and visitors
33. Holiday lights!
34. Parades
35. Fireworks
36. Events
37. Safety
38. Important draw
39. A hub/heart of Lawrence
40. Downtown boutique – flavor

41. Mix of residential but not heavily
42. Senior citizens – important to draw
43. Should not be focused on bars/night clubs
44. Downtown as a venue
45. Infill development
    1. 9th and New Hampshire area
46. Supporting requests for incentives
47. Outside dining
48. Public art
49. Landscaping

2. What could we be doing better?

1. Encourage less cars – use bus system
2. Large number of pars, eatery (health of retail versus eatery)
3. RIVERFRONT
4. Office space (1st floor) – less vibrancy, less space for retail
5. No thru streets downtown – staged areas for events
6. Dedicated area for events
7. Lawrence residents part of all decisions
8. Parking and lighting of garages (affects area neighborhoods)
9. Need of grocery (any size) – North Lawrence, Downtown Lawrence
10. Year round structures – ex. farmers market
11. Parks and Recreation – coordinate events. Is events too much in Downtown?
12. More benches in right places

13. Homeless use of benches
14. Vermont and New Hampshire – wayfinding for businesses, needs signage, also side streets
15. Pay for parking
16. Businesses are heightened – shopping versus buying
17. Better coordination with city/businesses for outside dining
18. Better organization of paper dispensers
19. More walkable
20. More access – sidewalk dining
21. Encourage small specialty shops – more affordable
22. Growth
    1. North of the River
    2. 9th Street Corridor
    3. Up cluster like downtown
23. Focus on Millennials/Retired
24. Close Mass. St. – create living room to businesses (activity area)
    1. Ex. 16th St. Denver CO, Santa Monica, Pearl – Boulder, Ft. Collins, Austin
    2. Try in stages – education
    3. Buy-in from Downtown Lawrence Association business owners
25. Another parking garage
26. Rapid Transit (climate change)
27. More infill/increased density compatibility
28. Grocery/pharmacy

29. Sidewalk maintenance – wider/ADA
30. More public seating
31. Bicycle parking
32. Parking – ADA and close proximity to doors – underground or elevated parking
33. Sidewalk walkability reduced by sidewalk dining encroachment
34. Parking/safety issues with events
35. Development should include adequate parking
    1. Solutions: trolley/shuttle
36. Height – should maintain
37. Covered parking within scale of existing buildings
38. Remove 90 foot tall building height cap
39. Perceived parking problem
40. Better plan for parking in area
    1. Ex. Iowa City, IA; Lincoln, NE; Columbia, MO
    2. Future costs?
41. Mobility to core services – residential density on side streets

3. What threatens Downtown Lawrence?

1. Court house (HRC), keep watch – no obstructions. Watkins
2. Bar outnumber retail, housing
3. Safety issues doe to number of bars/college-age
4. Transient population/homeless – safety issue
5. Retail of entire city versus concentration downtown
    1. Periphery/edges – challenges downtown growth

6. Big box versus small business encroachment
    1. Like to see big box – parking than other development like downtown versus corporate retail.
7. Neighborhood anchoring retail (walkable)
8. Crime
9. Noise
10. Legends
11. Competition from large developments
12. Late night activity (bars closing)
13. Balance of too many bars
14. Rising rental costs (leasing) – threatens small local business
    1. Rent control for mom & pop's?
15. Too much commercial on fringe – some are appropriate on fringe
16. Large infill development
17. Meeting local retail needs better
18. Events that cut off access
19. Businesses that don't pay their way
20. No/little support for existing businesses
    1. Tax incentives?
21. Smart support for businesses – balance!
22. Accessibility to amenities centrally located
23. Lacking?
    1. Larger shopping
    2. Range of retail options

3. Range of choices

24. Downtown – became more than Massachusetts St.

25. One bridge draws non-shoppers

2. Quality Housing for All Incomes (NOVEMBER 5)

---

1. How do you define affordable housing?

1. Happy this questions is a concern
2. Higher end of cost versus Topeka and Baldwin
3. More is needed – emphasize family supply needed versus students
4. Difficult to find affordable family housing on lower income wage
5. Problem with substandard housing
    1. Safety
    2. Especially students
6. Share studies via HUD/Section 8
7. Shouldn't imply renting – real ownership
8. Costs too high and causes more rental
9. Why is income lower and housing costs higher? (Major issue)
10. More "habitat" type housing
11. safe, warm, transportation/walk, transit oriented development
12. affordable housing for a large family
    1. combination of housing types in neighborhoods
    2. Infill
    3. Different types of housing – cooperative housing too
13. High property taxes
14. Rents are high
15. Student loan debt will become bigger issue to ownership – harder to quality

16. Trend to more rentals (millennials)
17. More than 30% of income on HSG
    1. Low wages play into it impart from limited work hours due to health law
18. Single mom with 3 kids – 3 bedroom apartment
19. Family
20. Decent/livable
21. Income not enough to meet housing needs
22. Income dwindles or doesn't go as far after retirement
23. Property tax cap?
24. Downsizing
25. Maintenance free
26. Housing stock that meets these needs
27. Close to amenities Lawrence has to offer
28. Walkability near public transportation

2. What role should Douglas County and the City of Lawrence play in ensuring affordable housing is available throughout the community?

