

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Cover Page: Listing of Comment Questions and Number of Comments Received

# Comments	Question
401	Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?
420	Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification? (If yes, write in letters corresponding to the values, along with any comments you might have. If not, leave blank.)
147	Q.6 1st Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:
69	Q.6 2nd Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:
58	Q.6 3rd Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:
13	Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? (OTHER)
503	Q.7: Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?
29	Q.8a: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of jobs in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)
53	Q.8b: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of housing in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)
77	Q.9: Which of the following best reflects your views regarding the rate of housing unit growth? (OTHER)
56	Q.10: Which of the following best reflects your view about the rate of new commercial growth? (OTHER)
18	Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? (OTHER)
250	Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?
37	Q.12: Which locations should the city emphasize for planning for redevelopment and future mixed use concentrated activity? (OTHER)
70	Q.13 1st Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:
25	Q.13 2nd Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:
16	Q.13 3rd Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:
195	Q.13: What additional examples of "community benefit" not listed above do you believe are important?
15	Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? (OTHER)
214	Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Cover Page: Listing of Comment Questions and Number of Comments Received

# Comments	Question
614	Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?
67	Q.18: What do you like MOST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that should be preserved or protected? (OTHER)
163	Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)
410	Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?
65	Q.21: The city is revitalizing its neighborhood outreach and programs with the new role of a neighborhood liaison. What neighborhood programs, improvements, or outreach services would you like to see emphasized by the city? (OTHER)
373	Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?
29	Q.27: Where do you work? (OTHER)
19	Q.28: Do you ever work at your home? (OTHER)
10	Q.30: Please check the one box that most closely describes the type of housing unit you live in. (OTHER)
6	Q.31: Do you own or rent your residence? (If you own a mobile home but pay a lot fee, then you own your residence) (OTHER)
12	Q.36: Which best describes your race? (OTHER)

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ - Community or county broadband should be a goal -Greater support of roof top solar
- ◆ "Currently identified values" - this frames the discussion in terms of current City Council. Benefit to city and citizens for any changes.
- ◆ : D - Medium-Coordination among the City and County and other Boulder Valley communities with NGOs on treating homelessness as a comprehensive problem to be treated as a social/economic problem not a criminal justice problem with resources allocated accordingly.
- ◆ 1) A city that has a higher priority to maintain the assets it has, i.e., roads, sewer, water, police, fire instead of aspirational goals. 2) A city with stronger neighboring municipality relationships and other entities i.e. CU, Naropa, churches, etc. 3) Stronger family themes.
- ◆ 1) A commitment to the arts within the community. This will require: Adequate work facilities for artists. Committed funds for arts organizations. Grants for artists. Funding for programs that bring the arts to a cross section of our populace. 2) A commitment to preserving Boulder as a multigenerational community.
- ◆ 1) committment to Open Space preservation 2) No More bike lane sectioning off of CAR LANES as has occured on FOLSOM Street 3) COMMITMENT to including gunbarrel areas (that are in the CITY, and paying City taxes) access to Boulder city services we fund heavily with our taxes!
- ◆ 1. Please use common sense, and stop being influenced by a small group of very vocal people.
- ◆ 1. a diverse community (,inclusive, doesn't necessarily mean diverse) 2. a compassionate community (I think we are very good at serving those in need in our community, but formalizing this value may be worthwhile when it comes to planning and supporting programs to serve the homeless, poor, mentally ill, and elderly)
- ◆ 1. Common Sense values not based on whims or unproven science.
- ◆ 1. Strong attendance at NEIGHBORHOOD schools; excellent education; excellent teachers; beautiful, well-supported schools and grounds. 2. Socio-economic diversity. 3. Promote urban density to preserve the environment and beauty of our area open spaces, and to encourage use of alternative (non-car) transportation.
- ◆ 1Limiting growth so that Boulder is able to stay a livable manageable size and so that it doesn't lose its unique special character.
- ◆ A balance of consideration for individual rights and community health and safety
- ◆ A balance of growth versus excessive development
- ◆ A balance of housing sufficient to better accommodate the large number of workers currently commuting into Boulder for work who cannot afford the Boulder housing stock.
- ◆ A balanced business environment that encourages small businesses to thrive and residents to eat and shop within the community without favoring 'big box' retailers, restaurants, and companies.
- ◆ A caring community
- ◆ A city and county that frequently solicits the opinions of its residents.
- ◆ A city in which one can remain as he/she ages. This is NOT a senior-friendly place.
- ◆ A commitment to diversity inclusion that reflects, on every decision, the differential impacts regarding race, ethnicity and class and rectifying any differential impact
- ◆ A commitment to making auto traffic move with more ease, and to stop the war on the car.
- ◆ A commitment to moderate growth A truly representative government
- ◆ A commitment to supporting education by funding for our public schools.
- ◆ A community with a diversity of economic opportunities for all citizens.
- ◆ A community committed to the educational opportunities of all ages and backgrounds of citizens.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ♦ A community defined by a commitment to justice for all, regardless of race, age, sex, income, or gender identification.
- ♦ A community that cares about ALL of its citizens, not only those that are activists. This should include the thousands of commuters who work in the city, pay taxes, but are disenfranchised from having their views counted because they are not city residents.
- ♦ A community that considers citizen safety equally important to its other values.
- ♦ A community that honors diversity of culture, race, and socioeconomic status.
- ♦ A community that invites and nurtures multicultural and crosscultural integration and activities (d?)
- ♦ A community that is concerned with quality of life including the perils of overcrowding and too much population
- ♦ A community that is not stuck in the past and citizens with a bit less of a sense of self importance
- ♦ A community that is out pricing its residents and outbuilding its attractiveness
- ♦ A community that practices true democracy
- ♦ A community that practices wildlife stewardship, preserving habitat as well as valuing their wellbeing and beauty. And value cycling. Noise and traffic have increased exponentially. City landscaping has been declining.
- ♦ A community that protects wildlife and habitat. A community with resources available to move people from homelessness and joblessness into being productive members of the community
- ♦ A community that pursues cohabitation with nature, specifically wildlife. A community with a diverse population A community that embraces diversity in the use of their public trail systems, specifically mt. biking A community with a public art program A community with a year round farmers market and a more open policy for food trucks which create communal eating.
- ♦ A community that supports and encourages diversity.
- ♦ A community that supports and enhances all stages of life
- ♦ A community that supports its children, and provides opportunities for them to support themselves as they grow into their own lives.
- ♦ A community that supports the well-being of its animals (domestic pets and livestock) with strong animal welfare and anti-cruelty laws and effective monitoring and enforcement.
- ♦ A community that values diversity.
- ♦ A community that works closely to foster a cooperative town/gown environment
- ♦ A community which always seeks to enhance its aesthetic qualities and appeal, especially preserving its historic sense ad flavor of the open West
- ♦ A community which encourages stewardship of the surrounding Open Space by residents
- ♦ A community which offers assistance to those in need. A community which supports cultural events and the arts.
- ♦ A community which offers strong K-12 educational opportunities which welcome a broad range of opinions. A community which is friendly to people of faith.
- ♦ A community whose leaders listen to the wishes of constituents.
- ♦ A community with a strong connection to its surrounding environment
- ♦ A community with closer ties to the offerings and values of the university--i.e, a stronger town-gown relationship.
- ♦ A community with the optimum balance between "organic-natural" (i.e., free market) growth and limited "social engineering!"
- ♦ A compassionate community that takes care of its vulnerable residents

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ A diverse community with people of all races and socioeconomic classes
- ◆ A diverse population across ethnic, cultural, and economic ranges.
- ◆ a diversity of office space types and price ranges - making start-up and non-profit sector businesses a vibrant part of the community and economy.
- ◆ A diversity of social-economical backgrounds and levels
- ◆ A drug and smoke-free community where people's well-being is positively supported. A community that takes positive steps to attract and keep jobs through attractive taxing structures, infrastructure assistance and strong city and county cooperation with commercial interests. A community that positively supports its places of worship in order to enhance strong family and community values.
- ◆ A flexible community willing to help neighbors.
- ◆ A focus on housing types for lower income levels.
- ◆ A focus on the arts specifically, not just creativity - which ends up meaning tech innovation and/or design, whereas I feel we need to value the arts themselves, and not as broadly as some do - i.e., a beer festival is considered culture by some organizations, and while I don't dispute that it is culture of a sort, we need to ensure that the mainstream fine arts aren't neglected (theatre, dance, visual arts, etc.).
- ◆ A government concerned about quality of life - affordable housing, transportation
- ◆ A government responsive to the community
- ◆ A government that does not discriminate between citizens within and outside city limits
- ◆ A government that respects the property rights of individuals. A government that honors each person's right to choose, without forcing lifestyle choices (environmental/climate) on its residents.
- ◆ A growth plan that takes into account the sheer number of people who call Boulder their home, including a reasonable and consistent increase in the height code, as well as a consistent accommodation for residents with extremely steep lots that takes into account precedent; i.e., accommodations that have been made for neighboring homes in the past. We also desperately need a light rail to connect Boulder with Denver and the airport.
- ◆ A healthy community where the wild animals that live in our environment are also given fair consideration

- ◆ A leading technical infrastructure capable of enhancing today's, and anticipating tomorrow's, communications demands.
- ◆ A mention of fire adapted or wildfire preparedness would be good, either in its own core value or incorporated into another core value.
- ◆ A moderated rate of growth which enables the community to embrace the change it experiences A balance between the growth of commercial space and residential space which stabilizes in-commuting
- ◆ a place that is kid friendly, and safe for children a place that supports conscious living and discourages or bans the use of recreational marijuana a place that is open to alternative healthcare practices and practitioners - supports people's choice of how they receive health care and by whom
- ◆ A plan that operates for a basis of public involvement and a vote of the people not of county or city representatives. A plan that is based on common sense, not the whim or pet project of County and City counsel members

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ A plan that understands the limits of growth, addresses the limits of infrastructure development and maintenance, and the real cost, both environmental and economic of unfettered real estate development for the undisclosed profits of developers. What does economic strength really mean here? Are we giving away the very things we are trying to preserve? Is well being really supported by more traffic, more pollution generated by more consumption of our cherish land, resources like clean air, water, even the level of noise and light pollution. Are these things taken into consideration, or is this all about making money? Is making money always the answer to everything? Does the city really regulate and enforce it's policies and rules? Do they impose these rules and policies on itself? What makes a strong city? Is a city strong if it continues to follow an antiquated 1950's way of 'development' with lawns in a desert , parking lots, roads, and decaying infrastructure that is not futuristic?
- ◆ A police force that understands and believes in these core values
- ◆ A respectful understanding of Boulder Valley's historic roots and desire to keep connection with our Western heritage, way of life and culture
- ◆ A safe community free from any gun violence, crimes and hazards.
- ◆ A safe community.
- ◆ A safe place to live and raise a family A city that puts reasonable limits on growth (such as limits on building size) to preserve its suburban identity and quality of life
- ◆ A school system where each school has a diverse student population. One where there are no magnet schools where all of one population are concentrated into one school.
- ◆ A self sustaining community to the maximum degree possible, including energy, water, and food.
- ◆ A sense of belonging! No upper class or lower class, but one class!
- ◆ A strong focus on education; a plan for attracting like-minded businesses without sacrificing our principles
- ◆ A strong infrastructure that supports all the above to include: road surfaces bike access and shoulders that promote safety
- ◆ A team of county commissioners that practices fiscal responsibility (subdivision road maintenance), instead of spending on pet projects (open space purchases outside of the county). A city and county government that supports all citizens, not just focus groups such as cyclists and dog owners.
- ◆ A vibrant community serving residents of all economic levels, not just the wealthy
- ◆ A. A 'compact' community . . . (Quality of life in Boulder is reduced by such 'compactness.' As a multi-generation Boulder native, Boulder is near and dear to my heart. I love Boulder and live HERE, and not in an urban-like setting, replete with such 'compactness.')
- ◆ G. A 'diversity' of housing types and price ranges. (Quality of life in Boulder is compromised and reduced by such 'socialist' practices as 'Affordable Housing' and 'Subsidized Housing' and Boulder's governing entities shouldn't be engaging in that. In essence, a home owner is paying for her/his house AND subsidizing someone else's housing via taxation. Now THAT'S expensive. This is not right.)
- ◆ Ability to drive around town! B, D, E, G, H are no longer important.
- ◆ addressing the homeless issue
- ◆ Addressing the needs of vulnerable sections of society
- ◆ Adequate and multiple opportunities for citizen participation instead of only planning staff and special interest groups.
- ◆ Affordability of living within that community.
- ◆ affordable and convenient transportation system
- ◆ Affordable housing for middle class/upper middle class. There's only affordable housing for lower class. That and overpriced dumpy houses.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ Affordable housing for young adults and young families. Greater ethnic and racial diversity. The planners should oppose legislation to limit occupancy to 3 or 4 adults unrelated by blood or marriage.
- ◆ All of the above values should take cost into consideration. Boulder continues to get more and more expensive. Having strong values should not be at any cost.
- ◆ All that is simply paid lip service by our elected officials. A commitment to our current "exclusionary" housing policies.
- ◆ All the major values are mentioned above
- ◆ Allow more people to live in Boulder, so housing prices will decrease. Boulder has become an ELITIST community!
- ◆ Allowing homeowners who bought their houses years ago to be able to afford to stay in their homes. The taxes have increased too quickly, too fast.
- ◆ Amount of building going on. Very large, tall buildings. At one time you couldn't go above 2-3 stories. What is happening where The Camera used to be?!? Yes, I have seen the sketches.
- ◆ an awareness that diversity is not just considered an economic, racial or religious difference but also an age consideration and allowing that while supporting a greener, healthier environment the aging population may be priced out of their homes and forgotten when new policies are put into place.
- ◆ An educated community that values education for all levels of learners and places a community priority with resources to raise the bar in quality education in Boulder
- ◆ An efficient and low-cost connection to surrounding cities such as Denver via LIGHT RAIL!!!
- ◆ an empowered electorate where leaders respect the wishes of the majority and the minority.
- ◆ An inclusive approach to management of OSMP resources. i.e. – blanket 'no mountain bikes in the West TSA' does not align with (d.) and (e.) above.
- ◆ Are the values listed in any ranked order that indicates any the weighting of resource allocation to them?
- ◆ Arts and the creative economy are very important to Boulder.
- ◆ As a Boulder native, I often feel like 'd', a welcoming and inclusive community doesn't include conservative christian beliefs. I feel like we go too far in making liberal lifestyles feel welcome and included and not all people are meant to feel included. It is sometimes difficult to feel excluded or not welcome in your hometown. I think we need to remember that being liberal means including everyone.
- ◆ Attention to the needs of the elderly and disabled
- ◆ Avoid 'Aspenization' of Boulder: highly livable community, but not 'precious'
- ◆ Balance of ideals versus reality/practicality
- ◆ Balanced community.
- ◆ Be a leader in sustainability practices.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ besides a) there should be a compact community, be preserving the size of that community... you keep trying to come up with car alternatives, while granting huge housing complex sites, yes even low income people drive cars. so while you continue to make it harder to drive a car down a 'right sized' street, you grant another 1000 housing units in boulder... all with two more cars to add to the 'problem'. you should be preserving open space WITHIN that community, by buying housing sites of existing buildings and lots, and then simply protecting them, the same way the open space plan works which was adopted long before current 'comprehensive plan' of today. I've studied cities for 30yrs, and the one conclusion one can take, is once a community goes over about 80,000 people, crime and lower living standards soon follow. Boulder has entered that phase, and there is nothing that the 'plan' will do that will extract Boulder from the fate of a 1000 cities before it... unless you start taking steps to bring that population back down to about 80,000... no amount of right sizing streets will ever make up for what is about to become of Boulder... you continue to grant housing sites, and punish building of businesses, which is counter to your stated goals.
- ◆ Better maintain roads, water/sewer lines; licence bicycles; require dog training; NO hungry children; more parking garages
- ◆ Better protection for animals, both wild and domestic; a prairie dog preserve is needed
- ◆ Better protection of open space from being overrun by mountain bikes
- ◆ Better public transportation - light rail - not running on freight rail tracks
- ◆ Boulder should be cutting edge in creating green burial options
- ◆ Build enough housing in Boulder to reduce the number of in-commuters
- ◆ Care of roads and infrastructure
- ◆ Cessation of out-of-control development in Boulder, city and county
- ◆ Citizen Empowerment.
- ◆ City and county listening to community
- ◆ Clean air. Less traffic. (Traffic cannot be reduced with more bike lanes and buses. There are too many people coming to work from out of town and too many people who will not bike or bus.) All of the above are already being pursued - to the detriment of other core values (traffic and clean air).
- ◆ Clear 'Communication' needs to be emphasized. There are things that happen 'Folsom Street' Living Lab experiments that just happen without prior communication to a broader audience. A lot of people who were impacted don't live in Boulder because they can't afford to live here.
- ◆ Clear snow from residential streets, and get city council to have meetings at reasonable hours with enough time for citizens to express their concerns, and support the rights of pedestrians (who are run down by cyclists on sidewalks), and control the bicyclists, and don't raise property values when the properties have not been improved since the last assessment. Mainly, Pay Attention!
- ◆ commitment to excellent infrastructure: roads/,high speed (fiber) networking, city wifi in public areas, etc.
- ◆ COMMON SENSE and COOPERATION: not proceeding with controversial projects that half of the community objects to.
- ◆ Common sense solutions to perceived problems
- ◆ Community events encouraging interaction with all members of Boulder young and old, working and those without jobs and all the full spectrum of wage earners
- ◆ Community rights to control fracking. Busing and rail transportation needs to improve Before you try to cut back use of automobiles. Don't force people out of their cars, lure them out.
- ◆ Consideration of why people moved here initially. Hometown feel. Open and not cramped. Family/people oriented--not corporate based overcrowding.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ♦ Consideration regarding aging population
- ♦ Consistent and serious outreach to citizens and neighborhoods affected by changes BEFORE they are decided. And have citizen input count in the decisions.
- ♦ Continue the excellent open space plan already in place
- ♦ Controls on growth, density and traffic
- ♦ Core values are right, but I think they need to be in order of priority. Higher number trumps lower. My priority listing is. c e a f d h b g i
- ♦ Cost too much
- ♦ Create more mountain bike trails close to the city and that connect the city with unincorporated parts for bike commuting totally separate from cars. Too much talk, too little action on the above values. Just because you list it and talk about it does NOT translate into positive action.
- ♦ cultural activities, more festival kind of events on a regular basis -- or maybe i just am not aware of them-- not sure how to find out about things around town.
- ♦ Cultural opportunities - music, library, talks
- ♦ currently it seems more them and us and I don't meant inclusivity, but rather governmental agencies (Council and county) making decisions with their values only and not recognizing the entire community. The last time I responded I was super high about Boulder Valley (and have been since early 70's) and lately I have been very discouraged and felt that I was losing the essence of Boulder.
- ♦ Diversity of housing no longer exists. I have cash to pay for a \$1/2 million condo or townhouse and cannot buy one. The number of condos and townhouses that are vacant 80% of the time is huge. Individuals who have 2 and 3 places to live have bought out 'affordable' places for those of us who would like to live here all the time. In our capitalistic culture, might this be addressed in some fashion? Is there a balance of wealthy vs people who are doing great financially?
- ♦ Diversity of people types
- ♦ Diversity of population
- ♦ Diversity of wealth, race and culture. D. and g. are necessary but not sufficient. We will have to trade off some of f. to get diversity of wealth.
- ♦ diversity on city council
- ♦ Doing a better job of providing basic services. Concerned govt. is trying to tell me how to live. Take care of infrastructure, enforce existing codes, and provide basic services. Please do not tell me I need to ride a bike more or force me to reduce my carbon footprint.
- ♦ Easy and accessible BY CAR
- ♦ education
- ♦ Emergency management and mitigation - too much new development
- ♦ emphasis on the well-being and excellent education of our children
- ♦ Encouraging a more diverse population in terms of ethnicity, socio economic standing, etc
- ♦ Encouraging diversity among the population
- ♦ Environmental *preservation*, stewardship imply a possibility of [managed] exploitation. I highly am against any such 'managed' exploitation.
- ♦ Environmental stewardship should include people making concessions to wildlife, such as better compliance of the use bear proof containers (Chautauqua had big dumpsters right next to bear habitat behind the auditorium), more trail closures for critical animal use, keeping dog poop off trails, keeping trails away from water sources and wildlife feeding areas.
- ♦ Equal treatment of all neighborhoods: North Boulder, Uni Hill, etc.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ Family oriented
- ◆ Feel like the middle class is disappearing
- ◆ Financially conservative to keep taxes to a minimum. This makes Boulder more affordable. A place where people have a multitude of places to recreate passively and actively outside.
- ◆ Fiscal responsibility, common middle of the road approaches
- ◆ Fixing potholes, snow removal, sticking to City Council's knitting. Limiting City Council's meetings to 3 hours.
- ◆ Flood mitigation plans for safer neighborhoods
- ◆ Focus on local/community problems in an effective and efficient manner. The values are all meaningless platitudes that mean whatever the person wants it to mean.
- ◆ g. does not address directly or strongly enough the SEVERE issue of affordable housing in Boulder. I don't have the numbers handy, but I know that a great many people commute in for work because they cannot afford to live here and as a 35-year resident I have watched most people I grew up with and graduated BHS and CU with buy houses in the L-Towns or move out of state because they could never afford to own a home in Boulder as they start their own families. This is a HUGE problem for diversity, justice, race, class, climate and other reasons. I feel sad and angry every time I see more businesses going in without more housing - affordable housing - to house its workers.
- ◆ g. needs to be paid more attention to. Housing costs are ridiculous in this town. Not everyone works in IT. There are tons of us who are still incredibly underpaid and the recent rise in rent, coupled with the increase in population with NO new housing is becoming a burden. Open space is great but we need housing.

- ◆ Get the big employers and space takers like the University, NCAR and NOAA to expand in other areas of the state. Spread the money around.
- ◆ Good and cooperative relationship with CU Boulder
- ◆ Greater density to allow less expensive housing and better support local economy
- ◆ Greater economic and ethnic diversity within Boulder
- ◆ height restrictions public transportation less expensive
- ◆ helping preserve Boulder's uniqueness by supporting local business, as opposed to national franchises or 'chain' stores, by considering rent control in the Pearl Street Mall and downtown shopping area.
- ◆ Historical Preservation
- ◆ Honesty in City Government Acceptance of the realities of the Community and the diversity of the communities that preclude some of values being feasible for them
- ◆ Honor the 55 foot building height limit, period. Hold the population down, as much as possible.
- ◆ Housing that is affordable/transport to it
- ◆ how about limiting lawn care hours with all of their attendant noise and air pollution - get rid of the airport and its constant noise - outlaw loud motorcycles - all of the things you listed above are good but of lesser value if one is constantly bombarded by noise and stink from motors
- ◆ how about welcoming diversity? racial, socio-economic? this sounds like a manifesto of a gated community

- ◆ How to attract more diversity here. While we claim to be so progressive, it seems there must be a reason that there is little racial diversity in this town. We should understand why that is and take steps to make sure people of color are truly welcome here.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ I am a native of Boulder we are being pushed out economically. I would like to see a program to support the locals ability to stay in the area. I am concerned with the permit of Google and others being able to 'buy' boulder. I don't know enough about the details but I understand that they are somewhat subsidized to be in Boulder and they are not paying their fair share. I believe the residents should also vote on the type of industry they would like to support or permit in town as well. I would like to see more programs to support local native business so they are not priced out by the big Franchise box stores as well. I would also like to propose maintaining the height restrictions on Boulder as well Traffic flow is also very challenging now in Boulder
- ◆ I believe the values of 'welcoming and inclusive' should be distinct from 'creativity and innovation.' I interpret the values of welcoming and inclusive to relate to including and embracing and accepting people of all ethnic backgrounds and all socioeconomic strata and I interpret the values of creativity and innovation to refer to including different ideas and perhaps commercial innovation. I am a third generation Boulderite (having lived in various cities throughout the country and abroad for about 10 years after college and before returning to reside here) and I believe that Boulder is perhaps one of the most exclusive and unwelcoming cities I have ever lived in. This is a white, wealthy enclave, where the few people of color who do live here are often hidden from view. Very few Boulderites even know that San Juan del Centro exists. When the Albertsons closed a few years ago many of our citizens had no affordable place to shop. How often are Latino families seen enjoying the Boulder Mall? I love living in this city, and I found it to be a good place to raise my children, but I am very thankful that they have had the opportunity, as I did, to leave and experience the real world where people of all races, backgrounds and social class can live together.
- ◆ I had a small restaurant in Boulder that was forced to move due to redevelopment. I would like to see that Boulder as a community values retaining diverse local businesses, and that these type of businesses can afford to compete with the national chains that are taking over.
- ◆ I see a good deal of conflict between some of the items
- ◆ I support all the above values.
- ◆ I think g could be a little more strong toward low-income (meaning normal income) housing.
- ◆ I think it is great
- ◆ I think municipal utilities, particularly high speed internet, and important and I would like to see effective implementation of such municipalities. (This may fit into an existing core value).
- ◆ I think that is pretty good...
- ◆ I think the recent controversy over GMOs has exposed the nearly universal shift in values from 'organic' food per se to 'local' -- See Adams and Salois paper -- and that Boulder has been overly indulgent with people unwilling to rent ground on more sustainable terms. I've spent some years on these issues, and I am convinced that monocultural high-input farming is inherently unstable and financially vulnerable. The great missing link in the small ag transition to sustainability is long-term finance, and that is where a city has very important capacity advantages. Time to re-think the management of the open space for long-term agroecology with diversified production and improvements in soil and water management. I'm spending my retirement years on this; the website is www.colorado.edu/ibs/eb/wiener and I'm assuming no one will have time to spend twenty minutes on this, but just in case... We're far ahead but not far enough!
- ◆ I think the use of bicycles or other means of transportation should be encouraged as much as possible and made as convenient as possible

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ♦ I think there is something more to be said around inclusivity and housing options- Boulder should be a place where people can live where they work/study and vice versa.
- ♦ I think there should be more emphasis on young families with children having options to buy homes and live within Boulder county, and most especially in the city of Boulder. Without families, no community can call itself vital. Without families of all incomes, a community can't call itself diverse. It seems like the current vision is to attract more young, single folks. Frankly, it seems like we have lots of young single folks in the area already. As soon as they start families, they move away as it is too expensive to live in Boulder. Most folks in Colorado do not envision apartment living for their kids. This isn't NYC. Perhaps designing higher density housing with play areas could make this type of housing more attractive. But what I've observed, that is not included. When we raised our children here, this was a fantastic community for kids.
- ♦ I think these values are awesome. And, they are NOTHING if they are not implemented in policy. Example: the use of GMO seeds on open space lands. Impossible to reconcile this fact with these values.
- ♦ I think this is an excellent list
- ♦ I would include diversity of ethnicity, income, and the distinctions that would make the BV a more inclusive home for ALL. I would also strengthen (h) to include the light rail we've all been paying for but which has never come to Boulder/BV. We need more cooperation from RTD on this. I would also include more public input on such notions as 'right sizing' of streets or the construction of the enlarged Hwy.36...both of those issues have big problems, typically because so little public input carried weight. The 'people' were not well informed not did they have sufficient listeners in positions to consider those issues carefully enough...that toll system on 36 seems to be somewhat of a folly unless those lanes are the size for later implementation of light rail, which IS needed throughout the BV.
- ♦ I would like more emphasis on h) and perhaps modifying it to include reducing the number of cars on the roads in Boulder. Traffic doesn't move well during rush hours and the congestion that comes from in is troublesome. I think that making a goal of having public transportation within Boulder would help a lot. Drivers would benefit by having fewer cars on the roads; pedestrians would benefit, and those using the buses would benefit.
- ♦ I would like our community to take the inclusion of people with disabilities into consideration in the decision-making process
- ♦ I would like to see more specific mention to stewardship and sustainability by adding: A community that is committed to reducing our footprint on this planet.
- ♦ I would specifically call out the goal/value of providing facilities and support for outdoor physical activity.
- ♦ I would tie creativity and innovation to economy (natural foods, software, aerospace)
- ♦ If we could accomplish the above, would be truly amazing. Let's try.
- ♦ If we could live up to every core value listed above TO THE FULLEST, Boulder would be a paradise on earth, but that's a dream, because there is no paradise on earth. Still, Boulder comes pretty close to being the best place in the country in which to live. However,. today, I am quite concerned that some of these core values are being 'overlooked' or considered 'passé.' I believe that change is happening so quickly that one barely has the time to consider these changes and address them. I wish that one of the core values had to do with VALUING TIME.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ I'm biased by association with a retirement community, but I think that encouraging interaction between age groups is important. Maybe not important enough for this list, but I believe it's emphasized in the city's goals, and I appreciate that. Especially in a college town. I sometimes felt isolated in a college bubble, with no older people and no kids and no dogs, in my small college town on the east coast.
- ◆ improved public infrastructure such as reliable sewer system and flood protection.
- ◆ Improvement in traffic patterns rather than getting worse as with right-sizing. More emphasis on aesthetic components of community as in art and architecture, unlike the current strip development that is patently hideous.
- ◆ Improvements in one area shall not be at the expense of other areas. As an example, 'right sizing' should not be at the expense of traffic flow, which is hampered enough by congestion. Also, when construction is commenced on one north-south artery, other north-south arteries should be free of construction. Too often Broadway and 28th St. are under construction at the same time, with even Foothills Parkway involved. Traffic is a major issue. Instead of spending money right sizing lanes at the expense of increased auto congestion, we should spend the money on subsidizing bus routes. \$2.25 is too expensive per trip. We also need to municipalize the internet in Boulder. Look at Longmont's fiber project. They have brought inexpensive gigabit access to almost their whole city. We still pay usurious rates for inferior service here to a virtual monopoly.
- ◆ Including the neighborhoods in any decisions that affect their quality of Open Space, environmental issues, neighborhood identity, Housing types and modes of transportation. The people who live in the neighborhoods have a better understanding of the qualities in any surrounding area.
- ◆ Increase safety (i.e., police, fire fighters) and pay them more!
- ◆ Increase the availability of new affordable condominiums in the city of Boulder.
- ◆ increased use of our open spaces, more affordable housing to decrease influx of traffic into Boulder
- ◆ Infrastructure! Roads, bridges, sewers, water pipes.
- ◆ Invite and integrate a multi-racial and multi-cultural demographic.
- ◆ Issue of equity is very important. Boulder has become a very elitist and exclusive place to live.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ♦ It fails to address excessive growth that has harmed Boulder to a great degree , since 2011, damage which is permanent and lasting. The growth that has been enabled by the City Council and developers has effectively destroyed the small town feel of Boulder and what used to make it a beautiful city. Boulder used to be renowned for a beautiful mountain backdrop which could be seen throughout the city and the eastern county. A backdrop carefully protected from development by prior generations of Boulderites. That is now being destroyed by growth driven by outside developers, local developers, and approved by elected officials. In 1977 the Danish Plan was approved by Boulder citizens to limit growth to 2%. Starting in 2000 exemptions to the growth limitations were passed and subsequently more exemptions were passed in 2004. The growth of commercial and industrial business has been unbridled. The prime example is the Daily Camera property which has obliterated the foothill views forever and is a blight. The next monstrosity undoubtedly will be the google campus (and the development of the Best Western Golden Bluff location), a business Boulder surely does not need, in light of over 60,000 workers commuting to Boulder daily. As to eastern Boulder county it is perceived by the city council and the planning board as an excellent place to dump high density, high height and ugly development without any consideration for destruction of foothills views, traffic and all the negative impact this type of development brings. This is being done at a huge cost of derogation of the existing residents property and the community. These county communities are being destroyed by the city council and planning board actions where the residents have no representational rights. Unfortunately the current council and most prospective council members have no interest in limiting growth and protecting Boulder's iconic landscape. In fact most have a financial interest in aggressive development, case in point is George Karakehian, an example of which is the massive building allowed to be place on his property at the corner of 9th and Pearl. Contrast this monster with low profile building from the 1990's built on west Pearl - case in point the building where Spruce Confections is now located and the surrounding structures. As Professor Bartlett put is sustainable growth is an oxymoron. Boulder is being destroyed by growth with the blessing of the city council and the bloated planning board.