1. Tenants to Homeowners
2. Renters to Homeowners (Lease to own options)
3. Development like downtown project, that provides low + moderate incomes that receive city funding, subsidy, zoning requirements (give and take)
4. Truly understanding where we are
    1. Assessments/investigate

5. 40% of students are on free/reduced lunch
6. Homeless numbers are growing (high school students)
7. Attract developers to build affordable
8. Incentives/"subsidized housing"
9. Harder to enter market
10. Increase density/tiny homes
11. Marketing need a desire with facilitated development applications
12. Accessory Dwelling Units, houses, apartments, duplexes – all types
13. Require in all new development – include infill
14. Require percent affordable
15. Rental registration program
16. City Hall to provide
    1. Landlord /renters
    2. Subsidy to help economic development for housing
    3. Energy efficiency
    4. Housing first modifications (Tenants to Homeowners)
17. Density – up not out
18. Provide homes for homeless
    1. 400+ on waiting list – some graduate to homeownership
19. New units need to be funded in new ways
20. Look at new housing types – co-ops
21. Certain percentage of units for new development have to be affordable or tied to receiving public incentives
22. Decrease threshold

23. Rental registration good – helps quality
24. Closely involved with type and quality
25. Track building permit data – make public and easily accessible to citizens
26. Objective based – affordability is the goal
27. Vacancies could become affordable options for tax abatement instances
28. Set guidelines (general)
29. Revitalization
30. Strongest building code in the state
    1. Why? Safety + aesthetics
31. Insulation to major streets with density
32. Floodplain: north and south/rocky to west
33. Strengthen support for downtown residences
34. Concerns with inclusionary zoning requirements
35. Apartments our response to affordable housing?
36. Architectural quality
    1. Maintenance
    2. Impact on land values
    3. Owners/renters (economy)
37. Subdivision regulation
    1. Cul-de-sac design versus grid design

3. Should affordable housing be concentrated in certain areas or scattered throughout the community?

1. Scattered/wide-range is embraced (ref. mixed housing options – square feet, RM12, diversity mix is healthy)

2. Development comes in and only put apartments among houses – how to make happen without push back
3. Embrace redevelopment/rehabilitation through easier with incentives, tax breaks, zoning
4. Mix (high density with less – houses, townhomes, apartments, flow correctly, zoning mix allowances)
    1. Ex. The Summit – who make sure percent goes to affordable housing (condition of incentives)
5. Affordable housing scattered, also clustered
6. Lawrence is more diverse with housing
7. Middle housing is missing – more choices, 100,000 – 300,000 range
8. Sites should be scattered
9. Community wide!
10. Accessory Dwelling Units
11. Recommendations from UN Report
12. Living wage
13. Scattered throughout the community = diversity
14. "Small town" communities/neighborhoods

3. Maintaining Agricultural Uses in Douglas County (NOVEMBER 5)

---

1. Is maintaining agriculture uses important to you? Why?

1. Big Yes
2. Growing food is a priority
3. Advocate for LOCAL food systems
    1. Urban fringes
4. Maintain sustainability for local foods
5. Needs to be protected/encouraged
6. Ways to farm soil (lease affordable land)
7. Forbid growing on class 1 soils (conserve/preserve land away from development)
8. Type 1 soils (next to city) challenge to prioritize soil not resources
9. Currently important – future use may change need. Should not be overly regulated
10. "Staple of life"
11. Need to encourage but NOT by zoning
12. Conservation/open space – buy by city to keep step-up
13. Essential Use. Local Food – support regulatory control
14. Access to local foods – important: yes
15. Keep farmers market – huge economic boon
16. Maintaining local food chain is huge
17. Garden project – good
18. Yes

1. Grows food local
2. Cost of growth is not equal to losing agricultural land (infill with increased density)
3. Sprawl is never preferable

19. Yes! Policies to protect
    1. Soil quality
    2. Community created incentives to maintain?
    3. Open space requirements
    4. Small community farms
20. Income for the county = 80% agricultural uses
    1. Consideration key when expanding
    2. 2 food deserts in Lawrence (North/East)
        1. Bus mobility – bag limit – key limitation

2. Do you think local food systems should be enhanced?

1. Building on Class 1 soils
2. Keeling land preserved for agricultural land
    1. Ex. Delaware Tribe land
        1. Transportation
        2. Ideal for development – plan pushes city/county to keep as agriculture/finding up port?
3. Connects with downtown (farmer's market/eatery)
4. Dedicate funding
5. Regulatory processes (zoning, funding) in place to preserve (Class 1 and 2 soils) but flexible for ideas.

6. Local foods have many benefits
    1. Eatery (local products)
    2. Small business
    3. Ag-farmers
    4. Farms to preschool
    5. Healthy population
7. Food hub is critical
    1. Quantity
    2. Reliable source
8. Preservation of soils/see Food Policy recommendation
9. Find ways to restrict unwanted uses
10. Needs to stay a priority
11. Food hub – incentives – food policy council – 16-26
12. Reserve top quality soils for production
13. Conservation for fair value to protect because it is limited
14. Some regulations too restrictive and discourage producers
15. Exclusivity of market
16. Protect Class 1 and 2 – County to preserve – others follow
17. Proposed food hub in North Lawrence or Douglas Co.
18. Access to local foods in schools
19. Maintain and/or expand Common Ground
20. Preserve green space – as percent
21. Promote diversity of crops
22. Ways to help homeowners have gardens

23. Models – for way to preserve/identifying area focus on in plan
24. Natural resources – tall grass (what makes us Kansas)
    1. River – underutilized resources
    2. Education about Kansas Land Trust – conservation easement
25. Using local food to decrease cost making more affordable
    1. Better utilization of perishables
    2. Distance
26. Take away sales tax on food and tax soda
27. Important to keep this active
28. Trade agriculture for other industry? Not so much.
29. Encourage locally produced foods
30. Language in the comp plan – proactive
31. School gardens
32. Define agriculture terms (wording in code/plan)
33. Young farmers – incubator at Common Ground
    1. Cost of land key factor to expansion/growth
34. Used as tool to limit growth, not agricultural
    1. Encourage preservation/land trusts
    2. Best use of land economically consideration
35. Special issues – flood plain
36. Type 1 and 2 soils
    1. Organic farming potential

3. What are some challenges to creating this throughout the community? What are the solutions to those challenges?

1. Agriculture versus housing – land use
2. Technology increased productivity
3. Supporting efforts of food policy must be economically viable for the producer.
4. Urban growth
    1. Cluster development – beyond agriculture
5. No development in the floodplains
6. Don't grow out into prime agricultural land
7. Transfer of Development Rights – could be used
8. People who want to do - support small farmer – economic development access to land – land costs
9. Transportation
10. Urban Growth Boundary
11. Attract younger farmers – help stare/make business side easy
12. Cap on number of acres removed from agriculture per year
13. Balance between agriculture erosion versus loss of business (ex. Berry Plastics)
14. Resources – do more with less
15. Assess the assets/plan to develop these areas wisely
    1. Rate by quality
16. Historic use – maintain traditional
17. Cost of land
18. Preservation incentive
19. Higher density

20. Infrastructure incentives
21. Encourage infill development first
    1. But with green public spaces provided
22. Changes in built environment to support
    1. Building designs
    2. Street designs/alleys

4. **Growth Management (including increasing height/density of developments) (NOVEMBER 5)**

---

1. **Do you have a concern about increasing density in your neighborhood?**
    1. Pohler Building is Smart Development
    2. Need intense building (walkability)
    3. Classes of people (poor) affordable housing shouldn't stick out
    4. Int. pocket neighborhoods
    5. New development: more square feet/corporate/big box (not friendly)
    6. Don't want to replicate west side everywhere
    7. Mix use priority
    8. Live/work (business/commercial) – walkability
    9. Green space/growth
    10. Some neighborhoods are maxed
    11. Park in every neighborhood
    12. Add density – ok
    13. Type between single family and apartments
    14. Guarantee of quality character – replacements
    15. Redbud Lane – ripe for redevelopment (crime, poor condition of buildings)
    16. Affordability component – incentives, all
    17. Blends in with neighborhood
    18. Commercial/industrial growth key

1. Jobs – city pro-active infrastructure for this growth
2. Share philosophy on city
3. Cooperation with incoming business/development
4. Have/develop standards
5. Market study requirement
6. Intermodal benefit
    1. Connection to Intermodal proximity could be plus

2. Is managing growth important to you?

1. Complete streets – equal users: vehicles, bikers, walkers
2. Need capital improvement plan direct development
3. Lot size and development + parking need to be assessed to increase. Not in all areas.
4. More dense = less dependence on car
5. Fewer derelict buildings
6. Complete streets
7. How to get around – places to go within a distance multi-modal transportation
8. Greater diversity of types
9. Increase density and cluster development to reduce sprawl
10. Banning freshmen from bringing cars to city
11. Reluctance to change can affect ability to increase density
12. Why don't we have a rooftop café?
13. Very!
    1. Where?