- ♦ It is hard for seniors to use public transit, walk and bike. More affordable parking. It's hard getting around the city because of the bike races every weekend. There should be a limit.
- ♦ It would be forward looking to have a point to 'Ensure the impact of tourism on our open space, environment, traffic and parking does not impair the quality of life for community residents'.
- ♦ J. Strong sense of our place in a larger, global community, so that decisions made for Boulder today asks what impacts these make beyond the county, the state, the world. Our model should attempt to be one that other towns could adopt and adapt to their own situation.
- ♦ j. Thorough planning for the upcoming aging of the Boulder/Boulder County population. k. Making sure that the compact-community concept doesn't get out of hand, with housing becoming overcrowded in urban areas.. l. Attempting to address the growing problem of economic disparity between different Boulder populations.
- ♦ j. A regional center of outstanding educational, scientific, and intellectual development k. A city that actively seeks the richness or racial and ethnic diversity
- ♦ J. A respected community with influence on the national and international stages contributing to the direction of human evolution
- ♦ j. a safer streetscape k. lower speed limits to encourage walking and biking

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ♦ j. Autonomous property rights for property owners based on current building guidelines. k. Not making property owners meet the proposed energy efficiency requirements for new builds for remodeling an existing structure.
- ♦ Keep getting our power from Excel
- ♦ Keep the unique Boulder appearance.
- ♦ Keeping growth down
- ♦ Keeping up with the influx of "transplants" moving in vs. those moving out of the area with housing and job availability.
- ♦ Limit building and growth to maintain some sense of hometown feel that drew people to this place initially
- ♦ Limit growth to preserve the existing quality of life. Especially limit tall building in the downtown (Pearl Street Mall) area. Preserve existing neighborhoods. Allow growth to take place outside Boulder city limits.
- ♦ Limits on density - allowing uncrowded areas in the community
- ♦ Livable wage (not less than \$15 per hour), traffic and pollution, more diversity, both racial and socioeconomic, height restrictions honored
- ♦ low traffic volume and more polite vehicle drivers, and a less hurried and more friendly citizenry in general
- ♦ Maintain and embrace the traditions of our Western US heritage.
- ♦ Maintain the quality of life in Boulder including emphasis on single family homes. Limit growth and overcrowding, even if this limits arrival of new business employment in Boulder.
- ♦ Maintaining a small town feel by avoiding new high density urban development like at the new transit center
- ♦ Maintaining and healthy and sustainable community and natural environment
- ♦ Make Boulder a place for all people, not just those who can afford the high price to live here!
- ♦ Maybe incorporating the concept of Resiliency, which overlaps with other values but could be called out separately as well.
- ♦ Mental health services; physical recreation areas, low income, and homeless populations
- ♦ More access to shooting ranges, i.e. pistol, shotgun, and rifle.
- ♦ More affordable housing without more congestion
- ♦ More focus on why many people moved here in the first place: recreational opportunities
- ♦ More laws and regulations reducing the probability of more and more transients coming to Boulder to enjoy the services we provide.
- ♦ More public art
- ♦ More trails for mountain biking
- ♦ Need more single family housing if possible
- ♦ New development should pay its own infrastructure
- ♦ Nine values already seems very broad, adding would dilute work already committed to
- ♦ no

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ no
- ◆ No - great values
- ◆ no additions
- ◆ No GMO farming, more bike lanes, more open space, no tall buildings, no Xcel in the county
- ◆ No I have nothing to add - this covers my values and the reasons I live here.
- ◆ No, although do not agree with all of the above.
- ◆ No, but a balance of jobs and housing needs to be considered
- ◆ No, but I believe City Council has paid far less attention to some of these than others. And more attention should be paid to neighborhood input.
- ◆ No, but strong emphasis on "c" and "h" especially for seniors should be considered
- ◆ No, I like those.
- ◆ No.
- ◆ No. But the wording of many of these are open to widely different interpretations. For instance, I'd bet the strip miners of the late 1800's would have said they were practicing 'environmental stewardship'. And 'climate action' isn't necessarily what most of us in Boulder would call positive action. Such ambiguity can be very dangerous. Unless, of course, that was the intent.
- ◆ none
- ◆ None
- ◆ not at this time.
- ◆ Not just a diversity of housing types, but welcoming a diversity of population.
- ◆ Not just preservation of open spaces and natural lands but of the native species (plant and animal) via sound management practices including limiting recreation in certain areas. Also, the city and county need to work better together... critical wildlife areas in the plan should receive more attention.
- ◆ Not so many bike lanes. Ones on Baseline are enough.
- ◆ Our household has one concern: the use of pesticides and herbicides in the environment. We'd like to see ZERO usage in the near future. It's sad to see my husband struggling with his health problems aggravated by spraying each time and a big increase in little animals run over on the highway after each spray.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ Parks and parklands should be present within the city as well as around
- ◆ Participation by neighborhoods in development and rezoning proposals
- ◆ Participatory and democratic modes of governance that nurture citizen input.
- ◆ Perfectly planned execution of changes that are made to the overall community. (this has not been the case)
- ◆ Placing individual rights (including property rights) equal to community rights. For example, removing rules on current home owners that make it difficult to impossible to improve their property without modifying the existing home.
- ◆ Planning that deliberately limits runaway growth to preserve the quality of life that makes Boulder special.

- ◆ Population growth, excessive taxes
- ◆ Preservation of Boulder's history and cultural character,
- ◆ Preservation of historic resources, in architecture and landscape.
- ◆ Preservation of view corridors so that people can enjoy our world-class Flatirons from most places in the city.
- ◆ Preserving Boulder's sense of place
- ◆ Preserving the rural feel of Boulder County (outside of city) especially in the Gunbarrel area.
- ◆ Progressive housing
- ◆ Promote a safe environment.
- ◆ promote compact housing projects on lands adjacent to the existing infrastructure, Pencost property next to Greenbelt meadows as an example
- ◆ Providing good education to all children
- ◆ Racial diversity
- ◆ Ready access to hiking access to open space is vital to public support
- ◆ Realistic, common sense management of community resources
- ◆ Reality
- ◆ Recognition that issues of housing, transportation, jobs are regional in nature and cannot be dealt with in isolation.
- ◆ Recreation and Outdoor Fun
- ◆ RECREATION. It's obvious, it's why many people moved here, it's what this community is known for all over the world, it's what many people do, and yet you have not included it. Why not?
- ◆ Reduce taxes.
- ◆ Reducing car congestion in city
- ◆ Reduction in City and County government micro-management, needless regulations and red tape
- ◆ Reduction of overcrowding Tranquility
- ◆ Regarding some of these values: I have had difficulty recently receiving feedback from Boulder government entities when I have tried to communicate via e-mail or phone. Having goals and/or values is great, of course, but we need backup by police, environmental enforcement, senior staff, etc. - at least an answer. A simple yes or no would often work.
- ◆ Regular consistent communication from the government entities to the members of the community
- ◆ Regulating and better planning of Growth
- ◆ Regulations which are not overly intrusive or cumbersome on the community

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ♦ Rental prices are uncommonly high for those of us who don't qualify for assistance but make too little to keep our rent down to 30% or less of our net income. I believe the power to make a change for those of us who fall through the cracks when it comes to housing can be made by better regulating the rental prices and rental increases landlords are allowed to charge their tenants.
- ♦ Resiliency from natural disasters and economic disasters; strong commitment to; emphasis on local food production
- ♦ Respect for and consideration of the structure of neighborhoods as they have existed over the years.
- ♦ Respect for existing zoning
- ♦ Respect for property rights.
- ♦ respecting homeless people as citizens, not human detritus reducing the growing problem of poverty in BC

- ♦ Rights of nature, including plants, wildlife and domestic animals.
- ♦ Road maintenance i.e.: Resurface roads where needed! Increase number of county commissioners and run by wards.
- ♦ Safe community
- ♦ Safety and crime prevention.
- ♦ Safety and security of citizens and children
- ♦ Safety and security of our residents; providing excellent educational opportunities for our children
- ♦ Safety is not mentioned as are schools or places of education / life long learning. I think item (e) could be modified to include safety since in the broadest sense 'healthy' would include a focus on public safety. (d) could also be modified to include some thoughts on a commitment to learning. The last item I might consider would be a commitment to communal support and development. I feel the community has actually moved away from this in recent years. We can not really have collaboration to implement the plan if a strong sense of working together to solve issues or problems is not a founding principle of what we do. Recent discussions around planning, dialog between CU and the community all point to a loss of this community based approach.
- ♦ Safety. The transient and homeless population makes people (especially families) feel very unsafe in many areas around town.
- ♦ Schools that represent the community. Support for the arts in the community as a whole and in schools
Strong town and gown relationship Easy access to quality healthcare for all the population Strong connections between elders and you hers Safe community for all
- ♦ SENIORS CAN NO LONGER AFFORD TO LIVE HERE -- PROPERTY TAXES ARE FORCING SOME OLDER GENERATION HOMEOWNERS TO MOVE OUT -- THE VERY ONES WHO HELPED TO BUILD THIS COMMUNITY... WE NEED TO LIMIT CONSTRUCTION TO MAINTAIN BOULDERS UNIQUE LIFESTYLE... BOULDER HAS ALWAYS MAINTAINED A UNIQUE, DESIRABLE LIFESTYLE AND WE DO NOT NEED SO MUCH OVERCROWDING THAT WILL TOTALLY UPROOT THE PRESENT LIFESTYLE... PLEASE THINK ABOUT THIS WHEN EXPLORING NEW IDEAS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT..
- ♦ Sensitive to senior citizens and students
- ♦ Slow growth
- ♦ Socio-economic diversity. Working people should be able to live here. And a balance where values conflict.

- ♦ Something specific to kids' services. After Parenting Place closed there's a huge lack in children-friendly/parenting support.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ Sometimes affordability does not include minimum wage jobs. I believe in working 40 hours a week should allow a person a normal house not condo. Many people leave Boulder who have been here all their life because they cannot afford a house.
- ◆ Sounds a lot like mom and apple pie.
- ◆ Specific light-rail routes to Denver and more convenient bus service to (illegible) - if we're looking at environment why aren't we looking at noise pollution?
- ◆ Stop allowing variations to the 35 foot height limit
- ◆ Stop lying to the public! A) height limits B) selling open space to developers for custom homes C) rail service to Denver
- ◆ Strong education system for all
- ◆ Strong rail service between Boulder and interconnected key locations (Longmont, Superior/Louisville, to Denver) (like what we paid for and want - not polluting busses, which we already had)
- ◆ strong/many education opportunity
- ◆ Sufficient housing for those that work here. Well maintained basic infrastructure.
- ◆ Support culture and the arts
- ◆ Support for a diversity of businesses through a diversity of commercial buildings that are affordable, right-sizing city regulations to limit administrative the administrative burden and providing infrastructure for synergistic businesses to be created and grow
- ◆ support for a diversity of people in all economic classes; a balance of housing options for people at all income levels (especially not forgetting the low and middle income folks); year-round housing for those in the homeless community; appropriate social, political, and economic support to support the plan's diversity initiatives.
- ◆ Support for an ageing population. Quality of life, noise, respect for diversity of neighborhood.
- ◆ Support for these goals, including city and county road maintenance and effective snow plowing. Respect for existing values of established neighborhoods and not allowing further development that would diminish those values. Respect for the community by not making decisions that will affect the community without long-term research and data.
- ◆ Support of a great educational system
- ◆ Supporting a culture of diversity and small businesses
- ◆ Sustainability -- building materials (for new homes and office buildings, shops) that are non-toxic and Earth-friendly; goes hand in hand with b. and e., but I feel this term, sustainability, is an important one. Education -- I feel enough research has been done that homeschooling ought to be recognized as a superior form of education, and that steps be taken in that direction. Elder-run 'day-care', for instance, that lasts throughout childhood!
- ◆ Tear down the trailer parks and build 4 story multiple 1000 square foot condos that sell for 250,000 to Families than make no more than a nurse and fireman couple make, or a teacher and a policeman. Let them be resold at the same increase in value that Social Security allots per year. Let retired couples buy the same condos for \$125,000 if their income is the same as the retired nurse/fireman or teacher/policeman couples. Same resale cap applies. Ensure that they LOOK good, get some artists involved. The current builders' designs are terrible. Boulder should insist on retaining its architectural charm - not let every greedy builder put up as many, cheap living spaces as possible on every square inch of land.
- ◆ The community should not have UGLY building like Lumine at Bluff and 28th
- ◆ The Future of Boulder.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ The rights of a diversity wildlife to safely live in the area they have always used.
- ◆ The seniors that helped build this town!
- ◆ The value of Less control by the city government More community building
- ◆ The value of personal space is critical to a happy environment. Crowded streets, clogged with cars, overburdened store clerks.
- ◆ There is a huge student population that is not mentioned at all. I think it is extremely important that the core values of the Community Plan address the need to balance student and non-student resident needs and wants.
- ◆ There should be a focus on traffic mitigation. People drive and roads should be expanded accordingly.
- ◆ There should be separate 'values' that cover RTD plans and services, working with school districts to support PK-12 education, Boulder Valley long term flood control and area wildfire resources for rapid response.

- ◆ these are plenty of challenges that are well identified I can suggest a) creating a goal of self-sufficient local economy to achieve resilience and reduce GHG: how about turning (25%) of open space into sustainable farming and demo permaculture practices? b) I feel that a better, more transparent and comprehensive collaboration with CU is justified: resource sharing, community based projects, land use planning. CU social and economic role has a substantial impact on culture and quality of life.
- ◆ These don't strike me as 'values'. Diversity of thought, race, religion, etc
- ◆ These statements are quite vague. It is hard to disagree in principle, but the practical implementations are often inappropriate or conflicting.
- ◆ Think about those of us who live here
- ◆ This is a college town strongly shaped by CU, but none of the values listed above directly support that
- ◆ This is pretty comprehensive
- ◆ This may be assumed under d, but I believe Boulder needs more of an emphasis on arts and supporting arts and artist in the community.
- ◆ Those are great.
- ◆ To clear all intersections with bums and street signs. These people are distracting to drivers and scary to pedestrians. Many of these street people bus-in from Denver!
- ◆ To know when a goal is beyond the scope of local government. Many current decisions are futile attempts to address something much bigger than our county borders, such as global warming. The money wasted on municipalisation is a good example. The hopeless affordable housing plan is another. Taxes, especially property taxes are way too high.
- ◆ Top-quality educational system stressing smaller class sizes
- ◆ Traffic congestion reduction
- ◆ Trail management with access to open space
- ◆ transparency and open communication, value of concerns, how they will be addressed and a timeline for that process
- ◆ Transparent government
- ◆ Transportation system that is able to handle car traffic without undue delays.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.4: Are there any additional core values not included in the above list that you think should be emphasized by the Plan?

- ◆ Two things that are missing that may be inferred by the values above but are not called out and should be are the words 'progressive' and 'leader.' We can have many of the values above, but if we implement them years after other communities, we will not be a leader and will stagnate as a backwater of innovation. Boulder has always been a progressive leader, be it our open space policies or the controversial, at the time, plan to remove cars from Pearl Street. Both of these changes have helped make Boulder the desirable community it is today.
- ◆ Vehicle congestion and pollution
- ◆ We are not inclusive
- ◆ We must not sacrifice our views and elbow room for the sake of high-density housing. For many, the point of being here is to see the natural beauty without having to drive to it. Likewise, the roads (with cars AND bikes) are so becoming so congested, it is difficult to get through town - which adds pollution, travel times, and general frustration, all of which seem to be opposite of the core values listed.
- ◆ we need a minimax income!! no one making income more than 20 times the least income [yes note I'm not meaning wage - but income]
- ◆ We need more neighborhood parks, libraries and recreation centers in the Gunbarrel Green area and in the county.
- ◆ Welcoming and inclusive are great goals, but, without a tangible action plan and a set time frame to accomplish goals, they words have no significance. What are the goals and targeted time frames that show the commitment to achieve inclusion?
- ◆ Well, there is a dilemma with these values, since to an increasing extent (a), (d), and (g) become mutually exclusive. Boulder is by outside visitors described as a 'gated community'. The socio-economics makes it a city farthest away from the US average. But maybe so be it, and one should face reality instead of pretending much can (or should) be changed about it.
- ◆ What about the core value of emphasizing education?
- ◆ While we don't have a concrete bullet point to enter, two things come to mind, emphasis on education and educational opportunities so we continue to grow and a recognition of our position as leaders, influencers and educators, particularly in the areas of environmental stewardship and community-mindedness (ie: the actions of one impact all)
- ◆ Willingness to pay taxes or raise revenues for schools, parks, and other services such as infrastructure maintenance
- ◆ Yes, there should be a goal to stop the out of control building and 'densification' of housing such as the buildings at 30th and Pearl, and a stop to the building variances that have been granted. This type of building has changed the character of this city, and added to the traffic issues. The traffic impacts of adding more residents and new buildings should be a consideration before any new building are approved.
- ◆ Yes, we think that an important value worth mentioning in the Plan is to balance economic and environmental issues. Boulder County is a very expensive place to live and without a balanced view of issues (for example, focusing too much or only on environmental issues) will only lead to a increasing economic dilemma of affordability in Boulder Valley.
- ◆ You have abandoned the values of 1980s Boulder. Rents have gone up annual 100s of percentage points. Your most important points are unlisted: profit, taxes, and connections.
- ◆ You've done a good job of making it comprehensive. How about racial diversity?

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ◆ Clarification on homeless population and how they will be supported to move and work into the community.
- ◆ Les City employees in the tax department that cost the tax payers a lot of money
- ◆ More specifics needed in plan on "how" to achieve its goals and achieve identified goals
- ◆ No changes, but I think all values should be weighed equally
- ◆ See above
- ◆ see notes above
- ◆ a
- ◆ a ... open space with sustainable use by all user groups from the community in mind.
- ◆ a 'Compact' community disturbs me because I DO NOT want downtown density to continue. I would like a more open community surrounded by preserved open space, one that does not have to replace every small building or parking lot with density downtown.
- ◆ a 'compact' sounds smart & attractive but reality is exhibiting over-concentration of population in buildings (sometimes poorly constructed) and impractical traffic expectations
- ◆ a 'preserved' open space is such an overreach and old idea
- ◆ a "Compact" = too much density = too many apartments
- ◆ a "Compact" seems a bit unrealistic/elitist
- ◆ a "Compact" should not mean "sardine can"
- ◆ a "Preserved open space" should be debated. At some point ever more costly land purchases must stop so funds can be used for basic government services.
- ◆ a ,compact, community should be better defined. eg. homes on top of one another? How will overcrowdedness be defined and measured?
- ◆ a A compact but not overly dense community surrounded by preserved open space
- ◆ a A compact community is ideal, and while I agree with height restrictions of buildings and maintaining the green-belt around Boulder proper, the only way to make the space liveable is to limit the number of citizens; however, to do so would probably stagnant the growth of the city as well as furthur increase the wage discrepancy between Boulder and the rest of the state. It is problem, and it needs to be assessed somehow.
- ◆ a a. A compact community is not as sustainable as one that incorporates, for instance, food forests.
- ◆ a additional open space purchases are not needed or wanted
- ◆ a as written would allow infinite density
- ◆ a Boulder is becoming too dense, i.e., "compact." Traffic is a major concern. Seem as though Council is trying to make it difficult for its citizens.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ a Cannot continue density east of 28th (downtown does not get this). Could do high-rise or affordable housing Mapleton area or off of 4th Street.
- ♦ a Community shouldn't be compact
- ♦ a Compact community
- ♦ a Compact doesn't mean New York City
- ♦ a define what compact means as bringing large companies like Google, to a street that's already jammed, with thousands more cars from the employees will certainly contribute to the feeling of 'packed,' but I'm not sure that's the quality of life Boulder is all about.
- ♦ a Does "compact" refer to a lack of sprawl (enclosed) or tightly spaced (due to enclosure)?
- ♦ a Does compact only allow for condos? How about townhouses, duplexes, apartments with outside entrances built around playgrounds?
- ♦ a Don't make Boulder like Denver
- ♦ a Feel that Item a would be better stated as: A community surrounded by open space where there is a balance of recreation and conservation for the community to enjoy and appreciate
- ♦ a Greater access to open space for dogs and bikes, encouraging more cooperation among all types of users
- ♦ a How compact? No need to obstruct the views of the Flatirons with high rise buildings!
- ♦ a how did that atrocity get approved--the huge building on the daily camera site? Height controls and space and view rules all obviously ignored for this building; who let that happen?
- ♦ a how much growth/ density is sustainable? This is attractive but needs clarification
- ♦ a I don't agree w/ Compact community (i.e. filling up all available space w/ high density housing), but do agree w/ preserving open space.
- ♦ a I don't believe that the community needs to be compact. However, I do believe that it is very important to maintain the open spaces around and throughout the community.
- ♦ a I don't know what 'A' means with respect to the diverse communities that inhabit many of the areas outside of the incorporated towns. Boulder City and County do not support these areas and seem to want to 'downsize' or limit the influence or importance of the rural/mountain dweller. I would like to see more support and for these areas and communities. They are important and vital to the county but don't support the idea of a compact community.
- ♦ a I don't remember the language "compact community" as a core value
- ♦ a I don't think a compact community and having a diversity of housing are achievable at the same time given the price of housing today. Limiting the size of boulder will only increase housing prices.
- ♦ a I have followed open space but did not hear the word plan used

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ a i see the open space along 36 being encroached up with development. where is the action to bring this into alignment with this plan?
- ♦ a I worry that this 'core value' can easily make Boulder into a giant gated community, not open to growth, change, progress or positive expansion.
- ♦ a I would like to see this item expanded to note the importance of having an abundance of trails so that people can enjoy open space without it feeling crowded. And the importance of having a network of connected trails throughout the county so that enable people to get to the various parks without needing to drive.
- ♦ a I'm not sure what "compact" means. If it means high-rise buildings, then I'm not for it.
- ♦ a If compact means dense, I don't value dense
- ♦ a If we insist on compactness, we can't also be welcoming and inclusive. Therefore, we should think of the open space as a 'greenbelt,' beyond which further settlement and economic activity can develop.
- ♦ a Means "high density?"
- ♦ a needs to include detail about retaining quality of life, not just creating 'compact' neighborhoods (e.g., maintaining views)
- ♦ a Not sure our community is still considered compact considering the density of housing and the reduction of lot sizes in new construction
- ♦ a Open space should be open to the public for enjoyment of nature and recreation, not closed off to groups such as mountain bikers
- ♦ a Open space should NOT be only about preservation but about multi-use by its citizens.
- ♦ a Open space that avails itself to a wide variety of uses and trail users
- ♦ a please clarify the definition of compact community
- ♦ a Preserved open space, too much emphasis on preservation, need more trails to disperse users. Population has increased so much in the surrounding area, open space use is getting higher impacts, need more access to disperse use
- ♦ a Rather than compacting city and allowing building height to go up perhaps some open space should be compromised
- ♦ a Rather than the City and or County owning and maintaining all of the open area, perhaps this could be done with zoning. City's buys the land at market value, rezones the land and sells with zoning or deed restrictions. It could still look like open space but you don't have to maintain it.
- ♦ a restricts space and drives up prices of housing and is in direct conflict with g

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ a Seeing what has occurred for other communities around the country who limit access, I am not in favor of being exclusive.
- ♦ a The 'compact' community concept is no longer viable. Communities need to be able to expand geographically consistent with other plan 'values'.
- ♦ a the community has become too 'compact' and crowded.
- ♦ a The compact community ideal is being perverted to legitimate very dubious pursuit of g - diversity of housing, and some real losses of quality of life with excessive densification and now some really foolish annexations far from transit and far from thoroughly considered planning. The Twin Lakes mess will be a huge problem for the locals and a huge expense for the intended beneficiaries, unless there is a big transit subsidy that could only benefit some of the residents...
- ♦ a The compact community only refers to the city and not outlying areas - greater focus on improvements to these adjacent neighborhoods is needed
- ♦ a The current densification which includes massive housing projects in areas bereft of parks is tantamount to physical assault.
- ♦ a The open space needs to be managed for fair and equitable use across user groups - not just for hikers on mountain trails
- ♦ a The term "compact community" needs to be better defined. If it means a high-density urbanized community then it is in conflict with values c, e, and h.
- ♦ a The word 'compact' seems to denote increased density within the existing community. One of the things I love about my neighborhood is the smaller, single family homes with nice yard space for trees and plants that add privacy and contribute to a healthy environment. I think it is important to maintain areas within the city that retain this balance of structure to lot size.
- ♦ a The zoning laws are adequate. We don't need a "compact" community. Boulder has been successful and it doesn't need to be Lodo Part 2!
- ♦ a There is an abundance of open space. Open space funds should be directed elsewhere, such as road maintenance. As I understand the term 'compact community', it implies overdevelopment.
- ♦ a They are generic enough that almost everyone would agree with them, but where the rubber meets the road is important. How 'compact' of a community is the goal? There's a huge range that can be interpreted.
- ♦ a This is not a role of government
- ♦ a We have enough open space

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ a We have enough open space, and we should not acquire any more, especially outside of our boundaries.
- ♦ a We have more than enough open space now
- ♦ a We need homes with yards, NOT urban living condos meant for wealthy young professionals
- ♦ a what does a compact community mean
- ♦ a What does a compact community mean? High density?
- ♦ a While I still agree with the value of preserving open space around, and within, the community, I would not describe the current Boulder community as 'compact'.
- ♦ a While this is a good value in theory, it has resulted in a number of unintended consequences, including unaffordable housing for many of Boulder's workers.
- ♦ a Why do you feel the need to have a compact community. Boulder has always been a great place to live, why are you making all these changes, keep Boulder, Boulder.
- ♦ a , g Please see above. Thanks.
- ♦ a, b, c, ABOVE COMMENTS
- ♦ a,d,g a is somewhat in conflict with d and g--this should be resolved
- ♦ b 'Climate Action' is vague and should be framed more positively, i.e. becoming a net positive city or something
- ♦ b 1. Stop Wasting Money Fighting Xcel. You will never to be able provide the same service for the same cost. 2. Other local communities should be encouraged to provide composting. Each patron should be able to have one paper bag for free, so they don't have to drive to Costco to buy new plastic trash bags.
- ♦ b Boulder encourages driving through some of it's policies (i.e. open enrollment)
- ♦ b Clarification. Any significant actions or changes which may directly affect constituents should be presented to those constituents for majority approval, i.e., vote.
- ♦ b Climate action goals have been unrealistic
- ♦ b Climate action is contraversial and should be continually voted on. It is wrong to assume that the majority of residents are activists for climate unless this is verified through ballot issues on elections more than a single time.
- ♦ b climate action is meaningless on Boulder's scale
- ♦ b Climate action is multi-jurisdictional / cross-border issue best handled at the National government level and therefore should be removed from the Core Value list.
- ♦ b Climate action is too aggressive. Environmental stewardship is appropriate. City council should not be engaged in the energy distribution business.
- ♦ b Climate action on local level is a busybody delusion

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ b Climate action. We are hypocritically working towards a local power utility instead of incremental gains.
- ♦ b climate always changes.
- ♦ b Climate change is not a problem that Boulder can solve itself. This requires a degree of realism and common sense.
- ♦ b Come on, Boulder, you're not going to save the planet with your ridiculous energy efforts
- ♦ b Cost of practices should be balanced with benefit
- ♦ b Could be made more inclusive and balanced by using "sustainability" which recognizes the necessary costs of stewardship and shares costs fairly to maintain viable life and choices for all
- ♦ b delete
- ♦ b Delete 'and climate action.'
- ♦ b does community include the businesses and students
- ♦ b does this mean a leader or simply an active participant?
- ♦ b Don't need "climate action"
- ♦ b Drop "and climate action"
- ♦ b Energy independent from Xcel. Be the leader in emphasizing alternative resources. Are we able to do the right thing for our environment? Just tell us what we need to do.
- ♦ b Environmental stewardship is good, "climate action" is a farce - climate change is a natural part of the evolution of and on this planet - nothing will change this - not costly impositions on the population
- ♦ b Focus on COUNTY-level environmental issues, not national or global
- ♦ b Get real!
- ♦ b I don't know what climate action means. If it costs taxpayer dollars, I am reluctant.
- ♦ b I think it that climate action is a misuse of resources.
- ♦ b Implementation to be subject to rigorous cost/benefit analysis.
- ♦ b It is time to take an "off ramp" from municipalizing Boulder power and work strongly with Xcel to achieve environmental goals
- ♦ b it's over-emphasized at the expense of practical considerations
- ♦ b Not needed on a local scale
- ♦ b Not quite sold on the utility focus.
- ♦ b Not worth the economic cost
- ♦ b omit climate action
- ♦ b Only as far as reasonable - don't go out of the way to push for municipal energy if it is too expensive for a lot of the community

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ b Should be individual initiatives not comp plan value
- ♦ b Should be moved to number 1 in the list.
- ♦ b Should include regional context. Keeping growth down in Boulder doesn't affect overall climate change - it just pushes it elsewhere.
- ♦ b Sounds good but what are the details
- ♦ b The community should not force it's views on the individual. Encouraging is fine, mandating is not.