2. Property rights versus regulation
3. Common good – balance
4. Regulations preventing chaos is in common good

14. Assertively addressed in comp plan
15. Infrastructure conductive to infill, bike and pedestrian paths
16. Grow into neighborhoods versus sprawl
17. Density – grow "in" versus grow "out"

3. What do you see as the impacts for not managing growth?

1. Another Topeka or Junction City
2. Traffic jams
3. Loss of nature if no preservation of green spaces
4. Who is investing in community versus living and moving away
5. More and more streets
6. Loss of environment
7. Need good controls
8. Increased property tax
9. Dependence on cars
10. Pressure on schools, utilities
11. Crime/fire (had to manage when sprawl)
12. Lack of services
13. More cars?
14. More students with cars

4. What methods would you propose to manage growing urban populations? (smart growth strategies, greater density infill)

1. Managing aging population
2. Less car culture (transportation systems)
3. Plan for future alternative
    1. Wakarusa/Bob Billings – imagine downtown feel
4. Neighborhood retail (small versus corporation)
5. Gathering places/spaces
    1. Bar/coffee shop
    2. Johnson Co. builds flow: green spaces, housing, retail, options
6. Public dollars dedicated to create a growth design for public spaces, mixed use, parks, retail, congregate
    1. Ex. Santa Barbara – children playgrounds, families, teenagers (mix of ages)
    2. Ex. Make sure spaces are for all, "not gated feel"
7. Vertical development downtown, all areas
    1. Favor building up versus building out – keeps downtown vibrant
8. Greater density infill/strategic
9. Vertical buildings
10. Walkability
    1. Ex. Austin, TX, Portland OR
11. Limit incentives
12. Define intensive development and open space
13. Fewer areas zoned very low density
14. No leapfrogging
15. Balance density to hold down education costs

16. Encourage other modes – incentives
17. Offer other services
18. "Woonerf street" (complete street)(design)
19. City work with KU
20. Make sure we reinvest in urban core so we don't have "flight" that larger cities have dealt with
21. Boulder, CO – growth zones
    1. Density increasing providing choice – incentivize
    2. Increasing industrial/jobs
22. Development could occur in blighted areas
23. Growth based on goals (community goals)
24. Concern with Horizon 2020 – not enforced
    1. Neglected portions of Lawrence? East Lawrence/North Lawrence?
25. Why do you choose to live in Lawrence?
    1. Friendly
26. Community investment – as guide to direct growth – ok
    1. Good coordination with subdivision regs and zoning
    2. Infrastructure provision key
    3. Quality of infrastructure consideration
27. Spend money downtown and on major streets
28. Economics – under-utilized spaces
29. Perceptions to welcoming new business
30. "Make it a win-win"
31. Adding more regulations – don't with Horizon 2020

Public Forum No. 2

November 12, 2015

6pm to 8pm

Lawrence High School Cafeteria

5. Creation of Employment Opportunities (NOVEMBER 12)

---

1. **How can the City/County most effectively foster and develop the diversity of employment opportunities?**
    1. How much do we accommodate our Comp Plan needs?
    2. Venture park a positive – makes Lawrence a viable location
    3. Education a priority (KU)
    4. Diversity aspects of Richard Florida – "creative class", "innovation models"
    5. Commute out (ex. Sprint) close enough but love Lawrence/KU
    6. Focus on small/homegrown businesses
    7. More professional jobs or others requiring higher education
    8. Focus more on Bioscience
        1. More important (national/state)
    9. Spin-offs from KU
    10. Tourism sector
        1. Student employment opportunities
    11. Retiree attraction
        1. Utilizing things available on campus
    12. Room to expand business parks in East Lawrence?
    13. Diverse job opportunities
    14. Collaborative industries
    15. How happy are you with the current diversity?

    1. Retail trade

16. Highly educated population = resource leaving Lawrence
17. Underemployed population based on degree
18. Service industry seems to dominate
19. Environment – green jobs
    1. Lawrence could be a cluster for green jobs
20. Labor jobs integrate with technical/educated
21. Underemployment – STEM jobs
    1. Smaller percentage of students study STEM (US/local)
22. Must increase diversity of employment
23. Number 1 job in largest: leisure – lowest pay for employees (Restaurants/bars, etc.)
24. Need manufacturing business
25. Denial of retail is message to outside
26. Peasley Center positive direction
27. Bridge KU and City to create businesses – convert patents to market

2. What incentives/concessions would be appropriate to utilize in encouraging major employers to locate within the community?

1. Make easy for business that want to locate without incentives – less red tape at government processes
2. Businesses look for quality place to live for employees
3. Need to do a better job describing "creative" economy – quantity – to depict for outside interests to see Lawrence
4. Need skill program for all wage

5. But need to prioritize the "creative class"
6. Attract jobs that focus on manufacturing or $30-40K "type" jobs
    1. Mid level jobs
    2. Need high wage jobs
    3. Enough of lower "retail" wage
7. Take consensus into account – poverty rates high, need to look for skilled (mid-level)jobs
8. Diverse skill set but no local opportunities – challenge 4.5-5 years ago but still exists – need employment opportunities
9. Government does not have a significant role in economic development – but infrastructure built to attract
10. More affordable housing
    1. Affects segments of the community
    2. Manufacturing
11. Education system – strong point
    1. Technical college – skilled labor
12. Incentives – for infrastructure of technology important
13. Marketing – partnering with county/chamber
14. Lawrence has good incentives for business to come – roads, rails, marketing

3. Should a dedicated funding source be created as a source to attract employers to Douglas County/Lawrence?

1. Difficult to be competitive without dedicated funding source for re-locating employers

2. Need to increase that funding and not limit to large employers
3. Very cautions
    1. Coffeyville, KS – Amazon example
4. City/County involvement with business entities – "pay in partners"
5. Step in the right direction – bioscience center, partnering with KU
6. Other partnerships that are not associated with KU
7. Other types of partnering
8. Pay attention to how incentives work – reassessing periodically and to measure payback
9. Transparency as a cornerstone for incentives
10. Put money into economic development
11. Is there enough industrial land?

4. What actions could be undertaken to nurture new and existing small business in the community?

1. Take care of existing business first
2. Take care of startups
3. Little opportunity to advance in higher wage jobs in Douglas County
4. Gaps in wages/housing costs
5. Affordable housing – high takers (lacks industry and business – cause and effect)
6. Lack of commercial office space
7. More business opportunity – business tax versus residential tax = upside down currently
8. Focus more on creating new employers, not re-locating established

9. Task force?
10. "Buy Local" mentality
11. (Chamber driven) would like to see more
12. Existing businesses hire more people
13. Community desirable – risk paying employees less

6. Retail Development Issues (NOVEMBER 12)

---

1. **What are we doing right with retail? (e.g.: location, mix, architectural design)**
    1. 11th and Indiana – retail/living – lucrative incentives
    2. Corner commercial lots (positive) functional design
    3. Retail allows more people to stay local – or attract outside counties to come to Lawrence
    4. Downtown allows enjoyable day excursions/atmosphere
        1. Don't want to lose small business to big box retail, that's what makes Lawrence unique
        2. Fine balance that needs to be monitored
    5. Mass St. – pull from Kansas as a destination place
    6. Downtown is a commercial draw because of its uniqueness
    7. Neighborhoods commercial zones
        1. Nodes
    8. Local needs met?
        1. Desire for more downtown than restaurants
        2. Grocery?
    9. Importance of development along major thoroughfares? Yes
    10. Focus on Local
2. **What could we be doing better?**
    1. Explore our mixed-use code

2. Look to communities that have successful mixed-use
3. Retail at neighborhood scale – No CN2 because want to keep big boxes (corporations) but smaller or micro-business in
4. Walkable retail (multi-modal)
5. You aren't buying the products, you're buying the "experience" – that's what missing.
6. Need more research on big box retail
7. Downtown incubator space or affordable space (booths/areas)
8. More inclined to think our plan is for a reason – better be a good reason to make a change
9. Changes to comprehensive plan should make sense
    1. Community input/public hearings
    2. More exceptions are existing today
10. How does e-commerce come into play?
11. Maintain partnerships with big and small
12. "Raven v. Borders" – build with precision/place
13. Consider Downtown Pedestrian Corridor with a trolley or bus
14. Protect the historic buildings but allow for modern design
15. "Bedroom community" development
16. Incentivize "new urbanism" development
17. Pedestrian mall downtown – Boulder, CO example
18. Revitalize Tanger Mall site
19. Conference Center?
    1. Riverfront Center

2. Untapped areas

20. Growth continuing as it has in past – concerns?
21. Retiree – growth in population
22. Urban areas with very good transportation – TOD
23. Mix of retail downtown – balance
24. More residents downtown – plus or minus
25. Retail in neighborhoods
26. Old nursery
    1. Grocery, gas, pharmacy
27. Pocket development makes it walkable
28. Some areas are ok for low development
29. Generational changes to affect development
30. Recognize economic need for developers to make decisions
    1. How much will City contribute?
    2. Incentives needed!
31. Build on unique character of community
32. Limit land use controls that restrict tenants – Home Depot example
33. What kind of retail/goods needed for different demographics. Where does it need to be?