- ♦ b The most vague
- ♦ b The need to preserve the beauty of the area by adhering to the height limits and reducing traffic.

- ♦ b thinking that a small city somehow can run a power company is ludicrous
- ♦ b This is not a role of government
- ♦ b This should be a 'core value' for the State of Colorado or the federal government. I question if it makes sense to attempt this kind of environmental stewardship on such a local level.
- ♦ b too much climate action . the sky is not falling
- ♦ b We believe that climate control is more appropriately an individual value, not a communal value. This Valley already has a pronounced affordability problem. Further climate action as a community would almost certainly accelerate the affordability problem.
- ♦ b What is 'climate action'?
- ♦ b what is 'climate action'? May be better to emphasize 'energy efficiency' and 'renewable energy' with an added goal of limiting climate change
- ♦ b You can't have municipalization of the power grid to help keep Boulder clean and maintain a diverse housing environment. That is, the current socio-economic climate of Boulder is fairly well-to-do (eg, a 'cheap' house is \$550,000). By allowing Boulder to control its utilities, the prices will only increase, where only the very upper class will be a part of the community.
- ♦ b You need to address that windmills kill one and a half million birds per year as this is not environmental stewardship. No to wind power should be emphasis of the city.
- ♦ b you're overdoing health-oriented controls, e.g. no smoking practically anywhere, letting bicycles have whatever they want, and ignoring citizen protests
- ♦ b , c Problems with high density housing in suburban neighborhoods
- ♦ b, f, g, i It is not a city government role to take on climate action, at least not as interpreted by the current city council, and adding more jobs (such as Google) deteriorate quality of life by adding to the traffic woes. We may need to talk about NOT adding more new jobs to this city.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ b, h H, transportation has to take into account the aging population and the need for reasonable travel time. You can't expect everyone to ride a bike or take buses for trips. B - environmental stewardship shouldn't mean automatically preventing access to Open Space as the most desired outcome. Climate action isn't necessarily the highest good, either.
- ♦ c Bldr. is no longer the beautiful little city, with a great college. It has become more upper class.
- ♦ c Boulder is lacking in manicured open park space similar to North Boulder Park. We have an abundance of wonderful open space and some little neighborhood pocket parks. It would be nice to see more parks that attract the entire community similar to Washington Park in Denver. Entering into Boulder Valley from 36 is a dramatic beautiful site. Is there are way to highlight some of the dramatic features as you enter on the main arteries of Boulder such as the flatirons as you come in on 36, Arapahoe Peak and Boulder Creek as you come off Foothills and onto Arapahoe, other?
- ♦ c delete
- ♦ c everyone takes this for granted
- ♦ c I don't see the need to improving the Civic Center
- ♦ c I think this can be REMOVED as (A) includes the spirit.
- ♦ c Identity and sense of place can be interpreted as exclusive. White, athletic, North Face wearing. What about the rest of us?
- ♦ c Make neighborhoods with commercial districts for food and retail
- ♦ c Not clear what "great" neighborhood is
- ♦ c Not the purview of the government
- ♦ c Public spaces to include views
- ♦ c seems to imply stability when change is constant ie value d
- ♦ c This is not a role of government
- ♦ c This is way too subjective - who decides what Boulder's identity is?
- ♦ c This should be based on residents; input, not what bureaucrats think it means
- ♦ c Those of you who make these changes to our city, like allowing the huge building you've let be built and the spreading out of all these buildings as well, are taking away from the 'unique' identity that Boulder has had in the past. You are changing the greatness of Boulder, why do you feel the need to keep letting these huge (and quite ugly to boot) buildings to be built. The 'Hilton Hotel' really, what is that about.....nothing unique about that!! I say enough, stop changing Boulder!! It was a really unique great place but you have taken away from that!
- ♦ c Too general
- ♦ c Too much talk of being unique.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ c We are losing our identity with respect to architecture. All new developments in commercial areas, i.e. Pearl st, have a similarly boxy look that just blends into the box next door. Not mention we have just about lost all views of the flat irons from all of pearl street and adjacent neighborhoods.
- ♦ c What does 'great' mean? Active, safe neighborhoods? Engaging public spaces?
- ♦ c What is happening to our neighborhoods with all the new construction towering over the older neighborhoods... we no longer have any sense of a small town spirit!!!
- ♦ c What is the city's definition of "identity and sense of place"
- ♦ d 'welcoming and Inclusive' deserves its own number, apart from creativity. Need to stress racial ethnic and economic inclusion
- ♦ d A vibrant economy: ours is plenty vibrant too vibrant, in fact. d welcoming & inclusive we are too big to continue this. g. Diversity of housing types we can't build our way out of this.
- ♦ d Add to it. On the surface we appear to have this trait but our lack of diversity and our real action do not represent Boulder well!
- ♦ d Boulder is NOT welcoming
- ♦ d Boulder is very welcoming and friendly, but not very inclusive with new folks. if we want innovation to surge here, we need to attract a more diverse population to tap into all that creative talent
- ♦ d Can you clarify how inclusivity relates to a compact community? How do you rectify these opposing values?
- ♦ d Could be defined more
- ♦ d delete
- ♦ d Ensure that inclusion is for everyone, not just those that believe the same way as everyone else
- ♦ d I think that the culture is just about right.
- ♦ d If we are going to be vibrant in 20 years we must make Boulder a welcoming, exciting and affordable place for young professionals. Look at what some other cities like Portland have done to attract young talent. We are too baby boomer oriented!
- ♦ d Include as much thinking as possible. This does not seem to happen.
- ♦ d Inclusivity for income as well
- ♦ d need to insure that diversity preserves core values
- ♦ d Needs stronger action toward multiculturalism, people of color, broader thinking problem solving, embracing creativity from larger populations, etc
- ♦ d not inclusive with respect to income necessary to live here
- ♦ d not so inclusive unless one has money/status/power and/or are progressive in action & politics

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ d Not the purview of the government
- ♦ d Remove the word "inclusive." For future surveys, ask citizens if the community they live in is "inclusive" or "exclusive" and ask them how they want it.
- ♦ d Seems to be trying to cover a lot of different bases. Is the inclusivity pertaining to race, class and LGBTQ issues? Is the creativity and innovation regarding methods of creating the inclusivity or is it referencing a commitment to a culture of creativity and innovation in general terms?
- ♦ d Should address diversity of cultures and ethnicities
- ♦ d Should include income, ethnic and racial diversity
- ♦ d Sounds good, but vague and subject to very divergent interpretations
- ♦ d Still a high priority for this one. Still need to develop diversity without increasing density.
- ♦ d The creativity that I have see so far is out of bounds and flies in the face of common sense
- ♦ d The elitists needs to be reminded of "a welcoming and inclusive community"
- ♦ d This goal, while fine by itself, is really at odds with goal a.
- ♦ d This has happened already
- ♦ d this is a strange wording - we are not really welcoming or inclusive since literally no one who's not incredibly wealthy could ever afford to move here. the second part - creative and innovative, yes, but that seems really different to me than the first half, which we are not.
- ♦ d This is not a role of government
- ♦ d Unless boulder severely decreases its current economy this goal is impossible (esp without environmental sacrifices).
- ♦ d We are no longer inclusive - our children can not afford to live here
- ♦ d We do not need to welcome everyone, including the entire country's homeless, or illegal immigrants. Once again, moderation is required.
- ♦ d We don't want to encourage even more people to move here.
- ♦ d We have too much of the NIMBY attitude. When mixed use housing with affordable prices and small square footage projects are proposed, neighborhoods vote them down, resulting in homogenous wealthy neighborhoods. We need to welcome people of different socio-economic status into our neighborhoods. This would result in a stronger local economy.
- ♦ d Welcoming and inclusive should NOT mean we accommodate all who might want to live here. There are practical limits to population density.
- ♦ d What do we mean by welcoming and inclusive? One downside to Boulder is that it is not very diverse.
- ♦ d What does "inclusive" mean? What identities are you hoping to attract and retain?

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ d, e, g These values need to be applied to all segments of the population not just for the benefit of the elite.
- ♦ d, g see above comment.
- ♦ e A ridiculous statement which doesn't mean anything. Just say healthy.
- ♦ e Community members participate in supporting the community's goals
- ♦ e Greater focus on women's health, quality child care and preschools
- ♦ e Health and safety of CU students
- ♦ e I don't think the City or County can foster this. It is ambiguous.
- ♦ e I think that more attention should be paid to the plight of the homeless people in our city. I am sure there are people who wish that they would disappear. And also those who don't care about them. These attitudes do NOT make for a healthy community, where everyone is welcome and included,.
- ♦ e I think the individual has more responsibility to take care of his/her well-being and health.
- ♦ e meaningless phrase
- ♦ e Never saw a rat in Bldr. until 2000.
- ♦ e Noise pollution - loud motorcycles and cars
- ♦ e Not sure what that would mean, how to measure success
- ♦ e Should not be included
- ♦ e Sounds vague, needs elaboration
- ♦ e Stop the "nanny" mentality
- ♦ e This is not a role of government
- ♦ e This is ridiculously vague
- ♦ e What does this mean?
- ♦ e Why is BCH buying places 80 miles away from here? Community owned health should be for local community members.
- ♦ e, f, h Stop trying to be a 'nanny state.' Corporate greed is smothering. Mode of transportation is a choice, it can't be forced.
- ♦ f 'A vibrant economy supporting and continuously improving...'
- ♦ f 'right sizing' to make getting around easy and accessible is extremely wrong minded. Bad idea, bad planning, bad for business.
- ♦ f Be nice to recognize what the economy has: strong science (NCAR, NIST, NOAA etc) and university basis

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ f Because we are separate communities, with lots of space in-between we will continue to need larger roads. (right-sizing is not the answer to our main roads) If we build out the commercial properties which are currently vacant you will have twice as many people trying to get to their jobs. Jobs and easy access are what keep the economics of a City strong. Running huge buses which are empty all night long are not the answer. Perhaps the on-demand system with a small vehicles would work. Traffic is a huge part of Quality of Life.
- ♦ f Boulder does not need to foster additional job creation if it desires to ever get some level of control of the congestion that is rapidly diminishing the quality of life residents once experienced.
- ♦ f Boulder has a thriving economy, but much of the economic growth is hurting quality of life and the sense of place. Large companies moving in causes severe traffic and infrastructure problems, as well as driving up the overall cost of living. Chain stores ruin the sense of place.
- ♦ f Boulders economy is already big enough. If I wanted to live in denver I would live in nyc.
- ♦ f Building and Business are not welcome
- ♦ f Does this mean the invasion of big developers and big banks from Wall St.?
- ♦ f imbalance of jobs and housing are not taken seriously enough
- ♦ f Many people seem to believe that city policies shouldn't help create more jobs and therefore we should pay less attention to commercial and industrial land uses. I disagree. We must have in depth conversations about how to nurture and retain our cutting edge technology businesses, acknowledge that large employers like Ball will need to expand in nearby communities. I don't want Boulder to be a bedroom community for the rich. Even though retail and hospitality bring taxes, the jobs they provide are low wage and thus exacerbate cost-of-living issues. We shouldn't incentivize more retail.
- ♦ f means very little, reads like a high school book report
- ♦ f not necessary to say this...e.g. the influx of business commuters is killing Boulder = comes from business presence that does not really benefit the community (+ CU is enough!)
- ♦ f One could argue that 60k in commuters means our economy is vibrant enough, should we remove or downplay this one until the economy slows down?
- ♦ f Our vibrant economy is destroying Boulder's quality of life
- ♦ f see above comment
- ♦ f These values can and do contradict each other. How can it be compact and provide everything else?
- ♦ f This is not a role of government
- ♦ f This value should not dominate the others

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ f Tone down a vibrant economy - this already exists - replace with reasonable economic growth based on neighborhood input.
- ♦ f Vibrant economy needs to mean economic diversity. Right now it's become the haves and the have nots, middle class pushed out.
- ♦ f We are already overdeveloped
- ♦ f We have enough economic vitality. We'll have so much economic vitality that no one who is a real bootstrap startup will be able to afford to live here.
- ♦ f What are the defined aspects of "quality of life?"
- ♦ f what defines a vibrant economy. How is the economic strength defined?
- ♦ f,g,h All need attention
- ♦ g a and f (and h, somewhat) make g very difficult to achieve. We all know this. I don't know what the answer is, other than better mass transit to other Boulder County communities, but g seems like a pipe dream.
- ♦ g Address open space WITH affordable housing that does not compromise views of beloved open space and quality of life as in e)
- ♦ g Affordable housing and maintaining what little race and class diversity we have should be more emphasized than just 'a diversity' of housing types
- ♦ g AFFORDABLE housing for students and grad students...not necessarily "diverse," because \$800-\$4000 rent per month is diverse but doesn't help.
- ♦ g affordable housing is not important to me
- ♦ g Affordable housing should not be exempt from growth limits. Affordable housing in Boulder was voted down in the 90s but the city went ahead and exempted it from the Danish plan that had been in place since the 70's. This is flagrantly illegal
- ♦ g Agree with various housing types. Disagree with having various price ranges as a part of the community value. The market should control housing prices, not the government.
- ♦ g be realistic, let the market determine prices
- ♦ g better masterplanning of infill, and urban redevelopment is needed
- ♦ g Boulder should not densify to provide housing for a large number of new residents
- ♦ g Clarify
- ♦ g Definition of price range
- ♦ g delete
- ♦ g Diversity of housing types and price ranges is severely lacking in the Boulder area
- ♦ g diversity of housing types we can't build our way out of this.
- ♦ g Diversity of types and price ranges are disappearing!

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ g Do you really think there is a range in housing prices in Boulder? Please, no matter your rolling out the 10% affordable housing regs. for each new development, no such thing as medium income earners who own in Boulder.
- ♦ g DON't do social engineering and wealth distribution - let the marketplace determine housing placement and cost
- ♦ g Don't make me laugh, only the very well to do can afford to live here!
- ♦ g Eliminate - we seem to either get low-income housing or high-rise - what about middle class?
- ♦ g fyi: there is only one house listed for under a half-million (\$499k)
- ♦ g Housing diversity and prices are just a nightmare with the beginning thought-block that 'you can't stop growth' -- in fact, you can manage growth and what is going wrong is that we're allowing far too much invasion of yuppie-palace aesthetically stupid blah while not actually encouraging true high-density instead of just high-expense. Boulder has too good a history to let the business-greed run it all down.
- ♦ g housing is not affordable for many
- ♦ g Housing prices should reflect market value
- ♦ g Housing should allow the majority of people who work here to live here.
- ♦ g How can more high density residential be included and what are the best places? Between the Peloton and the Junction or otherwise more of the commercial spaces?
- ♦ g how can you have diverse prices when a single building lot costs over a half million dollars???
- ♦ g I am not in favor of 'affordable housing'. And I am certainly not in favor of the ugly developments such as Peloton, 29th North and the 30th and Pearl development.
- ♦ g I am not sure that this is true for lower middle class. If you are financially able there is diversity.
- ♦ g I believe in the market taking housing where it will without govt. interventions.
- ♦ g I believe that it's nearly impossible to have housing in the lower price range and still meet the other goals
- ♦ g I disagree this is a core value. I have to pay a lot of money to live here and I do not know why so many want to provide low cost or low income housing.
- ♦ g I don't think this is being achieved
- ♦ g I don't think you can have a place to live that's compact and desirable and at the same time control housing prices. It's going to be expensive. A variety of housing options is good, but they're all going to be relatively expensive. Better to accept that than to become non-compact or non-desirable.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ g I feel that there's a strong push toward the dichotomy of either traditional-family or single-person living situations; my last house was a 6-bedroom house zoned for 3 unrelated parties, and while as a college student I can't afford to live in one of the shiny new apartment complexes, splitting rent six ways was comfortable, communal, and affordable.
- ♦ g I think Boulder is and will continue to be very upscale. Efforts to provide additional 'affordable' housing are a token. Let's just face the reality. We do not need to attempt to provide more affordable housing.
- ♦ g I think that Boulder goes too far providing housing for the high income and low income families and not enough for the middle class families.
- ♦ g I worry that the emphasis on affordable house has led to high density living. This places a strain on the community and places a strain on well-being and environmental stewardship. Building more is not environmentally sound. More traffic is not environmentally sound or beneficial towards well being. We need to have stricter limits on development.
- ♦ g I would like to see this item expanded to make it to emphasize the importance of the 'maintain the middle' concept. There are already policies in place for low income housing, but it's not clear if there's currently a strategy for middle-income housing.
- ♦ g If developers of condos are continuously allowed to pay the city instead of including affordable units in their buildings, there won't be affordable units built, except by the city
- ♦ g if you want diversity of housing, there can be more density. which would make for less people commenting into Boulder.
- ♦ g In the current housing environment, the goal of a diverse range of housing prices contradicts other values, like b) and c). It is a good goal, but we should be realistic and not sacrifice other values in order to try to get there.
- ♦ g Inclusivity for all price ranges is ultimately unattainable in a free-market society
- ♦ g it's unrealistic to have a community surrounded by open space, which drives up land values, and low cost housing.
- ♦ g Keeping a price range seems not to mesh with developing reality anymore
- ♦ g Let the free market dictate
- ♦ g Low income housing, visual impact, staying within height limits
- ♦ g Making housing affordable for a variety of incomes (especially those who do not qualify for affordable housing but are not very well-off financially) is very important. As a young professional, my peers and I find it very difficult to find housing that meets our budgets.
- ♦ g More consideration to the impact on residents in certain neighborhoods. I am a Martin Acre resident ,29 years in my home.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ g More emphasis should be put on lower income housing options based on the income disparities in Boulder.
- ♦ g more housing for low income
- ♦ g More work on affordable housing is needed
- ♦ g My understanding of this core value is that the city feels a responsibility to provide affordable housing for anyone who wants to live here. While I understand the value of diversity, in general (economic, ethnic, cultural, etc.), I also believe that people should learn to live within their means. I didn't move to Boulder until I was in my mid 40s because I couldn't afford to live here. I couldn't find employment in my field of expertise (health care) that would pay enough for me to live here. I worked, saved and planned in order to live in Boulder. I value being in a quiet neighborhood, within 15 minutes walk from downtown, where I can hike/bike right out my door and where I feel safe.
- ♦ g needs clarification and delineation of future plans/solutions
- ♦ g Needs clarity on "price ranges." Who defines that!
- ♦ g Not possible, we should buy land in the county near Lafayette and name it Boulder
- ♦ g Not real diversity or choice for "middle income" individuals (\$30-50K)
- ♦ g Price range seems high
- ♦ g Red herring - i.e., nobody really wants it to any significant way - just look at the opposition to having affordable housing in specific neighborhoods
- ♦ g Remove from list - oxymoron
- ♦ g rent prices need to be regulated at some point, it is difficult to be a working class person in this town
- ♦ g See above comments
- ♦ g Should be need based and not political and greed based. It was worded differently in the past.
- ♦ g Strengthen
- ♦ g That doesn't seem important
- ♦ g The city government should not be in the RE business
- ♦ g There always needs to be affordable housing for low income people and family's. This has always been a struggle for me. My income has never kept up with increases.
- ♦ g there is very little price diversity currently for housing in Boulder
- ♦ g This can be achieved without excessive development
- ♦ g This has not happened and I doubt 'affordable' will ever enter the lexicon of City Council in my lifetime

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
- b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
- c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
- d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
- e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
- f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
- g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
- h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
- i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan

Value Comment

- ♦ g This is doomed to fail, and Boulder will become a community of the wealthy, if we don't _reduce_ the current number of jobs per household.
- ♦ g this is in contradiction to a and b: A and B both increase the cost of housing. Choose one or the other; low cost housing OR environmentalism.
- ♦ g This is made unachievable by the other core values, such as a.
- ♦ g This is not a role of government
- ♦ g This value is even MORE important! Affordable housing is at a critical stage in Boulder. Tiny housing needs to be consider as well as the sharing economy.
- ♦ g To make single family home ownership accessible to middle class families
- ♦ g Too much emphasis has been placed on low-income housing
- ♦ g Truly affordable housing, not Boulder affordable...
- ♦ g Trying to control real estate prices is a recipe for disaster. The market controls prices, and the local governments shouldn't artificially create 'affordability'.)
- ♦ g We have enough rental property now. We are getting too much high density housing.
- ♦ g we just moved here and there are only expensive housing options
- ♦ g We need more diversity in housing options: smaller price points, smaller square footage, greater choice in locations of such housing.
- ♦ g We need to do a much better job providing affordable housing
- ♦ g Where is the affordable housing?
- ♦ g While the recent increase in apartment/townhome dwelling is heartening, the diversity of price ranges in both city and county is only relative and does not attract young, first-time homeowners.
- ♦ g you've taken this as meaning build more houses, you are destroying boulder by continuing to build houses instead of making it easier to build businesses
- ♦ g, d Too much population density already. Too welcoming to homeless.
- ♦ h "Right sizing" was a fiasco
- ♦ h Accessible to all parts of town; rail transit to other towns; NOT "right size" streets
- ♦ h An emphasis on the most environmentally- and people-friendly modes of transportation with separated bike lanes and, perhaps, electric car charging lanes is more evolved (perhaps in the future, teleportation platforms :D).
- ♦ h Bicycles need to be licensed and not allowed on sidewalks
- ♦ h bike lanes are adequate today, education of cyclists and adherence to state motor vehicle laws is lacking

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ h cars are a reality that are truly unwelcome but necessary for workers, seniors, and commuters....accept and accommodate such
- ♦ h City doing a poor job with vehicular traffic. People need to get to work!
- ♦ h Clarify
- ♦ h consider complimenting this goal with 'respecting' traffic : bikes and skateboards (especially student concentration areas) do not follow the law = lack of safety for all
- ♦ h County needs much better access to non car transportation
- ♦ h delete
- ♦ h Discourage commuters to Boulder, reduce traffic
- ♦ h Encourage private and nonprofit transportation modes like Via.
- ♦ h Even MORE important now. In-commuting to Boulder has drastically changed Boulder and its traffic in the 30 years I have lived here.This is a difficult issue that has to do with affordable housing, public support of transit systems and the desirability of Boulder.
- ♦ h H should include 'safe.' (I do not feel safe on a bike much of the time due to being right next to traffic.) Also 'consistent.' For example, I would like to see RTD routes covered 24/7. The Bike Park on Valmont has no service after 7 pm or on Sundays.
- ♦ h Having different modes of transportation is great but you are not going to get people out of their cars, the right sizing that you are doing is only pushing cars on to other streets. Not a good idea.
- ♦ h How about eco passes for all Boulder residents?
- ♦ h How about that vote to give RTD money to build a rail system through Boulder? Where's the leadership on that?
- ♦ h I believe in increasing bike paths but the Folsom plan was and is a disaster
- ♦ h I believe that currently the idea is to to put a the highest value on bike transportation which does not serve the needs of a vast majority of the population. Families, seniors, people who cannot afford hi tech biking gear which is necessary in inclement weather are not served by this skewed value. I do not see efforts in making car, bus, or senior/handicapped transport a value in the community.
- ♦ h I walk every day in Gunbarrell and NEVER see anyone on the RTD
- ♦ h I'm all for all-mode transportation. However, the street system is already too small due to the amount of people in Boulder now. Reducing roadway space, like the newly installed bike lanes, is really ridiculous. I would hope the planners have better foresight moving forward with any other 'ideas' like that one.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ h If this has any relationship to the debacle of bike lanes, poles, paint and elimination of car lanes on Folsom, then this needs to be revised to emphasize that cars are still the major mode of transportation and that we need to make getting around in a car a priority
- ♦ h If this means 'right sizing', I am not in favor.
- ♦ h In order to enhance the all-mode transportation objective, we need to consider nominal taxes/fees on alternative modes.
- ♦ h instead of 'all-mode' how about 'improved'
- ♦ h Interests of a tiny minority should not supersede the interests of the vast majority
- ♦ h It is unsustainable for 60,000 people commuting into the city because they cannot afford housing!

- ♦ h It's failing. Traffic in Boulder is getting quite bad.
- ♦ h more low and middle income housing but not ugly box type housing that is presentinly being built.