3. **Do you support more neighborhood-scale retail within your neighborhood and what would that look like? (e.g.: walkable, types of businesses)**
    1. Local business know me as a customer – experience
    2. Millennials want walkability

3. Allow for handicap drop-off
4. Neighborhood – "Mini Downtowns"
    1. Walkability + mobility
5. Especially in new development
6. Infill as in Barker/North Lawrence
7. Millennials – lowest driving population
    1. Good business strategy
8. Would not detract from Downtown
    1. Catch Topeka commuters
9. Where are new developments filled from – current residents versus new residents
10. Demand in underused areas – example: 19th and Haskell
11. Convenience
12. Urban infill growth
13. Millennials/retirees/20 somethings – bicycle/pedestrian access
14. Incentives for smaller neighborhood retail

7. Parks, Recreation, & Open Space (including sidewalks/trails/walking paths) (NOVEMBER 12)

---

1. What are we doing right?

1. 9th Street Corridor is an example – opportunity
2. Recent bond issue supporting schools connects to built infrastructure in place
3. Support multimodal (walkable)
4. Appreciate linear parks (run, bike)
    1. Tulsa, OK a great example of linear parks
    2. New York – small areas, but easy access
        1. Sense of scale (micro parks) needs to be created.
5. Love the Levee
6. New bike trails – but connections would be better
7. Soft trail surfaces like at Rock Chalk Park
    1. Nature trails preferred
8. Huge selling point for community
9. Quality of life amenity
10. Preserving park space at Inverness and Clinton Parkway
11. Well-kept parks
12. Scale of 1 to 10 doing it right? 7-8
13. Assets (assess and emphasize these)
    1. River

2. Vacant lots and opportunity for open space
3. Woodlands
4. Natural habitat

14. Burroughs Trail
15. Connections
16. Sidewalks – repair/gap program
    1. Community provide dollars towards repair
17. Paths help make Lawrence unique
18. Good maintenance
19. Good job with planting
    1. Downtown, Parks, Street medians

2. What could we be doing better?

1. Education for drivers/bikers/pedestrians to use area that promote healthy activity (behavior/areas)
2. Economic development issues – miles are less in Douglas County and need the interconnected system per demographics – students, aging, walkers
3. Parks & Rec needs to be part and economic development projects to create green spaces/parks/infrastructure (interconnected sustainable projects)
4. Less silos, work together on "like" issues
5. Infrastructure – who is responsible for what?
6. A lot of moving parts that need to coordinate resources/efforts (committees/economic development/infrastructure)

7. Complete streets ordinance – need design guidelines
8. Inadequate bike lanes
9. "I drive places to safely run" – linear parks needed
10. Problems could be associated with backfill that have been cause of mini parks
11. Make as destination
12. Connect trails
13. Splash parks
14. Bike etiquette needed for walkers/runners
15. Need infrastructure to really feel safe, especially with families
16. Cars/bikers – public don't think to look (educate)
17. Infrastructure not existing therefore the people "users" are fully there
18. East Lawrence more access to parks, but getting there is an issue
19. Better interconnectivity to all parks
20. West Lawrence needs more play areas/green space "walkable parks"
21. Open pace easy to get to multi-modal
22. East sidewalks (infrastructure design needed)
23. West intersections wide, traffic faster – less available
24. Parks & Rec models are focused on acres versus small pockets of green space, better distributed
25. Green space is important
26. Open space – prairie – grass paths
27. Connectivity – especially with walking and biking trails
28. Pocket parks – encourage more

29. More infill parks – Crestline at Bob Billings (Meadowbrook)
30. More pocket parks/commons
31. Charge fee for use at SPL to improve other facilities
32. Managed more for wildlife/natural plants
    1. Buffer river
    2. Maintain wetlands – stop mowing them
33. Maintain Kaw area
34. More bike trails
35. Connect parks – Perry to Rock Chalk Park
36. Natural surface trails
37. Encourage walking/movement
38. More trees along sidewalks – land development code requirements
39. Wakarusa Greenbelt park
40. Trails
41. More connecting facilities – better flow between parks and neighborhoods
    1. Bike, walk, run in networks
    2. Crosses for 6th Street and Iowa (examples)
42. Don't build gaps in connectivity moving forward
43. Safety – well lit trails
44. Classes at Parks & Rec – more balance of classes in various locations
45. How does Lawrence compare to state/US?
46. Support sidewalk staff position
47. Sidewalks expensive for residents
48. Support pedestrian coalition – employment opportunity

49. More public lighting – streets/sidewalks – public buildings – ex. 12th Street
50. Communication between Parks & Rec and neighborhoods, schools
    1. Add neighborhood – Woody Park notice by Facebook wrong
51. Hospital needs parking structure
52. Other stuff: traffic circles