- ♦ h Need to adjust transportation to eliminate rush hour commuting traffic jams through much greater use of mass transit - including additional bus routes to facilitate more direct access to shopping and cultural venues within the City and from outside the city
- ♦ h needs a lot of work. bus lines have been reduced instead of expanded
- ♦ h Needs clarification.
- ♦ h Needs more thoughtful ideas. We are not all bicyclists!
- ♦ h needs to include detail about spending wisely, not just creating projects to please some ('right-sizing' bike lanes), only to spend twice to correct the mistakes.
- ♦ h Non-car options need to be emphasized. If more people are going to move into Boulder to minimize in-commuting, then there need to be better bike/bus infrastructure and fewer cars. The number of cars on the street is already reaching saturation.
- ♦ h Not for the elderly!
- ♦ h Not so many bike lanes on road. Separate bike paths are better.
- ♦ h Put Folsom back the way it was. Aging people are not going to ride a bike, and there is enough room in the bike lane that was already there. Other cities have better bus schedules.
- ♦ h realisitc and researched changes, as opposed to the current 'Right Sizing' bike fiasco

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action
 - c. A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces**
 - d. A **welcoming** and **inclusive** community, with a culture of **creativity** and **innovation**
 - e. A **healthy** community where people's well-being is supported
 - f. A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
 - g. A diversity of **housing** types and price ranges
 - h. An all-mode **transportation** system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone
 - i. Strong **city and county** cooperation to carry out the Plan
-

Value Comment

- ♦ h Recognition that all-mode transportation cannot include favoring one mode of transportation over another - e.g. making it difficult to drive in an effort to increase bike-riding. I support the use of bicycles and public transportation. Having lived in many urban areas where I did not have a car, I have a great deal of experience relying on public transportation/walking to perform all of my daily tasks. Boulder is not, nor will it ever be, such an area and it is irresponsible to create a situation where it is inconvenient, indeed extremely difficult to drive.
- ♦ h regional rail transportation continues to be a major setback - buses don't work effectively outside of dense urbanized areas - example, getting into Denver from the Gunbarrel/Niwot area
- ♦ h Remove from list - a joke
- ♦ h Running huge buses all around the City vacant at night is not the answer. Perhaps, having on-demand service is better for the environment. We need larger roads and not right-sizing our main thoroughfares. Boulder has to be looked at as if it was an island, with only 6 bridges, or compared to Cities which are built along a river (which don't have bridges). 95% come from only 180 degrees. This is unique to most of the cities in the front range. With the exception of Co Springs and we all know how much traffic they have.
- ♦ h Sounds good but what are the details
- ♦ h STOP TRYING TO MAKE IT EVEN MORE DIFFICULT TO DRIVE A CAR IN BOULDER. Many people don't want to bike. The bus system is not practically useful. Stop playing at social engineering!
- ♦ h taking away car traffic lanes is idiotic
- ♦ h the bus system is terrible - not convenient- doesn't go where I want to go
- ♦ h The city of Boulder demonizes cars! This mode of transport is necessary for many people, especially the disabled, seniors, those who have to live out of the city & county of Boulder because of cost.
- ♦ h The emphasis on bike transit is a little excessive in Boulder. Bikers seem to operate without regard to traffic laws, and additional 'rights' would only further exacerbate this bad and unlawful behavior.
- ♦ h There has been significant growth and it is very difficult to get out of town. I believe more needs to be done in the county to limit growth and increase transportation options.
- ♦ h This is an impossibility in the short or long term.
- ♦ h This is not a role of government
- ♦ h Too much focus on bike transportation. We need a plan that's more considerate of adverse weather.
- ♦ h traffic problem is horrible

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.5: Are any of the core values in the above list no longer important, or in need of clarification/modification?

Value

- a. **A compact community surrounded by preserved open space**
 - b. *A community that practices **environmental** stewardship and **climate** action*
 - c. *A place with a unique **identity and sense of place**, with great **neighborhoods** and **public spaces***
 - d. **A welcoming and inclusive community, with a culture of creativity and innovation**
 - e. **A healthy community where people's well-being is supported**
 - f. **A vibrant economy based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths**
 - g. **A diversity of housing types and price ranges**
 - h. **An all-mode transportation system to make getting around (with or without a car) easy and accessible to everyone**
 - i. **Strong city and county cooperation to carry out the Plan**
-

Value Comment

- ♦ h Transportation. Boulder is not doing a good job of planning for parking. Street parking is becoming more crowded (and frustrating). Traffic is getting worse and I don't see those issues being addressed.
- ♦ h We don't need a traffic lane devoted for bicycles when they make up less than 1% of trip miles!
- ♦ h What we have experienced with 'right sizing' shows a blatant disregard to the voice of the people. It is also discriminatory to older individuals who can not bike on a regular basis to and from things in below zero weather!
- ♦ h Where is the Light Rail System we all paid for the last 11 Years???
- ♦ i city of Boulder dominates county planning
- ♦ i City Concil should not be as domineering
- ♦ i Clarification - it is the cooperation of everyone in the city and county - not just the council
- ♦ i I don't know what this is or what this means. Does this give them the authority to do whatever they desire?
- ♦ i I don't know what this refers to, specifically
- ♦ i I don't see this in practice, I see a great amount of strife between the city and county!
- ♦ i I think this needs to be broadened to regionalism. With 60,000 in-commuters, we need to go beyond country boundaries.
- ♦ i If only to say I am not clear how/why there is a difference
- ♦ i Include community input
- ♦ i Remove from list - a joke
- ♦ i should listen to county residents, their wants, needs desires. The commissioners only support the city.
- ♦ i Should read "Strong city, county, RTD, school district, university and business cooperation..."
- ♦ i The City of Boulder should no longer be bound by Boulder County authority regarding land use decisions affecting property in Area III.
- ♦ i The University is such a large and powerful presence, it should be included in plan and somewhat controlled by it. Individual citizens should also be included now, since so many question who the city and county planners represent.
- ♦ i This is not a role of government
- ♦ i This process seems to only include the City of Boulder as if it is the only 'City' in the county. This is reflected in the way this program is being advertised in this survey. Other cities and towns within Boulder County need to included as part of the whole process and brought on board as equal partners. This is not clear from the way this survey is being carried out.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 First Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ A city that puts reasonable limits on growth (such as limits on building size) to preserve its suburban identity and quality of life
- ◆ A clean well kept city.
- ◆ A community that promotes openness in spite of having a circle of friends for 30 years.
- ◆ A community that welcomes people of all ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds
- ◆ A comprehensive, non-criminal justice focused approach to addressing homelessness in the Boulder Valley
- ◆ A government responsive to the community
- ◆ A less dense community
- ◆ A safe environment to live: fire, police, medical care. Environmental standards that promote stewardship of the ground we live on.
- ◆ Aesthetics
- ◆ Affordable housing
- ◆ Affordable housing for the middle class as well as lower class, and by this I mean HOME OWNERSHIP not just rentals
- ◆ Allowing people to live without county intrusion.
- ◆ An all-mode transportation system
- ◆ Attention to the natural beauty/wildlife
- ◆ Attention to the needs of the elderly and disabled
- ◆ Attracting young families
- ◆ balance towards self contained (local economy)
- ◆ Better access to ultra high speed internet.
- ◆ Better Roads!!
- ◆ BIKE LAWS. Decide if bikes are to be treated as cars and therefore subject to traffic rules or pedestrians using the sidewalks and crosswalks. It is difficult for drivers(and dangerous for all) when bikes never stop at lights or four way stop signs and its difficult for pedestrians when there are bikes on the sidewalk. If we chose to give bikes all the benefits of cars, then there needs to be enforcement of the rules of the road.
- ◆ Clean, palatable drinking water
- ◆ Commitment to communal support and development where everybody is treated with respect and all dialog is open and supportive
- ◆ common sense
- ◆ Common sense
- ◆ COMMON SENSE and COOPERATION: not proceeding with controversial projects that half of the community objects to.
- ◆ Compact indeed - observe daily traffic jam, 60,000 vehicles in/out daily
- ◆ Concerned council
- ◆ congested hurried traffic and rude drivers
- ◆ decent acoustically-competent mixed low and middle income housing in the 28-30-baseline-iris corridor

- ◆ Development to accommodate the growing population in boulder
- ◆ Discourage developers
- ◆ diverse housing
- ◆ diversity of social-economical backgrounds and levels

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 First Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ♦ Diversity of wealth, race and culture.
- ♦ Do not attempt to force people out of cars, it's unrealistic
- ♦ do not create a town where only the wealthy can live.
- ♦ education
- ♦ eliminate Boulder creating a municipal electrical system
- ♦ Equitable Outdoor recreation
- ♦ Expand carefully the geographical boundaries of the City of Boulder to allow growth with reasonable cost of living.
- ♦ Finding a way to adequately house more people could help with some of the goals of raising the quality of life here by inclusiveness, reducing commutes, and practical environmental stewardship.
- ♦ fire adapted or wildfire preparedness
- ♦ Fiscal responsibility of city and county government in regard to current residents
- ♦ Fiscal responsibility
- ♦ Fund Public schools
- ♦ Government staying out of private citizens lives and their property rights
- ♦ Growth
- ♦ Historic Preservation
- ♦ Historic preservation as part of 'great neighborhoods'
- ♦ homeless problem needs to be addressed. Not a good look for this town
- ♦ housing
- ♦ Housing
- ♦ I do not wish to sound insensitive towards homeless people, but I do not travel along the boulder creek bike path with my child anymore. The profanity and drug use by them is intolerable.
- ♦ Immediate attention to the horrible roads, which should be paved to rid potholes, rather than patches that disintegrate shortly after being patched.
- ♦ Improve car traffic flow
- ♦ Improve small business environment
- ♦ Improve traffic congestion
- ♦ include Boulder city located in Gunbarrel area in connecting services to BOulder City.
- ♦ including protecting wildlife and habitat
- ♦ Increased attention? I think everything has adequate attention already. Don't fix what isn't broken.
- ♦ Incremental development of small parcels rather than large projects by one developer
- ♦ Infrastructure
- ♦ j. A regional center of outstanding educational, scientific, and intellectual development
- ♦ Keeping the community intact and not allowing such new growth as to offset the neighborhood climate.

- ♦ Land use compatible with environment
- ♦ leadership in government
- ♦ Leaving out buildings that block our natural back ground
- ♦ Limited growth
- ♦ limiting growth
- ♦ Limiting growth commercial & residential
- ♦ Lower sales tax.
- ♦ Maintain current building height limits

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 First Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Maintain the infrastructure, such as sewer, roads, public buildings
- ◆ maintaining the current character of the city and resisting densification.
- ◆ Maybe Council members and county commissioners should be required to ride only bicycles for all trips, year round
- ◆ More access to open space for humans on hiking trails
- ◆ More consideration for the aging population
- ◆ More diversity
- ◆ More housing for employees
- ◆ More inclusion
- ◆ More park and green areas within the city. What is happening to our pocket park funds
- ◆ More senior friendly
- ◆ More single track trails for mountain biking
- ◆ Multiculturalism, especially with the Mexican community.
- ◆ open space
- ◆ outlying subdivision infrastructure
- ◆ Panhandlers/Homeless
- ◆ pedestrian access and safety
- ◆ Positively support places of worship, or by removing, or exempting, adverse ordinances.
- ◆ practicality over ideology
- ◆ Preservation of mountain views
- ◆ preserved 'inner' space, to actually preserve 'compact' communities.
- ◆ Preserving the feel of rural spaces in Boulder County
- ◆ Prudent limiting of job growth and overall population
- ◆ Put quality of life ahead of growth
- ◆ Rail transportation to Boulder
- ◆ realistic goals given the # of students and commuters coming into and leaving each day
- ◆ Really DO Actions that address climate change, not just talk
- ◆ recognition of county residents
- ◆ Recreational opportunities
- ◆ Reduce growth
- ◆ reducing poverty
- ◆ reduction in automobile traffic through Boulder
- ◆ Reduction of overcrowding
- ◆ Remember we don't all travel by bikes
- ◆ Removal of snow from city/county streets
- ◆ Residential height modification
- ◆ Respect for neighborhoods
- ◆ Respect the property rights of individuals.
- ◆ respectg all people
- ◆ respecting buildings heights rules
- ◆ retail outlets found only outside area
- ◆ reversing many recent city council decisions including removing vehicle lanes from Folsom
- ◆ Right-sizing - continue correcting Folsom where needed, and delete doing anything to Iris, 55th and 63rd.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 First Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Roads and traffic signals
- ◆ Safe environment
- ◆ safer biking routes from Gunbarrel
- ◆ Safety
- ◆ Safety/Crime prevention
- ◆ See above about education.
- ◆ Services for the homeless.
- ◆ Single family home ownership accessible
- ◆ Slow down commercial development to stop the growth of in-commuting. We can never build enough housing for 60k, though we should do things like convert unbuilt commercial zoning lots to residential where opportunity exists.
- ◆ Slow down economic growth.
- ◆ Small town feel
- ◆ snow safety -- clear all streets
- ◆ Socio-economic diversity in housing.
- ◆ something is incompatible with my browser, I can not make a selection above.
- ◆ stop further development or at least severely curb it
- ◆ Support for ageing
- ◆ Support small local Business
- ◆ Supporting Locals
- ◆ Take cost of implementation into consideration
- ◆ taking care of existing infrastructure
- ◆ The aging
- ◆ The homeless situation is getting worse....word on the street is it is because of legalized marijuana. I have been directly affected by an increase in the homeless population due to the location of my property.
- ◆ This is a feel good evaluation. Non of this is truly Happening
- ◆ too much traffic
- ◆ traffic
- ◆ traffic accommodation - 63rd to 75th Arapahoe east s/b a 4 lane
- ◆ Train/rail service from Boulder to Denver
- ◆ transportation
- ◆ Transportation to and from Boulder, frequent and cost-effective and conveniently located.
- ◆ UNIQUE LIFESTYLE
- ◆ Vehicle congestion and pollution
- ◆ Very limited density increase
- ◆ Wildlife protection

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 Second Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ A place with unique identity and sense of place, with great neighborhoods and public spaces
- ◆ A vibrant economy
- ◆ a welcome inclusive and creative community
- ◆ accumulate more open space
- ◆ Act like you live in the desert and limit the waste of water and fuel
- ◆ Affordable housing
- ◆ Affordable housing
- ◆ Affordable housing
- ◆ Arapahoe 75 to 287 s/b 4 lane
- ◆ Attention to children's welfare
- ◆ Basic city services like fixing pothole and snow removal, rather than City Council science fair projects or national/international issues.
- ◆ Changing the way we vote for City Council, I don't know the details but, I believe Bob Greenlee had some very valid suggestions.
- ◆ Cheaper Mass Transit
- ◆ Citizen input
- ◆ common sense over ideology
- ◆ Control of the university's flood-threatening misdevelopment of 'south campus'
- ◆ Control the county tax assessor
- ◆ De-densifying housing
- ◆ Do not force ideologies (e.g., environment/climate) on residents.
- ◆ Do something about the cable TV monopoly.
- ◆ Educated, practical leadership
- ◆ emphasis on basic municipal functions
- ◆ encourage growth to the east of the city, there are lots of cows out there that could be replaced by people and high density housing. Leave the city alone as it is now. The city refuses to deal with the reality of cars and the high density occupants who occupy them
- ◆ Equality
- ◆ Exceeding the goals in the current climate plan calendar / Municipalization!!
- ◆ Family oriented, not student or professional
- ◆ Find ways of controlling growth
- ◆ housing
- ◆ Housing
- ◆ Housing - affordable
- ◆ Housing affordability
- ◆ housing will become more expensive...accommodate it
- ◆ Improve quality of health by sponsoring drug and smoke free initiatives and ordinances
- ◆ including embracing diversity and many cultures
- ◆ Increase condominium inventory
- ◆ Increased police and fire fighters
- ◆ Infrastructure maintenance
- ◆ k. A city that actively seeks the richness or racial and ethnic diversity
- ◆ Less traffic
- ◆ Light rail to Denver

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 Second Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Maintain parks, rec centers, pools and libraries and even expand libraries
- ◆ Maintaining the spacious, small town-like character of the city
- ◆ make outside of new buildings match the surroundings
- ◆ More traffic lights on 63rd to accommodate the increasingly large population growth.
- ◆ Neighborhood schools.
- ◆ No "right sizing"
- ◆ Noise and light pollution
- ◆ observe height restrictions, e.g. daily camera site
- ◆ open space
- ◆ public places, quality design
- ◆ reduction in high rise housing developments
- ◆ respect for people & property.
- ◆ Resolve issues related to homelessness and the sense of safety in public spaces
- ◆ Respect for the community
- ◆ restoring height limits of 35 feet
- ◆ See above about people of faith.
- ◆ Seniors - we don't all bike
- ◆ stop granting variances to new building (size, height, setbacks) with no exemptions
- ◆ STOP TRYING TO MAKE IT EVEN MORE DIFFICULT TO DRIVE A CAR IN BOULDER. Many people don't want to bike. The bus system is not practically useful. Stop playing at social engineering!
- ◆ Stopping growth before the place sucks
- ◆ stopping job growth we have too may
- ◆ Taxes on property too high
- ◆ The cleanliness of the streets
- ◆ too many festivals and events
- ◆ too much construction (density)
- ◆ Traffic
- ◆ Traffic- management and planning
- ◆ Transportation improvements for cars
- ◆ ty,

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 Third Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ A community that honors diversity of culture, race, and socioeconomic status.
- ◆ A community with resources to move people from homelessness and joblessness to being productive members of the community
- ◆ A healthy community where people's well being is supported.
- ◆ A place with a unique identity and sense of place with great neighborhoods and public places
- ◆ abandoning the utility initiative
- ◆ Address issues of police department with too many officers feeling above the law with DUI's, Shooting Elks, Tipping off suspected pedophiles.
- ◆ Address the constant impacts of developments in neighborhoods, pollution wise and the impacts on infrastructure
- ◆ Addressing transportation
- ◆ Affordability
- ◆ All major shopping areas have too little parking
- ◆ And, of course I am in favor of protecting our environment and eliminating systemic pesticides throughout the valley and beyond.
- ◆ animal well-being (see above)
- ◆ Balance on transportation issues
- ◆ Boulder is already a special place, no thanks to you. Stop trying so hard to make it more so, and just keep it working reasonably well.
- ◆ Can we please get more taxes from Marijuana industry and put them towards our schools and open space and climate goals?
- ◆ car traffic is horrendous and bike solutions aren't the answer
- ◆ Changes in zoning to allow for better housing options
- ◆ clear thinking
- ◆ control job growth as job growth results in more cars, and more residents
- ◆ control the bicyclists instead of giving in to them; protect pedestrians
- ◆ County-wide all-mode transportation system
- ◆ Create new tech jobs
- ◆ Ease of use of the infrastructure: the current program seems to be making almost every aspect more difficult to use (i.e. roads, energy, water, sewage, communications)
- ◆ education and enforcement of cyclists vs. traffic laws - safety needs to be a priority
- ◆ Education focus
- ◆ environment
- ◆ Forget Boulder municipal power fiasco
- ◆ Honoring set-backs, minimizing height variants, help keep the City from being boxed in. Be flexible with the current businesses which are located in Boulder. Slow down future commercial growth, we need to see what impact Google will have. Make sure that all new buildings will have plenty of parking for workers and visitors.
- ◆ housing supply
- ◆ Increased attention to improvements in areas outside the city
- ◆ Increased cultural opportunities
- ◆ Kids' services
- ◆ law enforcement on roadways.
- ◆ Less sirens

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.6 Third Priority: If the community values that you feel are in greatest need of attention are not listed above, please type in below:

- ♦ License bicycles
- ♦ Lower Taxes
- ♦ Maintenance of present town
- ♦ mantaining Boulder's small manageable size
- ♦ More teen projects similar to Boulder County youth corps/meaningful volunteer activities for youth. Free adult ESL classes to help immigrants assimilate.
- ♦ Not blocking the views of the mountains by big new buildings
- ♦ Police who live in and are from the neighborhoods that they police. No more militarized cops driving SUV's and shooting elk in our yards!!!
- ♦ Preserving open space!!
- ♦ Progressive Housing
- ♦ property taxes have gotten unbearable
- ♦ public spaces
- ♦ Subsidy for community RTD eco passes.
- ♦ Support for the goals
- ♦ The 3rd one above was moved over to address the lack of racial diversity here rather than the innovation & creativity, which I think is well on it's way in the private sector.
- ♦ The Gunbarrel community has become extremely overcrowded and the new housing proposal for the land by Twin Lakes will be destroying our community and wildlife habitat.
- ♦ The upgrading of neighborhood services
- ♦ Traffic planning via road networks DESIGNED FOR CARS, as a first priority, not bikes
- ♦ transportation
- ♦ Transportation
- ♦ transportation system but not based on bicycles please
- ♦ Urban density.
- ♦ We are an aging population - this is still a city for the young
- ♦ We need a community college within the city, not all the drive to Longmont, and the county should sponsor one. Not everybody can, can afford, or wants to go to CU
- ♦ We need increased consideration of how we treat the bears and other wild animals

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? (OTHER)

- ◆ 30th/Pearl area is awful. That kind of thing should never be allowed in Boulder
- ◆ building too much
- ◆ Depends on if 301 passes. At that point, we'd all be insane by association.
- ◆ Growth
- ◆ Housing prices are crazy. Traffic is actually becoming a problem.
- ◆ It is a very difficult place to live without a lot of money, which I see as a problem and a pity
- ◆ It seems like Ballot Question 300 and 301 needs to be decided before this question can be answered.
- ◆ Municipal power is wrong-headed
- ◆ our community is already wealthy, this will drive the future in many ways
- ◆ Overdevelopment leading to overcrowding of city; does every empty lot need a building? Miss the unique, smaller-town feel
- ◆ The City is headed in the wrong direction
- ◆ There needs to be better city/county cooperation and input
- ◆ We would like to see more independence of thought and governance between the county and the City of Boulder. The issues of the state of the community and its general direction are not inclusive of the other governments and sentiments within the county. Its lopsided toward a reactionary form of response to increased population and urbanization. We are not for sprawl, nor are we anti-growth, but this approach to growth and use of resources is not 'smart'. Moreover, we continue to blunder along.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Right direction	(1) Boulder seems to have a strong tension between wanting to have affordable housing and wanting to limit growth. Boulder is a very desirable place to live, based on all of the points in The Plan listed above; if Boulder continues to restrict residential growth, housing prices will continue to rise above the rate seen in other nearby communities. I think that the Boulder planners need to address this dichotomy and not continue to act like we can meet both goals simultaneously. (2) We really need a disruptive solution to transportation. (Disruptive in the sense of a disruptive technology; something that is a big change that improves on the status quo.) This will address both the traffic problems and environmental goals of the city. For example, one solution might be to charge a very high fee to be able to drive in the city. Another might be to bury some of the main roads. Another might be to shut down a large percentage of roads to private motorized vehicles. Of course we would need to create a source of income from such a change and then pay for better public transportation - buses, taxis, etc... - that would compensate for the commuting that people now do in their cars.
♦ Right direction	All appears good except "right-sizing." Folsom is bad enough but Iris will be a disaster as it is the only east-west route on the north.
♦ Right direction	All of the above values are excellent and I think people participating in the city and county help maintain this direction. Good job.
♦ Right direction	Allow guided growth and development instead of becoming a 'walled garden.'
♦ Right direction	Although I don't find modern architecture and design aesthetically please, I think it's great that there is new development throughout the city. I also think it's important that the community embraces and invites the growth of tech start ups.
♦ Right direction	Although I understand that increased population is inevitable, I am concerned about density and traffic. I prefer a less dense city. I like to travel by bicycle but with all the development of apartments that could add 2000+ residents in a matter a few blocks - Boulder feels too congested. The bike paths even feel more congested and slow my commute to work with the increased users that are not well educated on path etiquette.
♦ Right direction	Attracting businesses like Google to Boulder is important for long-term viability of our community.
♦ Right direction	Becoming a little exclusive with combative people
♦ Right direction	Boulder is becoming extraordinarily exclusive. Soon the only middle class folks living here will be retired folks who bought their homes years ago. It is becoming a gated community (this is especially true in Boulder and Louisville).

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Right direction	Boulder's economy for the past few years has indicated that Boulder is staying cautious but correct in most of its planning. As long as Boulder doesn't try to be on the 'cutting edge' of virtually everything, or doesn't try to do something it isn't prepared to do, it seems to be heading the right direction.
♦ Right direction	Folsom bike path is wonderful! Keep it!
♦ Right direction	I am proud to be a Boulderite. I would like more cycling options for transportation--safer commutes, access for mountain bike recreation. I would like more buy-in from my employer on environmental stewardship. I would like more health programs--similar to what the city offers to its employees.
♦ Right direction	I believe Boulder should grow in height and density - close to Boulder Junction
♦ Right direction	I believe that it makes sense to allow some additional growth. Any residential or business growth must be balanced with expanded parks/open spaces and the addition of transportation routes to support the growth (e.g. more multi-purpose paths).
♦ Right direction	I believe that market forces are generally guiding the redevelopment of Boulder. For example, the EADS building at the corner of 28th and Canyon was just one (of many) good examples of old, ugly buildings that are very visible, in prime locations that needed to be redeveloped. There is no historic loss to this community by allowing that to happen. Boulder is a desirable place and the structures should be allowed to reflect that as the market allows.
♦ Right direction	I believe the free market system should control the three items listed above. The city should set their rules and NEVER vary from them. That solves problems as developers would know NEVER to ask for or push for an exception.
♦ Right direction	I do feel there is a vocal minority that is trying to push Boulder to be less inclusive – preserving the community for them – which I feel goes against the true principles of our community.
♦ Right direction	I feel that Boulder is a great place to live, but that there needs to be better cooperation between the city and county. There needs to be a slowdown in the amount of apartments. I understand the need, but haven't we met that yet? Are we building future density slums? I think this is very possible and the infrastructure is NOT keeping up. The county roads are in terrible shape, but everyone uses them.
♦ Right direction	I highly encourage Boulder City to continue the effort towards operating their own power company.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Right direction	I love living in Boulder. Notice I suggested one new value as you can see above. In line with that value (safety from hazards).....Please be vigilant about hiking trails. It took the city longer than acceptable to repair damaged trails due to the floods of Sep 2013. Even other trails that weren't damaged by the natural disaster still need good inspection and repair for safety. I know some spots that people can cause people to be subjected to a serious injury or even death. The inspectors have to be aware of the fact that people would hike those trails not only during the dry season but also during winter time. Two spots that come to my mind right now are 1) Mount Sanitas on the east side of the loop and Gregory canyon about 2 miles up from the trailhead. Thanks.
♦ Right direction	I love the development that is happening, especially in places like East Boulder where it previously was industrial area. I think pushing the industrial spaces out a little more makes sense to make more room for housing, coffee shops, restaurants and shops--places people utilize everyday.
♦ Right direction	I think some smart growth is good. By that I mean sort of 'new urban'--housing near transit centers and shopping, so neighborhoods can develop and you don't need a car to do everything. I have lived here 35 years and I agree the traffic is getting annoying, but I don't think that should mean no growth. I don't want Boulder to just become wealthier and older with little opportunity for younger people and families to move here, and no opportunity for people at the lower end of the economic spectrum to live here.
♦ Right direction	I'm getting concerned that I will be priced out of Boulder.
♦ Right direction	In general Boulder is being a tech hub and I like how modern the city is becoming. I am excited for the new West End Pearl!
♦ Right direction	It has lost its warmth of neighborhoods and people who are interested in promoting or fostering basic human interaction. I encounter more people interested in matters that pertain to their own indulgence.
♦ Right direction	I've lived in this area for 37 years, went to school at CU in the 90s, lived in Boulder proper for 15 years, and bought property here 5 years ago. I could not be more proud of the direction I see Boulder heading in - I love everything about our home town. I do think it's critically important that we raise our focus on Boulder's communications infrastructure - building, maintaining and evolving a next generation internet, wireless and mobile infrastructure will enhance our way of life, increase our current prosperity, and improve our competitive position as a magnet for high-tech business moving forward. This is the future, we can embrace it in our uniquely Boulder way.

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Right direction	Let the free market decide what is right and what is not. Not the city council which is completely out of step with reality because their heads are stuck in the clouds of idealism. The market will balance out any concerns of the city council.
♦ Right direction	Let the free market prevail with housing.
♦ Right direction	More investment in the recreational artery of Boulder Creek would be welcomed. Extending the development of rock cutouts and patios along the creek path to the east where the creek calms and is safer to tube would be great. This could be combined with perhaps a parklike entrance at Foothills and Arapahoe welcoming people in to Boulder through this transportation artery. I would add that a regular police bike patrol along the path would be a welcomed public safety measure as this is currently a main artery for the homeless from east to west.
♦ Right direction	My biggest fear about our community is that as it trends towards more wealthy folks and homogenous population, people will build bigger houses, taller fences and there will be less interaction among residents of the city. I worry about the loss of our all-inclusive city vibe.
♦ Right direction	My concerns are more in the area of consistency in the application of the rules, specifically where residential housing heights are concerned. One year, a radical accommodation may be granted, the next year a more reasonable one is denied. I understand that the nature and politics of the planning board change, but something in the nature of precedent has to be established and observed. There is also the matter of where middle-class people are to live in a nearly no-growth environment.
♦ Right direction	My family and I are humbled and very grateful to be in Boulder, CO. It is the greatest city on earth in my opinion!
♦ Right direction	No growth is not an option, smart growth is
♦ Right direction	No.
♦ Right direction	Population is growing; we can't ignore it
♦ Right direction	Stopping growth will not help the community's economics or the jobs to housing imbalance
♦ Right direction	The cost of living is too high for students
♦ Right direction	The Front Range has been undergoing major changes in the past 10 years with growth (as people move here), and the resulting impacts on transportation, housing, economy etc. In some ways, the reactions I've heard among neighbors in our neighborhood has been to not want any change, particularly if it's different from past e.g. bringing in affordable housing. There needs to be more awareness of the changes and that we have the ability to manage our future.
♦ Right direction	The one major drawback is the county's decision to not live up to their responsibility to pave county neighborhood streets
♦ Right direction	The preservation board has seemed to aggressive on saving buildings

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Right direction	There are too many unsightly, modern apartment/condo units that clash with the old character of Boulder. Established communities are far too expensive to buy into for those of us making \$125,000. Small homes and condos that might be attainable are generally in extremely poor condition. Low-income housing has grown in north Boulder, but the middle class make 'too much' to buy these.
♦ Right direction	Transportation is huge issue with 50,000 workers commuting into boulder every day.. We need more housing in Boulder.. I'm not opposed density and height near transportation hubs. Right sizing Folsom does not add any net benefit (the bike lanes before were good and somewhat safer) to the transportation issue.. Some of the SMART standards adds to costs, although I'm pro sustainability.. The city taking over the power plant is crazy idea. I think other complaints I hear are the serious difficulties in dealing with the building and zoning departments.... There should be more flexibility and practicality in dealing builders and owners... Square foot requirements are a case in point, especially in the county.. Large parcels remain undeveloped and turn into a weed invested eyesores because size restrictions. Some environmental requirements are not practical.. For example, the Eldora Ski Resort expansion.. This resort is such a huge asset to the area so we need to keep it viable.. Loud and active groups have undo sway in political decision making..
♦ Right direction	Value mixed use, 10 minute neighborhoods, compact development, alternate modes
♦ Right direction	We like living in Boulder and find it to be a very family-friendly community. Would be nice to have a little more racial diversity here.
♦ Right direction	We need density with affordable housing, but with better designs than current 30th Street corridor - people need nature out the window/door - good design can combine nature with densitu
♦ Right direction	We need to move forward. There are definitely areas of town (like Boulder Junction or the core student area of The Hill - between Bway and 9th and College and University) that can handle more dense development and population and potentially even taller buildings. Let's focus on these relatively few areas that can support Boulder's growth and work to stabilize the existing family neighborhoods.
♦ Wrong direction	"Historic District" coercions! Various height exceptions. Housing expense=the equivalent of a gated town.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	1. If police are wearing combat boots, bullet proof vests and driving around in tanks, they distance themselves from 'their' community. 2. When do we cap growth? When it like NYC? I was born here in 1979 and the place totally sucks compared to how it was. If you build anything else then cars will have to be banned (truly progressive thought)... There seems to be a disconnect between over development and traffic, crime and other social issues. Growth must stop sometime... NOW is good!
♦ Wrong direction	As a long-time Boulder County resident, I cannot recall a bigger rush toward growth. In fact, it was quite the opposite as quality of life was defined by an appreciation of 'space', not just 'open' space. Just because Boulder is surrounded by open space does not mean we cram as many people into town as possible. Why the rush to add population and its inherent downsides?
♦ Wrong direction	As a native of Boulder, I've watched it change from an eccentric, blue-collar hippie town into a wealthy, snobby place. While I'm a strong supporter of open space and dense urban development, and while I believe Boulder is at the forefront of having municipal policies that benefit the environment, I think that the current state of Boulder and where it's headed is creating more pollution and less diversity. As a young professional, I make too much money to qualify for affordable housing, yet I can't afford to buy a house or condo in Boulder. My work requires me to commute all over the Denver metro area, so I don't have the option of using bike lanes or public transportation. I find that Boulder's efforts to slow down traffic in order to encourage alternatives to driving only creates more congestion, thus more air pollution. Boulder's affordable housing program is set up so that those who qualify won't make money on home ownership; a patronizing way of keeping the poor segregated from the rich, and making it so that only the rich can make money if they are to sell a house in Boulder. Additionally, as Boulder has become more wealthy and elitist, it has lost any kind of community feel. I've never felt welcome in Boulder and I'm seeing fewer reasons to stay.
♦ Wrong direction	As aq Boulder native, it saddens me to see Boulder sell out to corporate interests and encourage overcrowding thru high occupancy building of low quality both aesthetic and materially
♦ Wrong direction	Becoming another big city with tall buildings, cavernous streets, overcrowding, inability to move cars across the city rapidly in order to prevent traffic tie ups and pollution. Using open space for recreation instead of conservation.
♦ Wrong direction	Both the city and county are continuing to promote growth and economic development at the expense of quality of life. Traffic is outrageous because of the increased population.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder has become over populated with traffic congestion and crowds. The mood of people has changed from friendly to distant. I see road rage at least once a day. Pieces of land that separated housing and being developed at a steady rate. Quality of life has definitely deteriorated.
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder has changed from a large town to a mid-sized city - with a corresponding feel to it
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder has lost its charm. All the modern new ugly buildings, it's no longer the lovely place it once was.
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder is becoming overcrowded and is losing its character
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder is becoming overcrowded and overrun by east and west coast mentality and smacks of corporate greed
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder is being built up too much. There are too many new buildings, and too much traffic coming along with them. Everything in town seems to be crowded these days.
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder now looks like any place anywhere. Congestion is bad and seems to be getting worse all the time
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder, California is not the town I moved to, 36 years ago. It is snobby, rude and pricey.
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder, like the surrounding communities, is not doing a very good job of dealing with sprawl and the expansion of strip-malls and big-box retailers. Though Boulder is doing better than places like Broomfield and Westminster in this regard, more could be done. When I moved here I loved the fact that there was no Wal-mart, no Home Depot, no Target, etc. Now we have all three. So the town 'sold out' to three big-box retailers, which in my opinion was in direct contrast to the core value of a 'unique identity', and now we are getting ready to 'sell out' to Google... We are going in the wrong direction.
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder's become overcrowded. Driving's become a nightmare. The new high-density housing is UGLY.
♦ Wrong direction	Boulder's neighborhoods are becoming increasingly unaffordable and/or unsuitable to families with children, particularly families who actually make their livings within the city limits. A small and decreasing number of our teachers, public employees, etc. can live here with their families in a single-family home that is not surrounded by over-occupied student rental housing, especially within walking distance of our downtown.
♦ Wrong direction	Building downtown is obstructing views. Spending on new projects focuses on the few, not the many. We need to spend more time maintaining what was good, not creating new projects just to fix them later with more money.
♦ Wrong direction	City Council has limited operational skills. Boulder's image is unique but not in a positive sense. We must stop population growth, which leads to greater density, transportation problems, and higher taxes.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	Congested overdevelopment and intentionally designed traffic congestion to dissuade car usage
♦ Wrong direction	Council is too interested in growth and fixing the world's problems. Should focus more on Boulder's issues. Also need more thought before action; e.g., swapping auto lanes for bike lanes.
♦ Wrong direction	County should FIGHT for RIGHTS of unincorporated citizens re: municipalization. The county is not a city.
♦ Wrong direction	Creation of jobs are an essential part for improving the prosperity for the common good. Annex additional land for development. Provide density of housing in core areas.
♦ Wrong direction	Current priorities are not consistent with most current residents
♦ Wrong direction	Developers and money interests are influencing the City Council to a disturbing degree
♦ Wrong direction	Development has been given priority with no sense of Boulder's beauty and sense of place. The Daily Camera development on West Pearl is one egregious example of sacrificing the whole Pearl Street experience. Another example is what looks like an intentional decrease of parking spaces, especially in the downtown area. How can this be good for the small businesses there? It discourages local use of the downtown area.
♦ Wrong direction	Feels like a lot of recent building and growth that was not well planned for in terms of infrastructure
♦ Wrong direction	Formerly a peaceful community, there is now too much crowding, too much traffic, a city/county government that allows too many traffic-congesting events, and a less friendly populace.
♦ Wrong direction	Have not addressed transportation issues. Traffic in Boulder is too jammed.
♦ Wrong direction	High density development creating congestion and pollution; county not taking responsibility for roads; city trying to take over utilities in county
♦ Wrong direction	Housing affordability is not improved by building luxury apartments Regarding density, focus should be on people density, not building density Hollowing of middle class in Boulder will drive out the younger workers in our community Emphasis on climate action needs sustained attention
♦ Wrong direction	I am greatly disappointed in the large, high occupancy buildings that have gone up. This takes away from the 'hometown' feel, the view! and increases the already stressful high volume congestion within our city. Along with no preferred shopping, I prefer to just drive a few miles outside the city limits and have a much more pleasant experience.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	I am writing this before the election. I am sad and angry that the Pomerance crowd is using misrepresentations, personal attacks and fear to get support for their narrow, divisive and exclusionary ideas. I love my neighborhood and I don't believe evil people at the City are trying to ruin it. There are all kinds of neighborhoods here with lots of options. Not everyone wants (or can afford) a yard and a picket fence, but there are still a lot of this type of housing. I moved to Holiday condo from a 4,000 SF home on open space and my quality of life didn't degrade. The Council needs to SLOW DOWN; with a new major policy every meeting there is no time for reflection to look at interconnections, root causes and long term consequences.
♦ Wrong direction	I did not vote for densification. In all my years in Boulder I have never had the opportunity to pay less than half of my earnings on rent. I did not even qualify for low-income loans or houses. Nobody built me a house. I see neighborhoods of low income home ownership that stagnate because there are no income limits once somebody is in a home. Why would somebody making a lot of money move out of a really cheap house when he/she/they don't have to. Thus the need for affordable housing never goes away. This is the reason for the need for new affordable housing. If people moved when they were financially able the houses and condos would be used by new upwardly mobile families. Furthermore, everytime we build affordable housing under this stupid scenerio it just jacks up the already over inflated housing prices elsewhere in town and county.
♦ Wrong direction	I don't want to see large blocks of large builidings ala 30th Street and Pearl Parkway. I don't like the boring and ugly downtown buildup blocking views and crowding out nature in the downtown. Somebody has an agenda to fill up all downtown spaces with higher/denser buildings. This is repugnant to me. Let the downtown breathe. Keep open space ala parking lot on Northwest corner of Spruce and Broadway as is.
♦ Wrong direction	I get the general feeling that we are moving towards being ordinary. We'll have the same chain stores and restaurants you can find anywhere else. My brother lives in Amherst and came to visit and commented, 'Boulder is like one giant strip mall.' I am also downright depressed about the housing situation. I'm a tenured professor and I can't afford to buy a single thing in this town. I pay rent in a crappy condo ran by an even crappier HOA with outrageous fees and my rent goes up constantly. I have no renters rights and my condo is so inefficient I just live in my winter coat instead of wasting the carbon emissions on heating my place. I'm ready to take my business elsewhere like everyone else my age (33) and move to Lafayette/Erie/Louisville.
♦ Wrong direction	I hate all the gigantic building, especially downtown (where Camera used to be) and Transport Village on 30th and Pearl

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	I have lived here 16 years and now I can hardly get around town in my car. I bike a lot too, but if I have to drive, it is getting unbearable. All I see is Lexus, Mazarati, Tesla, Audi. It is just money, money, money moving here. Not much left of old Boulder...
♦ Wrong direction	I have seen the community become less friendly, community oriented and laid back over the last 10 years. Also, the rate of growth, development and destruction of housing for large expensive homes is concerning.
♦ Wrong direction	I have some vague sense that the character of Boulder is changing, and it doesn't feel like it is for the better. Also, I have and hear from others a concern about the ability of people who do not come from means or have a highly paid career to live in Boulder long term.
♦ Wrong direction	I hope you actually read this and plan to do something about it. I have lived here over 40 years and am badly shocked and very angry at recent actions by planning board and especially the city council. It's like 'Animal Farm' here, with the so-called environmentalists imposing their will on the citizens, who have no voice except at elections.
♦ Wrong direction	I see little input from the community outside of the Boulder area. Boulder appears to make decisions which affect the surrounding areas without input from those residents their actions impact
♦ Wrong direction	I stated earlier about my concerns about high density living. It is changing the character of Boulder in a negative way and increasing traffic and pollution. If we want to keep Boulder great and maintain its unique characteristics, we have to protect those characteristics. Growing Boulder by another 10,000 or 50,000 or more residents will forever ruin the great balance of small town living coupled with art, culture and business. We have to recognize that there exists a size limit that when surpassed, our way of life cease, and we will just be another suburb of Denver.
♦ Wrong direction	If large companies are going to be courted and welcomed here, the location of their facilities MUST be chosen better than putting Google in already the most congested place in town. I agree it's good for the economy, but it can be good for the economy on a different street/area of town.
♦ Wrong direction	If we care so much about the environment and climate, why are Boulder houses so large?
♦ Wrong direction	I'm concerned about the amount of growth in the city because there doesn't seem to be any discussion about how to mitigate the increased traffic. At some point, Boulder will reach capacity with how many people can live here and how many buildings the city can sustain.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	I'm deeply disappointed that building on the former Daily Camera site obstructs the views of the Flatirons from that part of the mall. I thought height restrictions were supposed to protect our views. I also disagree with the decision to force landmark status on that bungalow; its historical significance seems low to me. If the city or neighbors want to protect the property, they should buy it.
♦ Wrong direction	in my 15-year tenure in Boulder, I've seen elitism run rampant and the 'younger' class of residents shunned ... especially by open space programs
♦ Wrong direction	Increased office space and commercial development have led to increased traffic congestion and loss of views of the Flatirons. We are destroying what makes Boulder so special.
♦ Wrong direction	It is not feasible to force a large percentage of people to give up cars. Public transportation is not an adequate replacement for most people. Instead figure out how to accommodate cars and keep the streets and parking lots in good repair.
♦ Wrong direction	It seems that Boulder is becoming more and more a place where only people with a significant amount of financial resources can live here. When moving here in 2002, I thought it was difficult finding housing in Boulder. Unfortunately, I feel the housing has become more challenging, less affordable options for individuals living and working in Boulder who have been a part of the community for some time.
♦ Wrong direction	It seems that the developers' agenda dominates. All change does NOT have to be 'growth.'
♦ Wrong direction	I've lived here for 40 years and the emphasis on development with disregard to height limits and traffic, auto mitigation while doing so is not in line with the comprehensive plan. Disregard for water limitations, and the affects of air, sound, light pollution is out of sync with our responsibility to think beyond the 1950's model. We must become more innovative. Look to Denmark, Germany for some ideas.
♦ Wrong direction	Many of the new developments are too tall, blocking the view of the Flatirons and are so close to the street that there is little landscaping
♦ Wrong direction	Many people are worried about Google's massive expansion. I think most people are concerned about the high density buildings that are very poorly designed. E.g., Boulder Junction and "the blue apartments" on 28th St.
♦ Wrong direction	Middle income folks are being forced out. Businesses are squeezed in and parking is an issue. We tend to go outside Boulder to eat and shop because it is so much easier to get around.
♦ Wrong direction	narrow self interest of an elite few.
♦ Wrong direction	New developments are not well thought out (such as the transportation station near 30th of Pearl). If we wanted density we would move to Denver.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	No municipalization of electricity; too much density (transit center); traffic congestion
♦ Wrong direction	No room for lower income teachers, artists, creative folks. Too many monied people coming in a developing everything for wealthy people with high incomes.
♦ Wrong direction	Not enough attention to daily needs of the community. Too much attention to climate change (muni) and to outdoing other communities and countries in # of bicyclist-commuters. Too pie-in-the-sky. Need more balance between reality and futuristic thinking. I'm not Advil ting that we drop forward-thinking plans, but let's put things into a more pragmatic balance at times. I want to keep all open space, for example, but I also want more reasonable access to some of them (for varied uses), and I really don't want to spend \$\$\$ relocating prairie dogs instead of replacing sewers or fixing roads more quickly.
♦ Wrong direction	Overbuilding, growth and construction
♦ Wrong direction	People with money and power make the decisions without regard to citizen's right the happiness! Use money wisely - we're tired of your "IDEAS"!
♦ Wrong direction	Perhaps more applicable to Boulder city than the County: The city, especially the City Council, often crosses the line from maintaining Boulder as a highly livable city to trying to make Boulder 'precious', with it's own electric system (a national environmental issue, not a city one), bike lanes for their own sake rather than a well thought out all-mode transportation system (I bike a lot, but also drive and bus), and going overboard with historical preservation.
♦ Wrong direction	Plan and most actions of the city are centered around CU and creating an economy and housing based on raping them on tuition and rent - little consideration for the rest of us
♦ Wrong direction	Planned changes and expansion pander to Boulder's lowest common denominator of the trendy and eco-chic (see Folsom), and merely seek to strengthen what Boulder is known for, while weaknesses are ignored
♦ Wrong direction	Recent growth such as Boulder Junction / Junction Place is excessive, visually unappealing (large blocky buildings, no green spaces) and does not fit with the character of the city
♦ Wrong direction	Redeveloping land and buildings with new modern efficient buildings is important
♦ Wrong direction	Redevelopment has come to mean "cram as much money making space into a redeveloped property as possible." I absolutely disagree. The mountain backdrop is being obliterated in many places and "the city" appears eager to add to those places.
♦ Wrong direction	Removing height limits, facilitating movement of vehicles, and increasing density are more important than preserving views of the Flatirons.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	Roads in and out of town can't handle commuter traffic. Construction blocking all routes into town simultaneously. Improve bus service to Gunbarrel. Stop throwing my tax money at the tech bubble. Marijuana and startups drive up the price of light industrial and office space so any other small business is unfeasible in the area.
♦ Wrong direction	Seemingly uncontrolled growth. Business development valued over what the infrastructure can support.
♦ Wrong direction	Seniors and parents can't ride bikes for most activities stop fantasizing that they can be made to do that. Car traffic is hideous and needs to be accommodated. Trying to build continues to be ridiculously awkward and expensive with ludicrous changing requirements. Some of the regulations are beyond intrusive, embarrassing, and ludicrous.
♦ Wrong direction	Sense of community seems less to me. There is more a sense of "us vs. them" and lower tolerance. Like to see more cultural mixing on Pearl St.
♦ Wrong direction	Should work toward ZPG
♦ Wrong direction	Slow down! Too much density. Too many apartments! Way too many potholes! Too much money spent on municipalization. Too much development. Solve housing needs in more creative ways.
♦ Wrong direction	Take care of our assets: roads, parks, bridges etc. and scrap the fuzzy values and politicians pet projects
♦ Wrong direction	The accelerating pace of housing cost will limit the diversity of housing choice which will, in turn, limit how welcoming and diverse we can be
♦ Wrong direction	The amount of new construction is overwhelming. New buildings are oversized and out of context (14th & Walnut, Lumine apts on 28th, etc). The whole notion of 'setbacks' seem to have been eliminated or shrunken so that buildings encroach on public space: sidewalks and streets (17th & Walnut, 22nd & Pearl, etc.). New houses on North Broadway at Tamarack are so close to the road that their lights at night will be a visual distraction for drivers. Expanding capacity in town naturally drives population up and traffic is awful - which cannot be solved by imaging people will ride bicycles. Parking spots eliminated on Pearl Street to put in bulbous intersections with vapid poetry on stone slabs - really? Boulder is being overbuilt by those who seize any opportunity for economic gain without thought of community quality of life and turning into a strange version of Cherry Creek.
♦ Wrong direction	The assumption is that we must increase (development, growth, economic) ever year - I question that premise as unsustainable in the long run, i.e. the next 100 years

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	The building being erected on the former site that housed the daily camera is so out of proportion With every other building on the west end of pearl. The views of the flatirons is being obstructed along That entire corridor. It does not seem to adhere to the city's regulations. Curious as to how it was approved to be constructed?
♦ Wrong direction	The City Council has aided and abetted the wholesale alteration of Boulder from the town I used to enjoy
♦ Wrong direction	The City Council seems mono-directional towards rapid growth, seemingly so there is more of a tax base for the city!
♦ Wrong direction	The city is on a path of self destruction with its liberal policies of social engineering
♦ Wrong direction	The city needs to pay less attention to developers and more to the neighborhoods.
♦ Wrong direction	The city was once concerned about pollution., traffic and population density. All of that has been thrown out, apparently for tax revenue from new apartments and townhomes and their residents. There is too much growth in population and traffic.
♦ Wrong direction	The 'community' has conflicting goals regarding development, land use and affordable housing. There is limited land in a community that is surrounded by open space, this restriction will naturally drive housing costs up, the building and development policies that drive up costs on development and construction also drive up housing costs - both are in direct conflict with the 'communities' goal of affordable housing. There will never be affordable housing if the current land use, building construction, and development regulations remain the same or are increased.
♦ Wrong direction	The community has succumbed to the greed of developers in building high density unaffordable housing. The big box structures are unattractive, have worsened traffic and congestion, and they do not address the great need we have for affordable housing. This will continue the problem of a high volume of in-commuters pouring into the city every weekday.
♦ Wrong direction	The community is DEFINITELY heading in the wrong direction.
♦ Wrong direction	The community is far too focused on growing economically population is getting to dense for space.
♦ Wrong direction	'The community' is generally fine. The city council seems to want to fundamentally change our city into a much denser place and ruining a lot of the best aspects of town in the process.
♦ Wrong direction	The 'compact' community concept is financially unsustainable with the CU Boulder campus which provides a population growth engine. A percentage of CU graduates will always want to stay and live in Boulder after graduation.

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	The condos and traffic make me want to move. It not the Boulder that I moved to. Not everyone needs to live in Boulder...
♦ Wrong direction	The current rate of growth is reducing the quality of life in Boulder
♦ Wrong direction	The densification of central Boulder is destroying quality of life. Too many permits, too much building, too little attention to the effects of this on businesses who have to rent.
♦ Wrong direction	The emphasis on "urban" development condos such as by 30th St. the Baseline Zero project is not concurrent with the Boulder family lifestyle and the extreme amount of multi unit housing is leading to over crowding.
♦ Wrong direction	The governing bodies do not listen to the concerns of the people. They seem to have their own agendas but the agendas don't reflect the Concerns or viewpoints of the people who are most effected.
♦ Wrong direction	The Historic Preservation Board, a volunteer committee, is out of control. It does not reflect the values of the community and the neighborhoods. Their mandate needs to be clarified or their duties left to the Planning Dept.
♦ Wrong direction	The leadership may be well educated - but exhibiting total lack of common "SENCE" - get real and soon!
♦ Wrong direction	The modern, high-density buildings that are going up around the city do not fit the character of the town and are changing its 'feel' and contributing to congestion, particularly around 28th/30th St. where I live. Buildings go up without neighborhood knowledge and agreement. Less affluent neighborhoods (like 28th/30th St.) are 'stuck' with the affects of these buildings. Although the claim is that high-density buildings improve housing costs/affordability, I've noticed that buildings like Boulder Junction are still very expensive and 'luxury.' I live near 28th St. because it is all that I can afford, but now I want to get away from the traffic, congestion and general ugliness of this area. I don't think the city council realizes that many people live in this area, even if it is largely commercial. We can't afford to live in beautiful West Boulder. But that doesn't mean that we don't want a nice neighborhood, too!!
♦ Wrong direction	The NIMBY, I got mine you get lost philosophy is starting to dominate