3. What should Lawrence and Douglas County do to ensure adequate open space for everyone, including rural citizens?

1. Manhattan, KS has a unique experience with hillside trails
2. Most important places to build?
3. Encourage/engage citizens to use buses/trails/biking to lessen costs of infrastructure (incentivize)
4. Incentivize developers to include paths and open spaces
5. City purchasing open space for 10-20 years on
6. Creating riverside park – walkable and rideable
7. Bicycle/walking bridge across river
8. Pocket parks –positive, important to the neighborhoods
9. City purchase parks – use grants
10. Need to develop infrastructure up front of development
11. Identify/plan for park/open space
12. Set specific goal x% of development

8. Arts & Cultural Amenities (NOVEMBER 12)

---

1. **What role should Lawrence and Douglas County have in developing and fostering the arts & culture community, and how active should they be?**
    1. Promote investment and continue private/public funding
    2. Would like to see public art integrate into park and bus area/spaces
    3. Integrate – make utility area beautiful
    4. Allow mixed spaces in CN1, CN2 type areas
    5. STEM concept for arts movement – promotion, engagement
    6. Event space need to be planned more efficiently
    7. Opportunity for arts/cultural activities so they can be profitable but integrate in connectivity
    8. Markers, furniture, HRC elements need to be taken into account
    9. Compliments education, economic development and is a revenue driver
    10. Beauty inspires, community allows citizens to belong to educate to connectivity – all connect via initiatives and development.
    11. Keep HRC priority and invest
    12. Provides an outlet for youth/education
    13. It's a business/economic issue
    14. Arts should be spread out, not just downtown
    15. Very little
    16. Grants to help – with public support (matching dollars)

17. Continue programs that are currently in place
18. Limit too much government role
19. Negative – not so much government impact that squeezes artists out
20. Good
    1. Accessibility
    2. Final Fridays
        1. More like this
        2. Extend to west side
    3. Work more with KU and Haskell to enhance
    4. Vango
    5. 9th Street grant

2. How important of a role do you feel the arts and culture play in creating Lawrence and Douglas County's sense of community?

1. River trails are great – but not seen as the opportunity it is – explore development
2. River area less vibrant – need to regain its strength
3. Explore concept of bundling sales tax like Topeka, OKC to support like programs about at both forums
4. Walking bridge - riverfront
5. Incorporate more arts into infrastructure and other development
6. Require art to be incorporated into large development projects
7. Murals? Map of art installations?
    1. An arts/history/culture app could direct people to attractions/sites
8. Example percent for art

9. Art = important
    1. Mix of art and manufacturing
10. Build connections

3. What could we be doing better to support arts and culture in the community?

1. Support accessory and affordable housing
2. Look at incentives for artists that promote growth for arts and culture (housing, areas, sub, hans) federal, state, local opportunities
3. See less as a charity but as an economic driver
4. Good idea to hire a full-time arts & culture coordinator
5. Maybe local food producers and sales should be treated as a cultural resource?
6. Enhance area around Theatre Lawrence
    1. Create another cultural district – land around key
    2. Prevent certain uses to enhance location
7. "Final Fridays" – need showing venue Downtown
8. River Arts District – Asheville, NC example
    1. Topeka/Wichita examples – plans coming
9. Music scene is present
10. Buskerfest example
11. KU Connections key
12. Get the word out better – create directory of events
    1. Bozeman, MT example
13. Steamboat Springs, CO – symposium example

14. Amphitheatre at Centennial Point
15. Does arts and culture warrant a chapter in *Horizon 2020*? –Yes
16. Affordability for artists – housing
17. Arts Center – asset
18. KU – Art Guild
19. Music
20. Other: transportation – complete streets. Downtown = city identifier
21. Concerns
    1. Neighborhood involvement early!
    2. Negative gentrification
    3. Transparent process
        1. Make 9th Street grant details clear and known
22. Good to have free parking!
    1. Accessibility to Arts Center
23. Planning process resources
    1. Grant dollars
    2. Public dollars
    3. Private dollars
24. Inclusive groups
25. Dollars/Economic Development to build
26. Warehouse district good model – attract similar development
27. Not just arts but also historic

PC Minutes 9/21/15

ITEM NO. 5 ISSUE ACTION REPORT FROM H2020/COMP PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE (JSC)

Consider accepting the Issue Action Report from the Horizon 2020/Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee to provide the base for completing a new comprehensive plan. Adopt PC Resolution PCR-15-00414, and initiate Comprehensive Plan Amendment to make changes per Issue Action Report's direction if appropriate.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Mr. Jeff Crick presented the item.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Britton thanked staff for their work.

Commissioner Culver thanked Planning Commission members that helped with the steering committee. He said Planning Commission talked about creating a vision statement for the updated plan about a year ago and he liked seeing it implemented. He looked forward to seeing what staff did with this. He fully supported accepting the issue action report.