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	The number of large, ugly new buildings is just so sad. The variances for height, setbacks, etc. have changed the character of this town in irreversible and negative ways. There appears to be no badly designed and ill conceived building and no variance to the building codes that would not get approved. It is not common sense to think that adding more people, jobs, and cars to this city will yield any thing positive. I am in favor of a building moratorium, and for replacing most of the folks on the city council and various planning and advisory boards that have had a role in approving the rampant building, and transportation changes (deleting the car lanes on Folsom). The city council should focus on running the city, and drop the municipal utility idea. They have lost repeatedly in the courts, have 'borrowed' 4 million dollars from the general fund with no guarentee it will be paid back, and we are no closer to reduce carbon emissions. This is no longer the great town that it once was and those in charge seem to be following ideals (such as the stated goal of 30% of all trips in the city will be made by bike) without any sense of real life or reality.
♦ Wrong direction	The overall priorities of the last 5 years have resulted in increased traffic, noise and light pollution, severe deterioration of our streets and roads, and a shifting of the tax burden to the individual homeowner. Although we have done a fairly good job in reducing health risks from smoking, we have accepted Pot's contamination of our malls and stores.
♦ Wrong direction	The precious inclusive original community is being overrun and dominated by wealth, aggressive development folding under the influx of acquisitive shallow trendy wealthy people seeking the atmosphere created by the people who are leaving in horror . The old Boulder people are moving to Bellingham Washington, Nederland, and other places without aggressive drivers, where there are not people tearing down homes to build mcmansions and huge ugly condos that look like prisons. The old Boulder people created the atmosphere that makes Boulder desirable and the new influx is rapidly destroying it. There same thing is happening on campus with the Republican administration destroying Conference On World Affairs.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	The right-sizing mess on Folsom is an example of not respecting the community while trying to reach these goals. Boulder County and the city taking away open space from Gunbarrel in order to build mass housing on land with flooding issues while ruining the open environment cherished by the surrounding neighborhoods is an example of not respecting the community to reach these goals. Allowing developers to pay their way out of not building affordable housing within a new development is an example of not respecting these goals. Not maintaining and plowing roads creating dangerous driving conditions is not respecting the community in meeting these goals. City and County have been moving in the wrong direction.
♦ Wrong direction	The takeover of electric not for Xcel is crazy!!
♦ Wrong direction	There are now way too many ugly condo and apartment developments - Boulder is becoming ugly
♦ Wrong direction	There are too many height variances being allowed for developers. The height limit of 35' was for a reason. Also, the new designs of apartments and condos are awful, with no imagination. Boulder is starting to look like big cities with nondescript high rises.
♦ Wrong direction	There is a problem with the city staff working closely with developers. It is not objective. Example: Hogan Pancost - all Planning Board voted NO, city staff endorsed strongly.
♦ Wrong direction	There needs to be more affordable housing and more affordable retail space for small/local businesses, places that people who aren't super rich can afford to shop at. Boulder is getting far too expensive for most people. It's killing the diversity and uniqueness of the city. I've lived in Boulder for twenty years, am a homeowner, but feel like I'm being priced out of my town. I have no problems with increased population density to make this happen. I also would take public transportation far more often if there were some sort of discount for residents.
♦ Wrong direction	There seems to be a priority for high density housing. I am sure this works well for the tax base, and lowers the cost of providing services. But condo/apt living is not for everyone.
♦ Wrong direction	There's a lot of growth and development in Boulder without the infrastructure (roads, parking, public transportation) to keep up with the growth.
♦ Wrong direction	Too many high rise condos and apartments filling up every open lot
♦ Wrong direction	Too many McMansions, huge boxy buildings, in-your-face scrapes
♦ Wrong direction	Too many people, bikes and cars
♦ Wrong direction	Too many zoning exemptions, box stores, exceptions for \$\$ people
♦ Wrong direction	Too much accomidation for bicycle groups and enviorlists
♦ Wrong direction	Too much attention is being paid to "affordable." We don't need to attract more population.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	Too much business growth; high traffic, crowded city. Too many people moving to Boulder. Too desirable. The charm of Boulder is ultimately what's killing the charm of Boulder.
♦ Wrong direction	Too much density, too fast. Many do not want to see the city lose its small town atmosphere, with high-rises and high density (which results in more traffic congestion and more pollution.)
♦ Wrong direction	Too much development/big box stores. Too much yuppie, not enough (informed and intelligent) hippie.
♦ Wrong direction	Too much emphasis on "multi-use development," "right-sizing" and on approving buildings higher than 35 feet. Not enough consultation with residents and neighborhoods before approving community-altering actions.
♦ Wrong direction	Too much emphasis on building and development and economic growth rather than supporting local businesses that are already here
♦ Wrong direction	Too much growth
♦ Wrong direction	Too much growth and ugly, non-imaginative unartistic architecture!
♦ Wrong direction	Too much growth at the expense of neighborhoods. Deteriorating infrastructure.
♦ Wrong direction	too much growth without the proper infrastructure
♦ Wrong direction	Too much growth, too fast. Too much land being built on in Gunbarrel. I moved here for a nice, quiet environment and now it feels like we live in Boulder. Much too fast paced and not enough traffic flow. I'm seriously considering leaving there area because of this.
♦ Wrong direction	Too much growth; too much municipal endorsement of growth
♦ Wrong direction	Too much sprawl & buildings too large for the neighborhood. Some houses lose their private back yards, due to over sized houses next door.
♦ Wrong direction	TURN THE HORSES AROUND
♦ Wrong direction	Ugly development, blocking views, increasing traffic. Also, you can't force cycling on people.
♦ Wrong direction	Way too much building going on on every corner. Quit developing so much.
♦ Wrong direction	Way too much focus on use of government, e.g. municipalization, zoning and construction issues, right sizing streets. Need to significantly reduce city staff so they'll focus on important issues vice make work issues.
♦ Wrong direction	Way too much in-growth. I thought there was a 3-story limit on buildings? Anyway, too many large buildings are causing overcrowding and traffic. This is having a strong negative impact on Boulder's quality of life.
♦ Wrong direction	We are being boxed in. We are losing our quality of life. We are being run by people who do use Common Sense.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Wrong direction	We are overfilling the area, both businesses and population and housing. It's particularly irksome that such a large percentage of new housing is high end. I have no problem with high density affordable housing, but don't see much of that.
♦ Wrong direction	We are quickly becoming a monoculture. I feel as though I live in a gated community for the wealthy. We need better plans for growth and density within the growth ring that offer opportunities for the middle and low income households. In doing so we create a culture of experimentation and in general, a more dynamic place to live.
♦ Wrong direction	We have bad 'leaders'. Both City and County. Bad because they cannot factor the Big Picture into their mental calculations. They see minute portions of the Big Picture and pursue those to the bitter end.
♦ Wrong direction	We pay lip service to housing diversity yet the county is a no-growth county so achieving it is impossible
♦ Wrong direction	Wealthy people are moving to Boulder & trying to change it to their liking. Maybe they've already ruined the previous place they lived & are starting over here. The McMansions being built are hideous & totally changing the character of the established older neighborhoods & the character of Boulder.
♦ Wrong direction	wrong in that you emphasis growth of housing units and even reward a developer if they build more 'low income' housing... increasing the size and problems that your whole intent is obviously based on. there are no amount of bandaids 'right sizing' that will fix the obvious problem a community that has gone over the sustainable size of 80,000, Boulder WAS the largest city in the entire US without a single murder, back in 1983, and repeated that several times through the years, right up until the city hit 100,000 now murders and other crime are common. you can reverse this by buying up 'open space' on the inside of that compact community... leveling existing eye sores when an opportunity presents itself. but instead you keep building more housing instead of giving incentives to business/office space.
♦ Wrong direction	Yes Boulder Neighborhoods are under attack and is growing too much too fast. The city keeps approving tall massive dense buildings that few residents want. The city the Chamber of Commerce aggressive economic stimulus and employer wooing has created far too many jobs lead to a terrible in commuter issue with traffic.
♦ Wrong direction	you have a broken planning board that is too easily swayed & wooed by words like LEEDs. Parks & OpenSpace is too rigid on how acquired land is used. I no long support them as I can stand too see more land acquired that I can't use with my dog or bike.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	"Right sizing" on Folsom St. is unnecessary to bicycle safety and disrupts traffic flow...admit the mistake and change it back. Hiking trails on open space are essential to my support...access has been diminished to no real benefit. Keep the "purists" off the policy boards.
♦ Mixed reaction	1) Transportation policy seems fixated on bicycles. They have a place, but the reality is that most people must use a car in the 'real world'. That said, a reliable, convenient public transit system is a must, 2) Housing affordability and options need to be a higher priority. We need more rental housing (apartments) that young people can afford, not high-end luxury condos.
♦ Mixed reaction	1. How many banks does Boulder actually need? It seems every new construction includes one. 2. I don't like the building heights allowed in some places. It's not just about seeing the mountains, it's about seeing the sky! 3. Residential density is fine to a point, but too much increases traffic and pollution, and makes for competing interests of residents. 4. Boulder needs more senior/'affordable' type housing (a joke among my friends is: In most cities affordable housing is for folks who work at Burger King; in Boulder it's for folks who work at CU).
♦ Mixed reaction	1. Municipalization of power is a bad idea. We haven't done very well running a library. We simply don't have the knowledge to run a power company, even through hired managers. 2. Much gas is wasted by poor management of stoplights. One widespread defect: Left turn arrows that are too short, causing a line of cars to idle through an extra cycle. There are other less obvious cases of systematically dysfunctional light synchronization plans. 3. If people want prairie dogs as pets in their own yards, let them be responsible for keeping them there. Elsewhere, they are vermin and transmit a deadly disease.
♦ Mixed reaction	29th Street Mall redevelopment is a failure. The new housing and mixed use developments in that area are tremendously ugly. The city needs to continue to add multi use paths and work with the county and other cities to create regional connections. City needs to work with CU to get the university to create more student housing
♦ Mixed reaction	A lot of building going on that seems to diverge from Boulders sense of community. But on the other hand Open Space, etc is still being protected. FOCus should be on more affordable housing for people who work in Boulder.
♦ Mixed reaction	A lot of road projects have had to be re-done in a short time after completion, more careful planning to cut that waste (such as medians being dug up and re-made). Also, I think the re-alignment of the Arapaho and Parkway intersection is problematic (too curvy and unpredictable).

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	A major concern is over-development of neighborhood communities without adequate planning to prevent traffic congestion and under-development of support services (eg. neighborhood urgent care centers, supermarkets, etc.)
♦ Mixed reaction	A theatre group I belong to cannot afford to rent space in the parks to perform free plays for the public
♦ Mixed reaction	Again, this is a great town, but it is doomed to be an Aspen if we don't reduce commercial space and potential jobs. That's a big lift, so I can't be too optimistic.
♦ Mixed reaction	All new development needs more parking spaces - at least 2 per unit. It's only if public transport is free or very cheap that you will get people out of their cars. I don't think you will ever persuade more people to use public transportation in the snow or when it is very cold.
♦ Mixed reaction	allowing commercial and residential development with insufficient parking is bad planning in my opinion. I live in the unincorporated county area and we really have stopped coming into the core areas such as pearl street for restaurants most nights because there is no where to park.
♦ Mixed reaction	Allowing the Mapleton Warm Water Wellness Pool to close without a community-wide initiative undertaken to replace it with a state-of-thart wellness center is a travesty that calls into question all of the supposed values expressed in the Comprehensive Pan
♦ Mixed reaction	Although I understand that a concentration of housing and businesses may have environmental benefits, I believe the push for development without honoring preordained height restrictions, for example, detracts from the community. It is not all about money... we don't necessarily need to keep pulling businesses into the city. Slow down the growth!
♦ Mixed reaction	Always a great place to live, but some of the newest development, especially Pearl Street east of 30th is an eyesore in our community
♦ Mixed reaction	Annual sales tax increase discourages spending for low income earners.
♦ Mixed reaction	Arapahoe past 63rd - a flawed social engineering plan, not designed to move traffic, but to get people to ride the awful RDT or a bike. Same for Folsom. Restricting fracking near residential areas - good.
♦ Mixed reaction	as evidenced by the 'right sizing' bicycle lane modification to Folsom Ave, the community reaction was more polarized and vindictive than in years past. this is a disturbing trend, and one that may have grown out of the way 'right sizing' was developed and implemented by City Council, i.e. without convincing data to show the need for such a change to promote non-motorized transportation. 'right sizing' may have set back the necessity for a better, safer, bicycle-friendly Boulder.

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	As I mentioned, we should slow down commercial/growth development to stop the growth of in-commuting. We can never build enough housing for 60k, though we should do things like convert unbuilt commercial zoning lots to residential where opportunity exists. It is not as simple as being pro development or anti development; we need to separate residential and commercial in the development discussion. We need more housing so we need policies that are pro-affordable housing and housing in general, while increasing barriers to commercial development.
♦ Mixed reaction	As much as I would like Boulder to be small (so I can selfishly enjoy trail solitude and less traffic congestion), the reality is that small is already over. Counting inbound commuters, Boulder is more than half again its stated population. The people are already here, we should make it so more of them can actually sleep here, too. I believe this, along with an effective all mode transportation system (h.) would make Boulder actually feel less crowded. This will mean a lot of higher density developments. Let's be an inclusive, vibrant, growing community, rather than a stagnant one.
♦ Mixed reaction	As property values rise, young adults and lower- and middle-income residents can no longer afford to live in Boulder. I would hate to see Boulder become an enclave for upper middle class white people.
♦ Mixed reaction	Attracting more/big employers like Google, while also allowing developers to BUY OUT affordability, makes our housing problem worse. Who serves and works for 3,000 extra residents? A bunch more commuting POOR.
♦ Mixed reaction	Awareness for the need for more affordable housing supplies has recently increased, which is good.
♦ Mixed reaction	Balancing growth with a small-community feel is difficult, but I feel too much is being directed at growth right now, at the expense of that community feeling. I'm especially disappointed by the number of variances given to big building projects (e.g. the Pearl St corridor between Foothills and 30th).
♦ Mixed reaction	Becoming dominated by upper/upper middle class folk pricing out others and homeogenous in race/class/gender expression
♦ Mixed reaction	Better access to city gov - fewer secrets and manipulation of public - the quote in Boulder re city gov: "They have their own culture over there"
♦ Mixed reaction	Better architecture regulation on new condo/apartment development, 30th and Pearl looks terrible.
♦ Mixed reaction	Better representation by area instead of city-wide voting
♦ Mixed reaction	Bicycle advocates - going wrong direction - bicycles on roads with cars - dangerous and causes more pollution for start-stop traffic - need out of road bike paths in town

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Bike lanes are great-- if people use them. I am a pedestrian, without a vehicle of any kind for the last 11 years, and more often than not, I see bikes breaking the law (unless it is designated bikes only, pedestrians ALWAYS have RIGHT OF WAY. I don't have to move for you!). Buses are great, too. When they're on time. That being said, spending tax dollars on things not used is not productive. Is it environmentally sound on the face of it? Sure, but if it isn't fully utilized, then that's not progress. Admittedly, one a priori view does not a casual relationship make, but since I have personally seen it, I am sure it's happening to others, As for diverse housing, not seeing that, either. It's either low income or high end. There isn't much in the way of medium incomes (while is the normal prices for the rest of the state). Also, it would be nice for Boulder residents to be able to enjoy the town during semester as opposed to fighting our way to the grocery store around out-of-state students...
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder has a tough problem ahead of it regarding density, reasonably-priced middle income housing, and maintaining the feel of neighborhoods that wish to do so. I'd like to see more possibilities for creative solutions that allow additional density where there neighbors agree it will not have a negative impact.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder has conflicting values. Example affordable housing vs. 3 unrelated persons enforcement, or hundreds of new apartments in Gunbarrel with very poor bus service.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder has many contradictions. The open space, by definition, will increase the land values that are able to be developed - thus reducing the possibility of low cost housing and encouraging high density/high rise 'urban' developments. The energy use rules (Offsets) allow only the wealthy to have 'luxuries' that are easily available in neighboring counties.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder has saturated its space, and the only way for more economic growth is to drive up the price of housing, cause more traffic congestion for people who work in Boulder and live elsewhere, and bring in lots of people who do not necessarily buy into the 'Boulder lifestyle' which wrecks the sense of place. While the economic growth has funded things like the downtown WiFi, and the municipal power grid and fiber internet are exciting, it's perhaps even more important that Boulder retain its sense of place. This is hard to do when most of the population has moved here in the last few years (I am included in this demographic, full disclosure) and big box stores like American Apparel drive the rent up on retail space that could be occupied by a locally owned and operated store.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder has very little if any land available for commercial or housing development within the city limits. If city limits are expanded open space lands will have to be reduced. Open Space is by far one of the most significant reasons Boulder is a desirable place to live. Without Open Space Boulder would become just another Highlands Ranch which was featured in National Geographic a few years ago as one of the worst examples in the US of the undesirable aspects of urban sprawl.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is a great place to be but it is virtually impossible to move to and from the city because of traffic in all directions
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is a tough city to develop in due to the limited remaining development opportunities as well as the community's tendency to be anti-development. Boulder is growing and that needs to be taken into consideration. Of course it is important to maintain the town feel of Boulder, but the increasing popularity of the town and growing population cannot be ignored.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is growing because so many people want to be in this great place. We have a unique opportunity to approach our growth with creative projects that utilize partnerships and resources. We need to think ahead to what a growing city needs and creatively about specific parcels of land and what they could be. There have been a lot of reaction after projects have been started and it is too late.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is headed in the right direction in its concern for mitigating our contributions to climate change (solar should be emphasized above all!) and in its efforts to preserve (and hopefully grow!) open space, but in the wrong direction with the unsustainable growth in jobs, population, and the big, ugly, overly tall new buildings which have been going up around town. The 'new urbanism' (density uber alles) ideology runs totally counter to Boulder's roots and the vision of those who shaped Boulder to be what it is today.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is starting to bring itself into the 21st century, but there are many areas that it needs to improve on. The most glaring example is the almost complete lack of affordable housing in Boulder. Boulder has always been a city where it is very difficult to live on a low or middle-income budget and that problem seems to be getting worse, not better. There are many new construction projects involving apartments, but almost all of them are too expensive for an average college-educated 'twenty something' or an average middle-income family with kids. If Boulder continues to push out these populations, it's economy will surely suffer. There needs to be a dedicated, genuine push for affordable housing.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder is still a great place to live. The idea of a cultural plan is very good. A City owned utility company is also a great idea. Housing is getting so expensive that it is making Boulder a very exclusive place. A way to allow young creatives to afford to live here and contribute to the vibrancy of the community will go a long way in keeping Boulder a dynamic place to live. Traffic is a challenge, though I don't think more and wider streets is the answer. Environmental stewardship and encouraging business that fits into the community are important issues that didn't make it into my top three list, but ultimately are just as important as transportation and changing housing codes to accommodate more density and more affordable homes, but you only wanted three listed in the important issues column above.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder needs to find ways of reaching community consensus on solutions and leverage more innovative ideas of its members. The community seems to be driven by factions pushing their own interests. We need leaders who can help us all to find common ground and common purpose. The city should find ways of taking more advantage of the start up and business incubator talent in our community to solve some of our most challenging problems.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder seems to be losing its historical past - caused by tear down/build up the TOD, charging for use of roads, too much development, high traffic
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder should put more programs in place to keep/attract low to mid income populations to balance the influx of wealthy white populations. All income levels are needed in any given city to create a healthy multiculturalism, reduce commuting (traffic, pollution, parking), strengthen the local economies by having a local work force. Boulder right now is becoming too much of a rich person's town. A benefit of BVCP is preserving open space making Boulder more desirable. That's great. However, Boulder cannot let the economic market dictate who can afford to live here without threatening our other goals e.g. B: environmental stewardship, D: welcoming, inclusivity, and I: cooperation with the rest of the county, (for example. Erie, Longmont are becoming Boulder's suburbia, with rapidly sprawling housing developments, associated traffic, congestion, lack of charm, lack of identity.. We cannot claim to have those value goals when we dump our housing problems on the next town.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder Valley is a complex place, with some trends very positive and some concerning trends. For example, the abundance of homeless is a public nuisance. Boulder is a wealthy community with pleasant weather much of the year, so homeless make a rational decision to be here. And Boulder made a well-intended but self-defeating decision to build such a luxurious homeless shelter. Which attracts more homeless. Which strains law enforcement since homeless seem disproportionately prone to enforcement actions. So what is Boulder to do? Also, for example, Boulder Valley is a stunningly beautiful place to live and the community has done an outstanding job of preserving beautiful land.
♦ Mixed reaction	Boulder wants to have a vibrant growing economy. To his end wealthy interests are building and over developing the city and I feel as though in many cases it's 'get rich quick' development by companies that are exploiting the dive in head first, never think things thru spirit that Boulder sometimes has. Boulder is beginning to look more like Beverly Hills than Burlington, VT. At the same time Boulder wants to be a small town surrounded by open space where small business can thrive and there are no big buildings. Meanwhile the massive corporation Google is setting up shop in Boulder. We want to have our cake and eat it too. Boulder was not made great by being super rich. While having money is important to the community, it's the poor and middle class folks that have made Boulder what it is (or was, not too long ago).
♦ Mixed reaction	City Council focus on wealthy as ideal resident is wrong. More support for neighborhood community events needed.
♦ Mixed reaction	City council is very reactive. The moment anyone starts screaming, they reverse course.
♦ Mixed reaction	city council spends too much time and \$ on issues that have nothing to do with improving the city
♦ Mixed reaction	City is getting too crowded. Downtown parking lacks. Identity is changing from diverse and interesting to homogenized and plain.
♦ Mixed reaction	City/County leaders need to get back to basic LOCAL issues and services: fire & police protection; sewer and water; streets and sanitation. Too much time and money are being spent on trying to be a national model for environmental issues that should be addressed at much larger (state & national) levels.
♦ Mixed reaction	Congratulations on being in Resilient Cities program - and thanks to staff who work so hard on that! And THANKS for superb flood planning -- which worked far better than people think and then flood recovery.... But, no more yuppie chalets with arcs and official facade-jumble boredom... We look more and more like Anyburg, now, with such dull and repetitive urban blah, while we lose distinctive and historic character to the Gordon Gecko Chamber of Gimme.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Decrease in parking yet increase in events and businesses without significant improvement in the public transportation system. However, I do appreciate the focus on cycling options.
♦ Mixed reaction	Desirable development is being hamstrung by unrealistic affordable housing requirements. I believe in growth restriction, but it makes affordable housing unobtainable.
♦ Mixed reaction	Despite an already laborious process for getting projects approved, recent design is often ugly, boxy, and industrial-looking. This is because developers want to maximize their square footage, but it means there are no peaked roofs and the streetscape isn't pedestrian friendly. I realize that the comprehensive plan isn't intended to address this, but it is why there is so much push-back from the general public.
♦ Mixed reaction	Difficult to say where things are going as there are so many developments that will bring many changes that we may not be able to anticipate to the city. For example, incoming car traffic to and out of the city has changed a lot, and where is this going?
♦ Mixed reaction	Do not believe buildings over 2.5 stories should be built. Mountain views are critical to ALL residents and visitors. No Xcel in county.
♦ Mixed reaction	Drop right sizing and municipalization. Allow short-term rentals. Expand roads leaving Boulder.
♦ Mixed reaction	Encouraging homeless and panhandlers to come to Boulder is out of hand. I have been told it because of too much government assistance compared to other places Getting uncomfortable to walk on creek paths and mall (especially at night)..
♦ Mixed reaction	Environment, Environment, Environment. I feel that boulder is a rather special place and my most important goal is not to destroy that via development at the cost of any of our parks or openspace.
♦ Mixed reaction	Environmental buzz words -- climate action, sustainability -- being used to undermine quality of life
♦ Mixed reaction	Everyone cannot live in the city of Boulder, whether it be because of cost or other reasons. But we can take steps to make all residents of the county feel a sense of place and ability to enjoy the benefits of living in this beautiful place.
♦ Mixed reaction	Excessive building.
♦ Mixed reaction	far too much dense housing without any more streets/parking/traffic control - the surplus of cars in this community are making it a nightmare to get around - more people without dealing with this serious problem will bring everything else to its knees
♦ Mixed reaction	Feeling very crowded lately - traffic-wise, population-wise.
♦ Mixed reaction	Folsom bike plan could have been done better. Small interest group is forcing through their agenda.
♦ Mixed reaction	Forget developing Hogan/Pancost.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	From an architectural standpoint, most new construction is boring. The amount of affordable, truly affordable housing is pathetic.
♦ Mixed reaction	Getting people out of their cars is good, but biking isn't a serious option for many as the population ages.
♦ Mixed reaction	Great community but we lack diversity due to cost of living
♦ Mixed reaction	Great intentions. Actuality not always on par. Need greater affordability and common sense at times!
♦ Mixed reaction	Great parks and open space, but seriously bad traffic and a reluctance in the community government to improve cycling infrastructure
♦ Mixed reaction	growth and economic development are certainly an important factor in the overall well-being of Boulder and its residents. Care needs to be taken to ensure that the CHARACTER of Boulder is upheld through this process. Neighborhoods, parks, affordable housing and office space so that the people who work the backbone jobs (teachers, health practitioners, store attendants, cleaning people and small local business owners) can still live a quality life amidst the increasingly upper income folks.
♦ Mixed reaction	HATE the redev. East 30th on Pearl. Feels confined as a thoroughfare, buildings too close to road - very unpleasant. And don't like "right sizing" except good on Baseline.
♦ Mixed reaction	Hate those ugly buildings at Boulder Junction. Was frightened by the prospect of dense vertical 'development' at Baseline/27th/Moorhead. Would like to see Martin Acres remain modest single-family communities and support enforcement of limited # unrelated residents there and elsewhere in South Boulder neighborhoods so that young families aren't forced out by rising rents/prices. On the other hand, renters themselves need stable neighborhoods with good services. Perhaps it's too late to do much for those households of modest income (I'm not talking about the homeless and truly poor) but re- zoning and new development should not be undertaken lightly.
♦ Mixed reaction	Have not seen enough affordable housing, especially non-low income housing
♦ Mixed reaction	Historic preservation should be the option of the land owner. If the city believes the property is important enough to preserve it should purchase it at fair market value. City should continue experiments such as right sizing, but more slowly and with solid data.
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing and property taxes are getting ridiculously expensive. I like the Folsom St. bike lane improvements, that matters to me a great deal.
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing for a single person in Boulder is nearly impossible. I make too much to buy a 'permanently affordable low income home' but not enough to make the payments on a 'middle income home'.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing is a challenge in Boulder. I am a school counselor and it is very difficult to work and live in the same community. This is true for many people. The growth is impacting the quality of life-North Boulder is very different from 20 years ago. I'd like to see more limits to these developments. Very pleased with the city emphasis on kids, environment, community.
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing prices are rising rapidly, making it difficult to find an affordable home to rent or buy. At the same time, once-empty and wild areas are now being developed into additional housing. It's unclear whether this will be a sustainable solution. While I've seen some great transportation and public works projects wrap up, there are still many areas inaccessible to bikes/peds.
♦ Mixed reaction	Housing prices have dramatically increased due to great demand, pricing many out of Boulder. Additionally many public lands are being closed to public recreation in essence making them city/county owned private land. Public land should be public within reason.
♦ Mixed reaction	I am all for growth but we need to be more diverse. We need housing for lower income. The service industry needs to be able to live here too.
♦ Mixed reaction	I am concerned that the city's ability to maintain focus on the plan is getting compromised by the fiasco of its involvement in attempting to take over providing utilities.
♦ Mixed reaction	I am in favor of supporting economic growth which draws additional people from surrounding areas to join the Boulder work force. Often proposals to accommodate increases in road usage and housing costs seem to focus on residents of the city, creating incentives and cost proposals which will not address the rising issues. Increased transportation options to surrounding areas seems significantly more likely to reduce the pressure to either live within Boulder or drive than simply adding fees, reducing parking options, or providing a bus pass that is unlikely to be used.
♦ Mixed reaction	I am much encouraged by the new apartment developments in Boulder. I would like to see more use of neighborhood schools to help promote community and also promote walking and biking to school, instead of driving across town. Ditto for work commutes: live close to work! Has Boulder City or County considered eco passes for all residents?

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I am not in favor of Boulder trying to become its own power utility. XCEL is one of the greenest power utilities around and we don't need to recreate the wheel... we need to partner with them. I am also concerned that the council was so quick to move forward on the single lane proposal that included IRIS. There are very few east/west streets and it is NOT an environmental advantage to create more stop and go traffic...especially when there are so many bike paths and side streets available to our bikers.
♦ Mixed reaction	I am not in favor of growth; I am in favor of maintaining height restrictions; I am not in favor of municipalization; I am in favor of fixing the roads and streets (for example, make all manhole covers flush with the pavement; expand Baseline eastbound at Cherryvale into 2 lanes--one right turn and one left turn; add an additional lane on Foothills Parkway, northbound connecting Arapahoe on ramp to Pearl street off ramp)
♦ Mixed reaction	I am particularly concerned about out-of-town speculators buying up our neighborhoods and profiting from flipping and turning them into big profits.
♦ Mixed reaction	I am pro growth, but disturbed about the amount of building and road construction going on all at once. It is difficult to get around this city.
♦ Mixed reaction	I am proud to live in Boulder. I am generally happy with where the City is headed but worry about all of the rapid growth and development happening near Pearl St (including the handling of Google).
♦ Mixed reaction	I am somewhat disappointed that Boulder has either abandoned or created so many variances on height regulations. Now the downtown seems like every other city of its size. You used to be able to see the mountains from everywhere. Also, the latest developments all seem to be eyesores, with architectural style derived from post-WWII European designs, bland, modern, and completely out of sync with the idea of keeping Boulder from becoming bland and impersonal.
♦ Mixed reaction	I appreciate the ongoing support for the arts and education, and the city's recycling/zero-waste work. I am concerned about affordable housing. I also think there is a lot of low-hanging fruit to reduce carbon emissions, especially in the rental market.
♦ Mixed reaction	I believe that commercial growth downtown is allowing developers an opportunity to degrade our natural beauty (i.e. the old Camera building replacement)
♦ Mixed reaction	I believe the need to grow by adding housing is very important and should focus on neighborhoods where more single family houses can be built and not on adding more high density apartments. I believe Boulder County (and maybe the city) are very slow to respond to developer's (and private builders) plans.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I came to Boulder from NJ almost 8 years ago. I have seen a lot of development and increases in real-estate prices during those 8 years but even with the rise in cost of living and increased 'traffic', I still think it is comparably cheaper with a higher quality of life compared to many east and west coast cities. For this reason, I think it will only continue to be a place where people want to live. Whether the 'natives' like it or not, we're all going to have to learn to live with it and keep Boulder great. After going through the building permit process for a small business I'm starting here, I don't think the city's building and planning department is properly staffed to deal with the volume of work that is coming through their doors.
♦ Mixed reaction	I consider myself a moderate when it comes to most issues and I find the city council leans too far to the left on many issues
♦ Mixed reaction	I do believe Boulder need to and will have growth, but it needs to be regulated and well thought out. We do NOT need more buildings over the height restriction.
♦ Mixed reaction	I do not think there is enough focus on public education. I disagree with the stricter dog regulation in open space - it in some ways makes confrontation more likely.
♦ Mixed reaction	I don't like that new development is turning us into a large city. We are losing the feel of Boulder. While it has also grown and changed we're starting to burst at the seams. Our economy is good, we have highly educated and creative people here. Let's pause on the overgrowth and pay some attention on our aging infrastructure and maintaining the core personality of Boulder for while. It might help our discussions and plans for the future if we're not arguing while development is in process. We'll stand out across the country if we don't jump on the bandwagon of super sizing into a city model.
♦ Mixed reaction	I don't like the current initiative to take over energy from Xcel.
♦ Mixed reaction	I feel concern over how much growth and development is happening, and how expensive it is to live here becoming an even more prohibitive factor for diversity

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I feel that people that are from here are being pushed out financially. Housing is way too expensive. I grew up here and I can barely afford to live here. I am lucky that I was able to get into affordable housing or else I would not be able to live here as a single person. I also don't feel that I should have to live with roommates just to be able to live here. I am a professional in my late 30's and I don't want to live with others. My mom had moved away for some time and now has moved back to be close to me can't live in Boulder. She does live in Boulder county, but her rent is a strain on her fixed income. She was a teacher and has a nice retirement, but it is difficult to live comfortably. There would be no way for her to even purchase a small house in the county. Even the affordable houses that are for sale are not for people like me since I barely make enough to buy a condo. I feel that Boulder had become elitist and the people that are making the decisions have not been in the this town for very long. I do enjoy certain aspects of Boulder, but there are many that I really don't like. I would like to see more diversity here, but since it is so expensive it is not attractive to those of lower incomes.
♦ Mixed reaction	I feel that the city of Boulder is getting too dense and crowded.
♦ Mixed reaction	I generally like the design of developments that have happened in recent years (in North Boulder, around the 29th St Mall, and to a lesser extent, in the industrial zones on the eastern half of the city), and I especially like the added amenities like the Valmont Bike Park. I'm less of a fan of the construction noise, traffic disruptions, and sidewalk closures of the Pearl St/downtown-area redevelopments, as these are in my neighborhood and negatively affect my life at least during their current phases, which seem to be never-ending. (I may have a chance later in the survey to comment on this next topic, but if not, I'll say it now: I really hope we get a municipal utility to provide 100% renewable/clean energy for our city.)
♦ Mixed reaction	I have a hard time understanding the comments by city council (and the county commissioners) for the urgent need to address climate change while at the same time, allow for mansions to be built, but fight the tiny house movement. I also don't understand the fight against AirBnB, which helps provide needed income for many to make their housing more affordable in the community. (Behavior is not believable). Also, I live in North Boulder and have never been approached, until this survey, to contribute input to the North Boulder Community plan and I don't know of anyone in our area that has been asked, so I'm curious where the feedback is coming from?

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I like that the city is making efforts to set aside some new construction multi-family housing to be affordable, however I don't like that builders have the option to buy out of having affordable. The money from the builders is supposed to be used by the city to build more affordable housing but I don't think that's actually what the money is being used for.
♦ Mixed reaction	I like the direction as far as environmental and healthiness goes, but I hope we don't get to the point that young people can't afford to rent here. Youth must be welcome!
♦ Mixed reaction	I love Boulder and consider it my home. I have lived here for 19 years, and it fits our lifestyle perfectly. However, the cost of housing and lack of availability both of rentals and residence to buy seems to me that our community is heading in a direction where everything in town is occupied by renters, short-term renters, or the extremely wealthy and I do not like what that is and will do to our community at all.
♦ Mixed reaction	I love what we are trying to become in some areas: biking mecca, open space friendly, conscious of environment. Areas of improvement: real estate prices create gentrification (feels like a white town).
♦ Mixed reaction	I observe that Boulder is getting more socio-economically stratified. That each community layer cares about preserving 'their' Boulder, but that the groups don't generally mix.
♦ Mixed reaction	I really appreciate how hard City staff work within a very divided community with strong opinions. Good luck with this plan. Get us off fossil fuels entirely and make sure people in the middle and low-income ranges can afford not just to live here, but to buy modest homes and support our families. Allowing more density of housing would help a lot but NEVER give in on height restrictions!!! If we can't SEE the mountains we might as well live in Kansas. Good luck folks!!
♦ Mixed reaction	I strongly feel that the living lab experiment for Iris is the wrong idea. There are many good side streets for bicyclists going East-West, but not roads for cars. Iris is the only major East-West road in that portion of North Boulder while Folsom has 28th and 30th street as well as 19th.
♦ Mixed reaction	I support a local utility; I support mass transit. I DO NOT SUPPORT the push to force bicycle lanes on us by a small wealthy elite of (often) professional riders. It is not appropriate to expect working families with small children, the elderly who still need to get around. The weather will soon prove my point!

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I support high-density mixed use development, and support for local business, small businesses as well as larger corporate campuses (e.g. Google) that support our community values. These must be done with scrupulous attention to factors that do not make it too expensive to live here, or cause undue strain on our infrastructure. (Traffic, etc.) It's a tough balance, but that's what are our leaders are elected to do. God knows I am not smart enough. Good luck.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think building size limits are good. But in general too many things are regulated. Sometimes it seems we have rules about everything.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think continuing to limit growth in innovative ways is the only way to preserve the quality of life valued by people who want to live here.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think it is hard to balance growth and increased density/population with many of the values listed as guiding values for the Plan. It is important to grow smartly, which to me means ensuring that environmental values are protected, that alternatives and mitigation is considered before decisions are made, that stakeholders are involved early and throughout planning processes, that transportation remains viable, efficient, and safe, and that the city remains 'livable.'
♦ Mixed reaction	I think making businesses responsible for their impact is vague and we need to demand more. Solar panels mandatory, water systems that use the minimum, water treatment, etc. Also the increase of air pollution is alarming -- I bike to work and cough with the car exhaust now -- I can't imagine what having more traffic and more traffic jams will do the the air quality.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think most new construction is good, and density of housing is important if we want to avoid urban sprawl. But there seems to be an increasing NIMBY attitude in the city. Real estate developers are being unnecessarily vilified.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think new growth in Boulder is okay but I'm worried about keeping that nice small town feel if we have lots of new companies come in to town like Google. However, it's good for the economy so I'm a little torn. Also, I think it will be a miracle if I can ever afford to buy a house in Boulder so I'm renting. I'd like to buy a house here since I work at CU but I think the housing prices continue to go up and I'm getting priced out. More attention needs to be given to providing some affordable housing options like co ops so that Boulder continues to have a diversity here in town.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think that Boulder has quite a challenge because it is a beautiful place to live, more people want to live here than have been able to, and it seems that some of the coming (Google) development is making the city unaffordable for many civil servants and other workers who are necessary to the function of Boulder.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I think that the pace of development has been too rapid. Buildings, some of which are quite unattractive and do not fit in with what I consider Boulder's aesthetic, are cropping up everywhere. I believe that, as in most towns and cities, developers have too much clout. I believe that neighborhoods should have more input, NOT when the project comes before CC but long before that. By the time the proposed development gets to the CC, it is usually too late for neighborhood input.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think that the traffic is horrific. The lit crosswalks in the middle of streets are dangerous and not necessary. I walk all the time, and it is not a problem to cross at a corner - you usually only have to go a short distance to cross at a corner v. a lit crosswalk.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think that we need to be very careful about the pace that we are growing. Traffic is becoming an issue and part of what makes Boulder so special is going away with a lot of this growth.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think the affordable housing office is being poorly managed and not representing the public. I don't think the city has been listening to the needs of it's taxpayers concerning their deciding to put in bike lanes on Folsom and take away driving lanes. I'm glad they are reversing it, but what a waste of taxpayer money to both put it in and remove it.
♦ Mixed reaction	I think we've gone way too far with the build smart/green building initiative. Its too expensive now to do anything, but in the same respect, if you have the money you can get around the rules! Not right.
♦ Mixed reaction	I understand smart growth, but so many tall unattractive buildings
♦ Mixed reaction	I understand that the Great Recession led to a standstill of development, and this pent-up demand is now in full fruition. But the current building boom in Boulder is too much too fast. What's more, the buildings going up are all hitting the height limit. Just because the limit of size is 55 feet doesn't mean that every development proposal needs to be 55 feet high. The historic downtown of Boulder is all 2-story buildings, and all the new developments going in are 4 stories. Who's approving these plans? Bad.
♦ Mixed reaction	I was very disappointed that the city council rolled back improvements to safe cycling infrastructure on Folsom Street. While the 'right sizing' effort was not perfect, it was a step in the right direction that could have been optimized. Somehow people who drive cars to work think it's perfectly fine for a cyclist to take detours of many blocks to stay on safe streets, but the drivers can't yield to drive a few blocks out of their way to create a safe thoroughfare for cyclists through town. And a large majority of the cars are designed to carry up to 5 people and carry exactly one person. This has got to change.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	I would like to see better facilitation among varying ideologies. Maybe more clarity/ prioritization of Values, and referencing them often better, more concise accountability/ reporting from the leaders Overall, it feels fairly controversial. I would like to see where exactly we have control as a community and what are the tools.
♦ Mixed reaction	I would prefer that we leave some lots/areas undeveloped in the city. I do not like having high density development.
♦ Mixed reaction	I'm not certain, but it seems that the infill development designs thus far haven't built in real life designs to attract a diverse population. A family may choose to live in a more dense development, but if there aren't bike garages or personal storage/sheds as part of the developments it would make it more impractical for a family trying to make it work. Are there enough green spaces to attract families? Larger visioning and design requirements and balances seem needed for the developments to achieve the goals.
♦ Mixed reaction	If we're going to be a dense (compact) community, then infrastructure and services have to be emphasized. Jobs other than service and government jobs have to develop. Transportation becomes essential. Otherwise, it's one boondoggle after another, like the lack of Council leadership on reducing Folsom to two car lanes for more bike lanes.
♦ Mixed reaction	If you want to have an emphasis on low income housing why are you so set on preventing low income shopping in Boulder
♦ Mixed reaction	Illegal over-occupancy is a problem in several neighborhoods, and these houses are used as income properties and therefore taken out of the single family/professional/ and co-op housing reach.
♦ Mixed reaction	I'm concerned about the extent and size of new construction on West Pearl Street.
♦ Mixed reaction	I'm troubled by some community resistance to things like higher density living areas, growth, inclusiveness
♦ Mixed reaction	I'm very disturbed the the 'not in my backyard' mentality of a small but vocal faction of Boulder with regards to the City's efforts to create more affordable multi-use housing stock. We need to remember that most of us are not originally from Boulder, and we should give newcomers the same sense of welcome and access to opportunities that we received upon arriving. At the same time, I feel the City tends to side with developers and often writes off legitimate community concerns for a number of development projects.
♦ Mixed reaction	I'm worried that with Google building a new campus in town and rumors of Twitter doing the same that Boulder will go the way of San Francisco, with long-term and low income residents priced out by very wealthy tech transplants.

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	In most ways, Boulder is heading in the right direction. I wish there were more affordable housing options for middle to lower income families.
♦ Mixed reaction	In my opinion, Boulder should not be so welcoming and catering to vagrants (Not all, but the majority of transients have substance abuse and mental health issues). I believe Boulder should retract the welcome mat. I know that it is a 'feel good' gesture/action to be so welcoming. However, as a parent whose teenage daughter was the victim of a rape by a vagrant three years ago, and who saw her child plummet into depression, drop out of high school and a result and be blanketed with feelings of worthlessness, it is devastating. She is still struggling to climb out of it. Please know that there can be tragic consequences to 'feel good' actions like welcoming vagrants. Please know that the homeless population commits a disproportionately large number of crimes, and this does not 'feel good' for those of us on the receiving end of the bad behavior they can bestow.
♦ Mixed reaction	In order for Boulder to remain a "welcoming and inclusive community" while still being "surrounded by preserved open space"; a "diversity of housing types and price ranges"; must be available to avoid a soulless town only afforded by upper income households with middle and low income families forced to commute if desiring to work or play in Boulder. I feel many people in Boulder would agree with this statement; however, when higher density housing is presented most seem to have a "fine, but not in my neighborhood" mentality. I think sometimes the intentions are heading in the right direction but the perceived sacrifices of making those intentions a reality can hinder progress.
♦ Mixed reaction	in regards to modes of transportation as to modes of transportation used such as bikes, and as well all services, it is my opinion that whoever is the beneficiary of a value that they will be able to use, such as bike lanes that it should be paid for by the users, That goes also for developers such as parking needs and road use etc.. e.g. If special bike lanes are provided, a user fee in the form of a license would be appropriate as motorist should not foot all the bills. User fees are a common sense to solutions.
♦ Mixed reaction	In the small picture, Boulder is heading in the right direction, in a larger context (looking at energy, transportation and housing) Boulder needs to review plans, look at future projections and effects of massive commuting and a sustainable, clean energy plan.
♦ Mixed reaction	Increased wealth in Boulder is good in some ways but decreases diversity and requires those who cannot afford to live in the city to spend more time commuting, which decreases the sense of community and increases vehicle emissions.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Increasing density without adding infrastructure is yielding increasing congestion. Transportation needs to address getting into/out-of city - many new projects have not added any additional capacity in/out of city.
♦ Mixed reaction	Individuals who are new to the community are generally open minded. Individuals who have been here for 30-40 years appear to be exclusive, 'better than,' and resistant to change toward the world as it is today.
♦ Mixed reaction	Initiatives 300 and 301, while not perfect, are an important statement of what needs to be urgently addressed.
♦ Mixed reaction	It doesn't seem as if there is a consensus on the right direction or necessarily how to get there. While this is understandable, it needs to be worked through more thoughtfully. The bike lane mess is an example. It was jammed on the residents of the city with out a lot of thought, opportunity for discussion or even a vote.
♦ Mixed reaction	It feels like Boulder is becoming less affordable and no longer a place where the "middle class" can thrive
♦ Mixed reaction	It is my opinion that the anti-growth sentiment which seems to be abound in the city is partially derived from the visibly dramatic influx of tech and other industries and the very dramatic increase in demand for residential and commercial property - which has resulted in significant price increases.
♦ Mixed reaction	It seems like development in Boulder is becoming more disjointed, serving special interests or individual projects.
♦ Mixed reaction	It seems that too many decisions are made with the attitude that no matter what we must accept the consequences whether we like it or not as those in power always know what is best.
♦ Mixed reaction	It seems the community could develop better mechanisms for soliciting citizen and neighborhood input on major projects and strategic decisions. Economic development appear at odds with the citizen wishes at times.
♦ Mixed reaction	It seems to me that there is a diminishing preservation of the three values I would prioritize.
♦ Mixed reaction	It's a great place to be and understandable that population would increase, but I'm getting priced out of the rental market and could never buy a house here. Traffic is getting noticeably worse
♦ Mixed reaction	Keep large employers in Boulder - policies encourage companies to move to Broomfield/Westminster, more driving
♦ Mixed reaction	Lack of innovative leadership to motivate people and help them see a bigger picture. Often people's objections to programs are based on unspoken concerns such as: concern about neighborhood population density is really about noise and cars, not number of people

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	let the power company continue to operate the power generation but convert to natural gas immediately spending tax money to experiment with running a power grid is not in the best interest of the community promote the use of solar hot water collection is key to saving energy
♦ Mixed reaction	light rail to denver and dia
♦ Mixed reaction	Many good ideas; but as a county resident I don't hink it wise to initiate an independent and local energy provider
♦ Mixed reaction	Many of the decisions are based on recommendations from Staff. Our elected officials need to challenge and ensure that the Staff analysis is of high quality and complete. We need to spend more time hiring highly motivated, qualified, and experience Staff plus to hold current staff accountable for lackluster performance. We also need to have those in charge of our government personnel to be totally free of political obligations.
♦ Mixed reaction	Measured growth would be my priority. Overcrowding serves no one. Would hate to see Boulder disregard the height limitations on buildings.
♦ Mixed reaction	More high density development is needed. However not enough high quality long term livable apartments/condos are being built or are available. I consider the Peloton to be an example of what should be built. Lots of apt/condo housing is built to satisfy the needs of young people for a couple years until they are able to afford a house (dakota ridge condos come to mind since I've lived and owned there). More people would stick around if there were enough storage space, bike parking etc (think europe and asia where people live in condos all their lives). Also the height restrictions and other anti development sentiment just doesn't make sense. If we can't grow outwards we must grow upwards, or Boulder will become just a rich neighborhood with a declining economy.
♦ Mixed reaction	Most of the residential development, including affordable housing seems to be in North Boulder and the infrastructure is not keeping up with it.
♦ Mixed reaction	Municipalization effort should be stopped - Xcel is doing fine - City government should be less intrusive and more practical
♦ Mixed reaction	Municipalization is unrealistic. 'Right-sizing' city streets is a bad idea.
♦ Mixed reaction	Need community involvement in decisions
♦ Mixed reaction	Need increased coverage for eco-pass. Concern that Boulder economic situation is struggling/declining.
♦ Mixed reaction	Need more diversity of opinion in municipal government
♦ Mixed reaction	Need to control growth, to maintain high quality of life
♦ Mixed reaction	Need to work out the situation with unincorporated county subdivisions because infrastructure is suffering and the cities image with it.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	New commercial buildings are horrendously ugly. For any personal (individual, not development company) residential renovation is unbelievably difficult and expensive. The only housing in Boulder Valley is existing and new owners want to renovate, expand or alter are severely limited and overwhelmed by complicated rules and restrictions. Even to perform sustainable landscaping requires obscene time, effort and coordination with county. That HAS to change.
♦ Mixed reaction	none.
♦ Mixed reaction	Not happy with foolish decision on Folsom car lanes removal, waste of money and needs to be returned to previous two lanes for better & faster traffic flow.
♦ Mixed reaction	Number one priority in multi mode transportation system is RTD holding its end of the bargain and providing our rail service - not the bus rapid transit system that merely supplements what we already had with the B and HX bus lines. Instead of the train that we voted for and paid for, we got a toll road (because THAT is close to a train, right?). Train service will significantly reduce vehicle miles driven in and to/from Boulder.
♦ Mixed reaction	Our children attend a diverse BVSD school--it's about 60 percent white. I am concerned that the lower income kids are sliding farther away from the general Boulder population. There are kids who are wearing outgrown shoes or whose needs are otherwise not attended to. I think it benefits all our kids to learn with people who are different from them--ethnically, culturally, and economically. But if we don't do more to support the lower income children, the gap between what they have and what other kids have might become too great. Also we see this in school funding--the PTA must fundraise to provide basic supplies to the teachers and schools. I learned that a BVSD school a few miles away is able to provide its teachers with double or triple the funding that our school has because its parents are better off, and better able to donate. This doesn't seem fair or right or good for the future of our city.
♦ Mixed reaction	Our community is already bike-friendly. We NEED to pay more attention to being inclusive to hispanic/minority residents and low-income. If Boulder's creativity can focus on INCLUDING minority voices, then we can be at the front of a very important social movement. We can do this!
♦ Mixed reaction	Our current council continues to doggedly pursue headline grabbing 'feel good' issues such as implimentation of a municipal electrical utility at huge 9 figure cost, when what Boulder truely needs is a revamped land use plan and allocation that encourages - indeed welcomes - a LARGE increase in housing stock of reasonably dense urban proportions that will provide close in living opportunities to the THOUSANDS of workers daily commuting into the City at large cost to both to the environment and to the lifestyle of the commuters.

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Our house has 40 year residents and the growth naturally has troubled us
♦ Mixed reaction	Overall Boulder seems to be doing well, but some of the comments by certain members of the city council seem really disconnected from reality. George K. seems like the only normal person on the council.
♦ Mixed reaction	Overall I see strong economic vitality, but the soaring cost of living in Boulder scares me. I worry it will become more and more exclusive and lose the little diversity it has.
♦ Mixed reaction	Permitting moderate growth and redevelopment during this time of economic expansion has moved us towards a more energy efficient, transit rich, and inclusive community. This has been and will continue to be a great benefit to the community. However, the community has failed to get all of its priorities straight. It should prioritize and fund middle and low-income housing, above open space acquisition, municipalization, climate action plan, and some of the other aspirational agendas that have far less immediate impacts on our residents. In general, the community takes on too many issues at once, spreading its resources thin and failing to adequately address each issue in turn.
♦ Mixed reaction	Personal concern ~ increased traffic as the community develops condensed housing and the overall impact on the environment.
♦ Mixed reaction	Population growth is something I'm nor sure can be addressed, or how, but it is a concern along with the pressures it causes
♦ Mixed reaction	Projects in the cities that are poorly designed, lack green space, and provide little communal or pedestrian amenities do not reflect Boulder values. While not always successful, I support experimentation in solving transportation issues.
♦ Mixed reaction	Right direction - dense housing is flat out better for the environment, which some has been built. Wrong direction - not enough done for alternative/public transportation
♦ Mixed reaction	'right sizing' of Folsom---failure
♦ Mixed reaction	'right sizing' was handled in a terrible and arrogant manner
♦ Mixed reaction	Scrapes and pops should be disincentivized; old Boulder Camera redevelopment is too massive and too tall
♦ Mixed reaction	See all previous comments and answers to your questions.
♦ Mixed reaction	Seems like having money and power run the town - property taxes will eventually drive me out of my house
♦ Mixed reaction	Since packing in more and more apts, codos, hotels, businesses, there is more and more traffic congesting Boulder. And then we slow down Folsom for the bikes. I have no answer, but the whole feeling of Boulder is different now. The sense of a community is disappearing. Inevitable!!
♦ Mixed reaction	Small but vocal minor opinions are given undue weight
♦ Mixed reaction	Some activities in the city are crazy: i.e., taking over electric utility and messing with traffic on Folsom

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Some development is done incorrectly or doesn't fit the character of the surrounding area that it is being built in. For example the building coming into the space that the Daily Camera building was in is too tall for the space and blocks too much of the view shed of the Flatirons. Future development should be designed with alternate transportation in mind, particularly bike/multi-use paths.
♦ Mixed reaction	Sometimes decisions are impulsive (right sizing) or extreme (preserving historical sheds/unlivable houses)
♦ Mixed reaction	Special interest groups confrontations
♦ Mixed reaction	Spending too much on 'wish list' items (like bike underpasses) and not enough on fundamentals, like ROADS/STREETS. The municipal utility is a misguided mistake that should be abandoned.
♦ Mixed reaction	Stop building housing for homeless people! This is a terrible decision which is making our homeless problem much worse.
♦ Mixed reaction	Stop encouraging growth at the expense of required infrastructure.
♦ Mixed reaction	Stop pushing growth out of City of Boulder to the County. Streamline approval process for reasonable development (e.g. building and restaurant approvals in Niwot) and FIX THE ROADS in the county
♦ Mixed reaction	Strong economy, rising property values and great parks. More crowded, more panhandling, less safe.
♦ Mixed reaction	stupid projects that cost the taxpayer! 1. buffaloes on open space 2. Boulder's own electric utility 3. bicycle lane expansion on Folsom Street
♦ Mixed reaction	The Boulder City council needs remember that they are supposed to represent the public and not just state ' we were elected by the public, so we can represent them how ever we want' attitude. Top of the list should be to spend more attention to the city included gunbarrel area, we are out here and we pay the same city taxes that inner city residents pay, yet we have no SAFE bike path connecting us to the bike path system in Boulder, no close libraries, we are in a school desert, frankly there is no safe route to travel on a bike with my children at all! It is infuriating (as a city tax payer) to see all the money wasted on the Folsom bike lane / reduced car lane business... when we have no protected (at all) means of traveling via bike connecting to a boulder city path. Its not acceptable.
♦ Mixed reaction	The Boulder Junction is good. High density on the periphery with good transportation and retail. But why such ugly buildings. Huge buildings (the Camera building site) blocking light and views of the mountains are asinine. We are TOTALLY overboard in historical preservation. The city is becoming less affordable due to tax rates, utility rates, building costs etc. And then we need more affordable housing.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	<p>The BVCP decisions Boulder makes now will have major consequences for years to come. Some decisions will lead Boulder in a positive direction and a number will set a negative trajectory. It is important to understand what makes Boulder unique and preserve that above all else. Many of the Comp Plan values are maturing, i.e., environmental stewardship /climate change, transportation and housing. These issues will continually evolve and need creative solutions. But now we need to turn attention to the three values prioritized in the previous question. Below are 'Right Direction and Wrong Direction' examples. Obviously much can be written on all of these, but this should at least get the topics noted.</p> <p>RIGHT DIRECTION 1. CONTINUE TO FOSTER DIVERSE ECONOMIC BASE - biotech, hightech, outdoor industry, natural products industry, services, education, academia, energy, science labs, and entrepreneurial ventures. Viewing Boulder County as a whole region and part of the entire front range will help the city and county assess growth needs appropriately. Not all business or residences can, or will, fit within Boulder city limits and we should look strategically towards incubating more businesses within limited city real estate and then support their expansion to the more available eastern county communities to accommodate growth. The Planning Reserve Area III should preserve the rural nature of Boulder as it was set aside to do.</p> <p>RIGHT DIRECTION 2. GROWING OPEN SPACE AND PARKS: Continue to promote open space and improve parks. I've been in Boulder as a resident and business owner for 40 years and was drawn here by the. The grand appeal of Boulder has been its foresight to establish the Blueline Plan and open space program. It is the large ratio of open space to population that has made Boulder so livable and pleasing. But, in the next two decades Boulder and the front range are expected to experience exponential population growth. Keeping a similar ratio of open space to population as Boulder grows would be a goal. The pressures from front range cities to use Boulder's foothills and parks as recreation areas will be huge. It will be very easy to lose the feeling that has been Boulder's signature and what separates it from other growing communities.</p> <p>RIGHT DIRECTION 3. CONTINUE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BETWEEN CITY AND COUNTY - Positive and constructive relationship will expedite the best decision making for the whole area</p> <p>RIGHT DIRECTION 4. PROMOTE THOUGHTFUL ENERGY DEVELOPMENT. Obviously Boulder County is benefitting and also paying a price for oil and gas/energy development. Don't think it is realistic to ban oil and gas development but important to make sure there are appropriate regulations and limitations in place as to where it can be done and how it is done. Certainly progressive regulation (methane rules are a start), and monitoring of wells and lines is needed.</p> <p>WRONG DIRECTION 1: TRANSPORTATION - RIGHTSIZING AND MULTIMODAL FRENZY Important to have reasonable multi-modal approach. Boulder is not physically set up like European communities - though it thinks it is. Proposed 'right-sizing' (wrong sizing) of our critical main thoroughfares and arteries on the edges of town will choke the traffic flow to county, make driving unsafe, and roads unsightly. Roads have gotten increasingly chaotic with all forms of transportation competing for prominence. Right sizing Folsom was a painful lesson that some theoretical ideas are just that, and not practical. Multi-modal planning should not be at the expense of all else. One example is the unnecessary proposed bike lanes up Four Mile Canyon which will require destroying and blasting the stunning natural rock walls and building up of unnecessary retention walls to widen roads for bike lanes (beyond flood requirements). It reflects 'bike lanes at all cost' mentality in Boulder. Areas need to be assessed individually beyond transportation policy. The natural and environmental damage outweighs the case for a bike lane in that unique canyon. Multi-modal needs to be thoughtful in the varying landscapes.</p> <p>WRONG DIRECTION 2. DENSIFYING BOULDER'S CORE BEYOND ITS INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY Boulder should not aspire to be a dense, stressed out, urban core area. That is what it is becoming. Denver can provide that. Boulder is beginning to overflow its infrastructure as it densifies beyond comfort and risks destroying the quality of life.</p> <p>WRONG DIRECTION 3. MUNICIPALIZATION: While Excel presents challenges as a privately held utility, it has been a reliable power provider. It built excellent infrastructure throughout Boulder over the years, and proved its value and expertise during flood recovery. It is hard to imagine that the city could manage disaster scenarios as well with contractors. Also, county property should not be forced to annex into the city for the municipalization purposes.</p> <p>WRONG DIRECTION 4. LOSING BOULDER'S RURAL EXPERIENCE - The development boom has left Boulder citizens groping for a way to manage unbridled growth. Ballot initiatives 300 and 301 are a reflection of the desire to retain control over development in the future. Boulder's Planning Reserve should remain rural as it was intended which will retain critical rural.</p>
♦ Mixed reaction	<p>The city & county leaders are out of touch with reality. Most people cannot afford living here & you expect everyone to earn six figures. Anybody that does not is treated like scum by you. My family has been here for 120 years & we are treated badly by the officials in office. Public transportation is a total joke.</p>
♦ Mixed reaction	<p>The City Council needs more diversity, geographically, ideologically and pragmatically. The same could be said of the Planning Board.</p>
♦ Mixed reaction	<p>The city council needs to respect the wishes of particular neighborhoods and not make decisions for them.</p>
♦ Mixed reaction	<p>The City needs to not pursue taking over and running our utilities. City officials need to focus on local Boulder government issues and not focus so much on Federal and International level issues.</p>

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	The City really missed the mark in the recent "right sizing" experiment on Folsom. While providing pedestrian and bike safety alternatives is important, it should not be at the expense of causing additional congestion. Many people cannot or will not commute by bicycle.
♦ Mixed reaction	The city should take over from Excel Energy
♦ Mixed reaction	The city's getting too congested. There's too much construction in a very small space (for example, Pearl and 30th).
♦ Mixed reaction	The community needs to reevaluate the 'development at any price' policy it seems to have. The spillover to congestion, traffic and demands on housing needs to be understood and dealt with.
♦ Mixed reaction	The community supports the transportation master plan, affordable housing goals and other innovative strategies. Yet when implementation occurs, the community reacts negatively and makes it politically difficult for policy makers (ie council) to implement programs. I feel strongly that Boulder has become very provincial and not at all innovative. A few minority but outspoken community members seem to have more voice and power than appropriate. Does not represent the greater community.
♦ Mixed reaction	The cost of housing is getting to be too high for the average income or low income household. There needs to be allowances for higher density/shared homes/newer concept that allow growth of affordable homes so people can afford to live near where they work.
♦ Mixed reaction	The County has diverted funds that need to be spent on infrastructure, such as roads. Ron Stewart seems to be an example of one who is expanding the focus of the County's Open Space department by funneling funds into subsidizing food stamps.
♦ Mixed reaction	The current community structure (more jobs than housing) is directly contradictory to the stated goal of reducing environmental impact. Boulder housing is subject to supply-and-demand economics, and it's an illusion that policy can significantly alter the direction that the job/housing imbalance inevitably imposes on the changes coming to the town.
♦ Mixed reaction	The decisions being made do not reflect the involvement of the people. Rather they appear to be 'pushed' on the City Council by the Staff, rather than the City Council reflecting the will of the people and instructing the Staff to carry out its strategies. This needs to return to a more representative form of government.
♦ Mixed reaction	The dedication to alternate transportation is encouraging. The NoBo development style (yuppie chic?) and likewise Pearl/30th 'canyon' is less encouraging. Not at all looking forward to Google's arrival.