Commissioner Kelly said there were some themes that came out in the issue action report, such as a focus on neighborhoods. He felt they should pay attention to the use of outside advisory group's plans within the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Sands felt this was something they had needed for a long time. He said he was jealous he didn't get to participate in the steering committee.

Commissioner Denney appreciated all the work that went into this. He appreciated it was being put together by people who live in Lawrence, not an outside group.

Commissioner Kelly said the purpose and mission statement was developed by KU students and it was a great project for them since they were the generation that would benefit from the plan.

Commissioner von Achen asked if this would come back to Planning Commission after written.

Mr. Crick said yes.

ACTION TAKEN
Motioned by Commissioner Denney, seconded by Commissioner Sands, to adopt the issue action report and sign Planning Commission Resolution PCR-15-00414, forwarding the issue action report to the County Commissioners and City Commission.

Motion carried 9-0.

CITY RESOLUTION NO. 7143

COUNTY RESOLUTION NO. ____

A JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF LAWRENCE, KANSAS, AND DOUGLAS COUNTY, KANSAS, FOR ADOPTION OF THE *HORIZON 2020*/COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE'S ISSUE ACTION REPORT.

WHEREAS the City of Lawrence, Kansas, and Douglas County, Kansas, in order to promote the public health, safety, morals, comfort, and general welfare and to conserve and to protect property values in the City and the County, are authorized by K.S.A. 12-741, *et seq.,* to prepare, adopt, amend, extend, and execute a comprehensive plan;

WHEREAS the City of Lawrence, Kansas, Douglas County, Kansas, and the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission, in order to coordinate development in accordance with the present and future needs of the City and the County, to conserve the natural resources of the City and the County, to ensure efficient expenditures of public funds in the City and the County, and to promote the health, safety, convenience, prosperity, and the general welfare of the residents of the City and the County, have adopted *Horizon 2020*, the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County;

WHEREAS, on October 1, 2013, after giving lawful notice by publication in the official City and County newspaper, the City Commission of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, conducted a public hearing regarding Joint City Resolution No. 7045/County Resolution No. 13-28, finding that *Horizon 2020*, the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County, was in need of a comprehensive public review and revision and that a Steering Committee was necessary to oversee and guide that process;

WHEREAS, on October 2, 2013, after giving lawful notice by publication in the official City and County newspaper, the Board of County Commissioners of Douglas County, Kansas, conducted a public hearing regarding Joint City Resolution No. 7045/County Resolution No. 13-28, finding that *Horizon 2020*, the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County, was in need of a comprehensive public review and revision and that a Steering Committee was necessary to oversee and guide that process;

WHEREAS, between February 10, 2014, and August 31, 2015, the *Horizon 2020*/ Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee convened to complete a public process of identifying issues that needed to be addressed in the comprehensive plan update and prepared an Issue Action Report consistent with its findings;

WHEREAS, on September 21, 2015, after giving lawful notice by publication in the official City and County newspaper, the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission conducted a hearing regarding the *Horizon 2020*/Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee's Issue Action Report; and

WHEREAS, on September 21, 2015, the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission voted to adopt and authorize the Chair to sign PCR-15-00414, accepting the Issue Action Report as received, and to forward to the Governing Bodies of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, and Douglas County, Kansas, a recommendation that they receive and adopt the *Horizon 2020*/Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee's Issue Action Report.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF LAWRENCE, KANSAS, AND BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF DOUGLAS COUNTY, KANSAS:

SECTION 1. The above-stated recitals are incorporated herein by reference and shall be as effective as if set forth in full.

SECTION 2. The Governing Bodies of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, and Douglas County, Kansas, do hereby adopt the recommendation of the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission and receive and adopt the *Horizon 2020*/Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee's Issue Action Report.

SECTION 3. The Issue Action Report, affixed hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference, shall, upon adoption by governing bodies of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, and Douglas County, Kansas, be utilized to guide the revisions of *Horizon 2020*, the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County.

SECTION 4. If any section, clause, sentence, or phrase of this joint resolution is found to be unconstitutional or is otherwise held invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, it shall not affect the validity of any remaining parts of this resolution.

SECTION 5. This joint resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its adoption by the Governing Bodies of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, and Douglas County, Kansas, and publication as provided by law.

ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the City of Lawrence, this 10th day of November, 2015.

APPROVED:

_____
Mike Amyx
Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Brandon McGuire
Acting City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Toni R. Wheeler
City Attorney

ADOPTED by the Board of County Commissioners of Douglas County, Kansas, this ____ day of _____, 2015.

_____
Jim Flory
Chair

_____
Nancy Thellman
Commissioner

_____
Mike Gaughan
Commissioner

ATTEST:

_____
Jameson D. Shew
County Clerk

*****

NOTICE TO PUBLISHER

Publish one time and return one Proof of Publication to the City Clerk, one to the City Attorney, and one to the County Clerk.