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	The development goals are generally correct, but the process by which design is evaluated is flawed. The wall-like development at Boulder Junction is a good example. More step-back should have been required. Also, there is a big question about the basic quality of the apartment buildings. Without constant maintenance which they are not likely to get, they are going to be slums in 25 years. Similarly, the apartment building(s) constructed on 28th Street are visually offensive, and again should have been stepped back. This might have reduced the number of allowed units, but tough. I own income property in Boulder of this sort, and would never have dreamed of putting up eye-sores of this ugliness.
♦ Mixed reaction	The exterior colors and materials of much of the new growth is far too limited and ubiquitous. In many areas the focus is on: creativity and innovation and unique and diversity - but the new structures and growth do not represent that!
♦ Mixed reaction	The focus on affordable housing is off-base in my opinion. Trying to artificially create lower-cost real estate options takes the system out of balance.
♦ Mixed reaction	The frequent granting of exceptions to height limits and crowding of these buildings are obscuring the special beauty of this place while not producing the needed affordable housing.
♦ Mixed reaction	The general population is not being served. The do not want "living labs," high rise exceptions, more jobs bringing more commuters which pushes for high density everywhere and lowers the quality of life
♦ Mixed reaction	The Google campus location is the worst possible location with regard to traffic and congestion that already exists. Gunbarrel would have been a better placement with a ton of new apartments going in, existing offices and easy access from all directions. I can't figure why that project was approved for that corner.
♦ Mixed reaction	The growth and economic stimulus is a good thing when done correctly, but it is very difficult to be a working class person in this town which reflects diversity of citizens in the community and I am worried that certain growth will continue to drive diversity out of this area because it is unsustainable to live here.
♦ Mixed reaction	The homeless population in Boulder is a significant issue that needs to be addressed in a way that does not simply draw more homeless from outside our community. I have never seen a city with more panhandlers (many aggressive). I feel that the overall quality of life in the city has declined since I arrived in 1986 in large part due to our tremendous homeless problem.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	The implementation of the "values/aspirations" are not reflected in enforcement of ordinances. People live in vehicles on streets not protected by parking restrictions. VRBO renters crowd houses and make noise with no consequences for renters or owners. Many employees of the city do not bother to return calls or emails.
♦ Mixed reaction	The increase in density is a fairly big negative for me. As a rule, I find west of 30th Street to be 'too dense', and that line seems to be moving east.
♦ Mixed reaction	The increasing disparity in income troubles me. It's very hard for even a middle-income person like me to live in this town where I work, and commuting is against my ethics. It also leads to less diversity. On the other hand, I value the open space TREMENDOUSLY and think other species like prairie dogs and bears must have their own space to live, just like we do, with no humans encroaching on them. One answer may be instituting rent control and lowering home taxes on smaller places.
♦ Mixed reaction	The limitation of only 3 unrelated adults is a house need to be revised to allow more people to live cooperatively in houses with more than three bedrooms. Megamansions (over 5000 sq feet) should somehow be discouraged (they are an ecological disaster, result in more danger of flooding because neighborhoods are paved over with houses, garages, driveways, etc, and are completely unnecessary). Surcharge Tax on any garages over two per house. We must have Ecopasses for the entire community and all of those who commute into Boulder for work. The employment slots and amount of housing are completely out of balance. Stop adding more commercial/business space and convert some of that zoning to residential. The number of people commuting into Boulder for work should be cut in half, not more.
♦ Mixed reaction	The mess on Folsom Street was well intended, like a lot things the City Council does, but it was very poorly implemented, like a lot of things the City Council does. On the other hand, the City and County have done a remarkable job of recovering the various paths and trails after the flood two years ago. Thanks.
♦ Mixed reaction	The new buildings we're seeing around town don't seem to reflect the value most of us see in having the open space around us visible and prominent. Its nice to have, let's say, the Flatirons nearby, but sad when you can only see them by driving up to them because new buildings are more and more urban in nature.
♦ Mixed reaction	The number of affordable housing units has increased over the years, but there still appears to be more needed for moderate income residents.
♦ Mixed reaction	The numbers of huge multi dwellings
♦ Mixed reaction	The pace of adding new buildings both residential and commercial has seemed to exceed the pace of infrastructure improvement. Roads seem congested much of the time.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	the planning process needs to include more ideas to appeal to a broad cross section of community values
♦ Mixed reaction	The politics of the city are completely non-representative. The council does whatever it feels like regardless of public opinion. It amazes me that any of them get reelected. I know less about county politics, but I suspect it is not much different.
♦ Mixed reaction	The recent development in Gunbarrel is increasing the population density without taking into consideration traffic. Lookout Road is a parking lot in the morning and evening.
♦ Mixed reaction	The recent trend of the Planning Board and City Council toward approving and encouraging maximum height, concrete block buildings is degrading our quality of life. I believe we can increase density through in-fill without this disturbing trend of trying to turn Boulder into downtown Denver. I also believe it's unrealistic to think we can add an unlimited number of new commuters and residents in a confined space such as Boulder.
♦ Mixed reaction	The 'single lane experiment' on Folsom is an example of 'wrong direction.'
♦ Mixed reaction	The traffic/bike 'right sizing' has got to go. Build bike paths on side streets instead.
♦ Mixed reaction	There are huge pressures to expand and accommodate more workers that makes for a vibrant economy, but which is at odds with no or slow growth and a compact community. Pretending those pressures do not exist does not make them go away. The height limit seems unrealistic.
♦ Mixed reaction	There are so many great people here, but there's also more and more people moving here that are self-centered and entitled. Maybe it's a sign of the times, but it's a bummer either way.
♦ Mixed reaction	There has been a disturbing increase in large high-rise buildings lately. They look out of place, disrupt the beautiful views of the mountains, and seem counter to a number of the above values. Why have such buildings been approved?
♦ Mixed reaction	There has been a lot of growth in recent years with more coming. Car traffic around Boulder is becoming more of a problem. This is also impacting pedestrians and cyclists as it becomes unsafe to walk and ride or downright scary.
♦ Mixed reaction	There is more attention given to prairie dogs than human beings. Prairie dogs are destructive and of no value to our lives.
♦ Mixed reaction	There is too much emphasis on hiring more employees and little emphasis on upgrading the neighborhoods that pay the highest taxes. Alleys are a mess, telephone wires are not underground, poor lighting on streets.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	There needs to be more attention on affordable housing. It would also be nice to have more bike paths but not on streets that are the main routes for cars. Consider having a good bike path on the streets next to Folsom or 28th so cars and bikes can flow without impacting each other. The city council needs to get better and more buy-in/cooperation with the community before enacting big decisions.
♦ Mixed reaction	There seems to be a lot of development going on that is or will significantly increase traffic on our existing roads. This needs much tighter reviews and controls to assess and mitigate impact to Boulder.
♦ Mixed reaction	Things like the recent 'right sizing' just outside my house demonstrate a massive waste of money. I am appalled at the recent short term rental debate and ruling. I do not rent out any rooms in my house, but visitors I have had generally love AirBnB as an alternative to expensive hotels. What makes me really mad however, is that I feel disrespected and undermined as a home owner. I bought this house, I should be able to rent rooms in it out should I want to. Additionally, as a dog owner, I find the lack of trails in Boulder that allow dogs of leash to be frustrating. I think that those of us who have voice and sight tags should be allowed dogs off leash on all trails not just a few. I have to get in the car daily and drive to the dog park or a trail that I can exercise my dogs on, and as a bike commuter 90 percent of the time, it frustrates me that the dog rules force me to drive. If Boulder is really into reducing carbon footprints, enforcing strong dog obedience training and allowing more areas under voice and sight control is a way to do this.
♦ Mixed reaction	Too dense; driving and parking a problem (City actions are making it worse); losing any sense of "Boulder" other than its setting
♦ Mixed reaction	Too many McMansions. The houses along the foothills are dwarfing the neighborhoods that had such character. They are using the entire yard to build onto the present houses. I would like to see the trend of smaller homes
♦ Mixed reaction	Too many regulations.
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much commercial development all of a sudden - large boxy buildings close to the streets and sidewalks. Too many multi-million trophy houses.
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much crowding (esp. around 30th and Pearl) and not good public transportation. I ride a bike but most people over 50 do not and will not, so emphasis shouldn't be just on bike paths!
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much emphasis on creating/forcing more affordable housing - the market forces should be left to dictate this. Too many tax dollars spent on these surveys and consultants (i.e. municipalization) that should go to fixing roads, pruning and cutting down dead trees!
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much focus on feel good politically correct initiatives. Not addressing the basic things that affect everyday quality of life.

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much growth. No plan for dealing with increasing traffic. Bikes/pedestrians are NOT more important than vehicles. Xcel plan is a mistake.
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much housing - Boulder is getting too busy
♦ Mixed reaction	Too much top down direction. Not enough input from citizens
♦ Mixed reaction	Traffic density is awful at times. We are losing our small community atmosphere as more people move into the area.
♦ Mixed reaction	Until we know the outcome of 300 and 301, what is the direction we are headed?
♦ Mixed reaction	until we solve the transportation and housing issues we don't need any more large commercial buildings/businesses
♦ Mixed reaction	Very disappointing to see height limitations increased and do NOT appreciate outside developers buying large tracts and building untis when neighbors ask repeatedly that they NOT.
♦ Mixed reaction	Way too many "affordable" low income housing buildings; not enough middle income
♦ Mixed reaction	We are good on environmental sustainability and terrible on social sustainability. An ethnically and economically diverse and truly inclusive environment benefits everyone in the community.
♦ Mixed reaction	We are relatively new to Boulder and we've been amazed that a city that has done such a great job of setting aside and protecting open space has done a spectacularly bad job of urban and residential planning, and encouraging/supporting diversity through affordable housing. There seems to be a very vocal group of people in Boulder who are adamantly against affordable housing or development of any kind, and this is a real shame and a serious threat to Boulder's future vitality.
♦ Mixed reaction	We have a vibrant economy that needs more employee housing. We need to balance (reduce) some open space to provide housing and reduce commuting.
♦ Mixed reaction	We have become an elitist community. The common folk have moved out of Boulder unless they bought their house a long time ago.
♦ Mixed reaction	We need for housing in Boulder for the people who work in Boulder - at all income levels in order to have a diverse community, to decrease the impacts of in-commuting, and to build community amongst those who work in Boulder. When people just come to Boulder for jobs and then leave after work, they do not build a connection with the community. (I have seen this change over the last 30 years to the detriment to the community and the workplace.)

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	We need light rail. The real estate prices in Boulder and now throughout the BV are squeezing out the people we need...this is a major problem throughout the metro area, however. Senior citizen housing/welfare needs more overarching consideration...this sector of housing is even tighter than the general housing situation. The open space programs and the greenbelt around Boulder must be protected...we need green 'breathing' space and many fewer vehicles with one or very few passengers.
♦ Mixed reaction	We need to be mindful that the existing, poorly designed developments don't distract or take away form positive developments on the horizon
♦ Mixed reaction	We need to find creative solutions to make housing more affordable in Boulder without compromising on what makes the City of Boulder great including its small size and being surrounded by open space.
♦ Mixed reaction	We need to remove restrictions on shared housing, yurts and additional structures on existing building sites. Zoning laws are highly and unjustly prohibitive
♦ Mixed reaction	we personally favor higher density in housing and office space as the best way to achieve more opportunities for living and working within the community.
♦ Mixed reaction	We're very concerned about the growing homeless problem. We've had our car boekn into, we've called the police due to gfighting on our street after the warming shelter on Mapleton closed for the day, tired of panhandling. More should be done to weed out those who are from other areas or who are choosing homelessness as a lifestyle. Boulder has more panhandling than Portland (2.4 million pop.).
♦ Mixed reaction	While I support the redevelopment of areas of Boulder I'm worried about affordable spaces for groups such as small creative businesses/artists. I also wish our city/county staff would/could/should afford to live in Boulder, as well as our teachers/police. It makes a difference if these people live and breathe the decisions they make in the Boulder community. And I wish the huge former Daily Camera building would be a nice addition to downtown Boulder instead of the ugly vision in the sky.
♦ Mixed reaction	While I understand the need for densification to counteract sprawl, I do not favor increasing height restrictions.
♦ Mixed reaction	While quality of life seems to be generally improving, it seems to become more and more exclusive (only accessible to the area's wealthier residents) while housing and rental prices are squeezing out the lower and middle income residents, including long-time residents.
♦ Mixed reaction	Who needs multi-million dollar homes?!

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Mixed reaction	Why was the Gunbarrel area allowed to have such high density apartment development. Right now, does not seem to be adequate parking & road design for this area. There was a town center proposed as part of the development in this area, but I haven't seen it yet. Maybe my definition of a town center is different? Re 'right-sizing' Stop using that term. And this idea for Folsom (and I travel this road 3 times a week, various hours.) was just not necessary; bikes & cars always seemed to be OK...except when the bikes skipped from street to sidewalk to crosswalks. The city seems to be a developers' dream as well as nightmare. Also, why are developers allowed to trade their percentage of affordable housing, wetland areas, etc. from one development to another?
♦ Mixed reaction	with the increasing gentrification, some of us old timers will no longer be able to live here, that would break my heart to move
♦ Mixed reaction	Would like to see less elimination of parking and traffic lanes with no obvious purpose. Making things easier for people who want to ride bikes is great, but vehicles are still an important option given how our community is built, and they are not necessarily environmentally unfriendly. If Boulder really wants to move away from driving as a mode of transportation, attitudes toward high rise buildings should be reconsidered.
♦ Mixed reaction	Wrong direction: Not observing open space, allowing building height to block the mountains, increasing cost of living in Boulder to make it unaffordable to those of us who have lived here for many years, increasing cost of housing is a wrong step. Right direction: Integrating nature into the quality of life has always been Boulder's best feature. We should never lose that. Keeping the culture environmentally invested.
♦ Mixed reaction	Wrong direction--we spend lots on municipalization, 'right-sizing' streets, and shifting bike lanes on University Ave but can't even fill the potholes. I am a bicycle commuter, and my route is a minefield of holes.
♦ Mixed reaction	Zoning is an issue with too many apts. Traffic even more of an issue (we need more easier ways North-South). Power plant is a boondoggle. Council attitude out of touch.
♦ Don't know/no opinion	I am new to the community which is why I don't know of the plan and can't speak to the recent trends!
♦ Don't know/no opinion	I am well aware that I am among the tsunami of new people moving to the Front Range; I haven't lived here long enough to have seen the community change very much. It's a difficult situation to balance and optimize, and I wish you guys the best of luck!
♦ Don't know/no opinion	I'm unclear as to wright or wrong, but I do know the lack of affordable housing (including low-middle income housing) is barely available anymore
♦ Don't know/no opinion	My biggest concern is that, with Google's expansion here, Boulder not become 'the San Jose of Colorado.'

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
♦ Don't know/no opinion	Right direction IF "300" and "301" DO NOT PASS
♦ Don't know/no opinion	Their doing a real good job
♦ Don't know/no opinion	What 'direction' are we headed? Unless that is defined, the question makes no sense.
♦ Other	As an older driver Folsom and Iris are routes I take to avoid too much tarffic. I'm NOT happy with Folsom. As for Iris - I get so upset to know those affected years ago (lost most of their yards in widening Iris) will now be used for a few bikes. I could cry.
♦ Other	Boulder is losing talented people and businesses because they cannot afford to live and do business here.
♦ Other	I support affordable housing. I think the city works pretty hard toward that goal. But maybe the anti-growth people are getting a little nutty, in an anti-growth capital of the world. (Where I enjoy open space daily, and understand the value of that.)
♦ Other	I've lived in Boulder for 25 years and am not liking the increasing growth rate over the past few years. I'm all for being welcoming, but the endless compact housing units going up are creating a 'big city' feel that I'm not as happy with. Traffic is difficult and takes time out of my schedule. Also, with all the housing that is being built, at my level of income I cannot afford decent housing - because the low-income is too low for my income level and the regular market rates are out-of-this-world high.
♦ Other	Moved to Boulder because of it's small town feel, uniqueness, and open spaces. I feel it's becoming 'any town' USA.
♦ Other	Municipal power is wrong-headed and too much money is being spent on this.....community expected cost-control and this isn't happening.
♦ Other	The City of Boulder seems to have a sense that their desired changes can reach beyond the city boundaries without input from the county residents their decisions effect.
♦ Other	There are a myriad of conflicts that have been expressed by Boulder County Commissioners that show a lack of representation toward their constituents, that show a greater alignment to other values. Reference the recent lawsuit brought by residents of county subdivisions regarding road repaving. Our commissioners have taken an adversarial approach to these residents/constituents. This is clearly unproductive and lawsuits are clearly a waste of everyone's time and money. These values, that of an adversarial approach, portray our government negatively. As a mountain dweller, I feel we are under siege by the very people who are supposed to be considering our interests in balance with the other constituents they represent. This does not seem to be the case.
♦ Other	Upsurge in growth without corresponding transportation improvements/expansion
♦	Housing prices are crazy. Traffic is actually becoming a problem.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.7: In the past year, people have expressed varying sentiments about the state of the community and the general direction it is heading regarding redevelopment, growth, and design. Which of the following statements best reflects your views about recent trends of growth and change in the community? Any comments on your response?

Community direction	Comment
◆	Millionaire alley attitude persists - reduce high priced real estate offerings in favor of compact community
◆	Really affordable housing not just trailers and condos. Eliminate the 3 non-related persons requirement. Accountability so city council does not ____ above others.
◆	The City Council must represent all of us! Great example, the Folsom bike lane. These are NOT what Boulder wants or needs. Yet I hear Mary Young and Lisa Morzel talk about "their" agenda.
◆	The community is headed the right direction, but our elected officials are increasingly trying to control every aspect of our lives

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.8a: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of jobs in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)

- ◆ Additional jobs for lower income workers
- ◆ Allow slow increase
- ◆ Boulder Chamber of Commerce founding fathers were very mindful and plan-ful when attracting certain kinds of employers. The National Bureau of Standards (Now NIST), Ball Aerospace, etc. attracted high-level talent, which subsequently has populated the area and substaintially contributed to Boulder's character. In sum, jobs of high caliber augment Boulder's desirability & should be encouraged.
- ◆ Boulder should concentrate on livable wage jobs; the rich don't need more help.
- ◆ Boulder should encourage and attract employers that add social, international, and intellectual value to the community while also minimizing impacts on our natural resources.
- ◆ Boulder should encourage companies that employ all age groups, no just 20-40 year olds
- ◆ Boulder should increase the incentives for people to choose to take jobs here by attracting and keeping the best companies (bye-bye Burger King, hello CostCo).
- ◆ Boulder should maintain potential for jobs other than tech.Enough of that already.Look at the effects on SF.Focus on industries that help the planet as well as the people.Green industries.
- ◆ Boulder should maintain the current amount of jobs
- ◆ Boulder shouldn't try to regulate business growth.
- ◆ get rid of googoo they bad neighbors
- ◆ I do not believe government controls jobs. I do not believe government should give a special tax deal to any business. Free market should control jobs
- ◆ Increase current potential for additional jobs for Boulder residents
- ◆ Increase the potential for high wage jobs that contribute to more economic development with potentially less in commuting.
- ◆ increase the quality of jobs
- ◆ Increasing jobs must be balanced with affordable housing
- ◆ Infrastructure should be addressed before any increase is considered
- ◆ maintain or reduce
- ◆ maintain or slightly increase
- ◆ Mixed; jobs=housing; more people who work in Boulder should be able to live in Boulder
- ◆ my concern would be for the quality of those additional jobs
- ◆ Need to balance housing and jobs
- ◆ No increase of jobs without increase of more traffic lanes on arterials
- ◆ Not the purview of the government
- ◆ Re-think the key parameters that have to do with congestion: rules of the road, roads, sizes of vehicles, use of vehicles, innovation as relates to energy and transportation - there is a lot out there that City and County seem to not be aware of.
- ◆ Reduce the current number of jobs. We already have 1.5x the number of jobs per household as San Francisco..
- ◆ Reduce the potential for future jobs, without harming the current owners by down zoning. Perhaps changing the industrial to housing is a good thing for current owners. Limit amount of commercial growth on an annual basis. With exceptions to existing companies.
- ◆ WORRY ABOUT PRIORITIES -- NOT JOBS
- ◆ You kicked out business before. Let's have ones that the public uses!

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.8b: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of housing in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)

- ◆ Affordable housing
- ◆ Allow more than 3 non-related people in one unit.
- ◆ Allow slow increase
- ◆ Allowing more mixed usage areas would be helpful.
- ◆ Annex land outside of the open space (like Gunbarrel)
- ◆ Boulder should aim to develop state-of-the-art transportation infrastructure (mass transit) to support in-commuting rather than trying to accommodate 6,300 new housing units.
- ◆ Boulder should allow more unrelated people to live in homes, increasing our efficiency.
- ◆ Boulder should be encouraging creative and flexible approaches to housing rather than discouraging them with the occupancy limit legislation.
- ◆ Boulder should close the affordable housing office
- ◆ Boulder should convert existing commercially zoned land to multi-family, and even convert existing commercial development to multi-family housing.
- ◆ Boulder should focus on additional housing only if it is consistent with small town spaces. Dense, large scale developments should be avoided.
- ◆ Boulder should increase diversity of housing
- ◆ Boulder should increase potential for added housing only if it is affordable and reflects the wages of the jobs. The reason that there is so much in-commuting is because housing is expensive and wages are low.
- ◆ Boulder should increase the current potential for additional housing that is neither mansions nor tacky-tacky with too many restrictions on living there. People need living nature where we live, not all walls and concrete.
- ◆ Boulder should increase the current potential for multi-family dwellings.
- ◆ Boulder should maintain the current amount of housing
- ◆ Boulder should re-purpose existing housing and spaces but not add any more.
- ◆ Boulder should think about ways to temper rising housing costs to allow for more economic diversity
- ◆ Boulder's current '3 unrelated people per house' (regardless of house size & number of bedrooms) is nonsensical. Rather, Boulder's housing ordinances should focus and penalize (nuisance) 'behavior,' instead. E.g. excessive noise, litter, etc. Please, no more subsidized/affordable housing.
- ◆ Depends how it is done
- ◆ Do not annex in more land.
- ◆ Don't change the 35-acre subdivision rule. We need to preserve the character of Boulder County with its larger parcels of land compared with the city.
- ◆ Healthy growth is good.
- ◆ I think it is okay, but we need to be sure to have low/affordable housing available.
- ◆ I wish I had more time to digest all available information, but my sense is that while Boulder may want to maintain its current potential for job growth, it may not be sustainable for its other values to increase housing by the same units (18.5k), as a result, some middle ground may be best, depending on the options available for infill, conversion of industrial to residential, etc. once all of the benefits and drawbacks of this kind of development are weighed. I hope to have more time to dig into the data in the future.
- ◆ If housing is increased it needs to be affordable
- ◆ Increase affordability - people who work here should be able to live here too
- ◆ Increase affordable housing
- ◆ Increase housing but make it mandatory that a % of rents in every development be income contingent with a sliding scale. Rent control!
- ◆ Increase potential for certain kinds of housing, e.g., 'affordable'

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.8b: Which of the following statements best represents your preference regarding the future growth of housing in the Boulder Valley? (OTHER)

- ♦ Increase potential housing, but NOT at the expense of our beloved Flatirons. That monstrosity that was allowed to be built on W Peal & 11th that entirely blocks the mountains is SO, SO sad and disappointing. We have to get more creative! Consider a neighborhood of tiny houses for example.
- ♦ increase quality of housing. No more condos/apts!
- ♦ Increase the potential but I don't favor a high amount of subsidized housing
- ♦ increase through smarter code and regulations
- ♦ Keep as is
- ♦ Let the market decide
- ♦ maintain or reduce
- ♦ Maintain, but allow more people to live in one house on one property.
- ♦ Moderately increase, but maintain open space and public lands
- ♦ More affordable housing
- ♦ More affordable housing, less destruction of downtown for super-luxury aesthetic trash.
- ♦ more low income housing
- ♦ Must look at impacts to neighborhoods. I don't believe most of the studies conducted by the City are objective.
- ♦ My answer would depend on how much of the additional housing would be affordable to different income levels.
- ♦ Needs more affordable housing
- ♦ No increase of housing without increase of more traffic lanes on arterials
- ♦ Reduce high price real estate - increase compact community
- ♦ Stop letting NIMBYs defeat affordable housing.
- ♦ The ONLY new housing that should be approved should be affordable housing.
- ♦ Use zoning to make new units more affordable for buyers and renters--i.e. density and lot size. Otherwise the new housing will all be \$1m custom homes.
- ♦ We need housing that is accessible to people and does not negatively impact current neighborhoods.
- ♦ What kind of housing are you referring to?
- ♦ work harder to restrict/ constrain the growth of CU and encourage CU to provide more in the way of housing for faculty and m'd students

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.9: Which of the following best reflects your views regarding the rate of housing unit growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ 2%
- ◆ a balance between fulfilling market need thru infill only.
- ◆ Again the Big Picture: use more careful controls, not outright prohibitions on height, location, etc.
- ◆ All new housing growth should be affordable.
- ◆ allow growth within a capped limit
- ◆ Allow increased number of people (unrelated) per house and nontraditional rental arrangements, rent controls
- ◆ Allow normal market fluctuations in the # of new housing units, but subject to standards and regulations; including more affordable housing, probably funded from additional sources
- ◆ Am convinced the market should regulate residential expansion, not the City Council.
- ◆ Be more creative with housing growth this is not an all or nothing
- ◆ City needs to become more flexible in housing and housing rules, density
- ◆ City should limit, but 1% is too restrictive
- ◆ City should manage growth AND increase >1%
- ◆ Continue limiting growth to 1% with a larger percentage being affordable and let the developers take it or leave it
- ◆ emphasis on affordable and middle class housing
- ◆ Exemptions should be held to a % too - otherwise the limits aren't actually effective
- ◆ Growth may need to be limited, but perhaps 1% is currently too low. Maybe there needs to be a bit of flexibility there along with some ideas on where more housing could be built.
- ◆ honor the current zoning rules (no downzoning), consider increasing density near campus and do not allow height and set-back requirements (minimal changes okay)
- ◆ Housing is the issue closest to my heart. I feel there's great potential in communal living to reduce the amount of resources consumed (heating, cars, etc) but that much of the housing growth that I've seen has been small apartments that encourage individuals to pay more rent and have their own car, which funnels money into the hands of property owners and out of the hands of service-industry workers
- ◆ Housing should be judiciously increased, depending on the needs of Boulder and potential residents.
- ◆ I agree with controlled growth, but don't think it should always be held to 1% per year. I would like to see a more dynamic approach to how much growth is allowed (based on the fluctuating need for more housing and based on projects that can provide additional housing without having negative impacts to the community).
- ◆ I agree with the idea of maintaining the current rate, but what about the issue of how many full time residents that Google will bring to Boulder at a fast rate when they establish their campus?
- ◆ I don't like to say the city should limit or not limit growth. Market factors in and of themselves do not produce a vibrant community. The city needs to be involved in how the growth occurs, but not be overcontrolling.
- ◆ I don't understand the question. I certainly don't see that there have been limitations if people have the money.
- ◆ I think the limits on housing growth should correspond to the type/cost of the housing. Affordable housing should be encouraged, very expensive homes using lots of space should be more limited.
- ◆ I'm not sure exactly what % growth I would be in favor of. There needs to be a better system of building affordable housing. If the growth is just market rate, then I would not be in favor of increasing the %.

- ◆ Increase affordable housing
- ◆ Increase affordable housing and decrease spending on open space. Change zoning so people can add housing to their existing units.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.9: Which of the following best reflects your views regarding the rate of housing unit growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ Increase allowed housing growth to 1.2%
- ◆ Increase exemptions for permanently affordable housing and mixed use projects
- ◆ Increase housing growth rate as need dictates. Present need is for more affordable housing options.
- ◆ Increase limit above 1% but not remove the limit
- ◆ Increase limit to a slightly higher value (e.g. ~2%)
- ◆ increase opportunities for more density
- ◆ increase the housing rate for affordable housing
- ◆ Increase the rate of growth by measures identified above. Determine a build-out population by a community discussion.
- ◆ It's not the rate that is the problem; it's the exceptions that are the problem
- ◆ limit mixed use projects
- ◆ Limit rate of growth at a higher rate, perhaps 1.5%
- ◆ Limits and controls are needed but 1% is too small. Good things attract, and the high tech industry feeds upon talent and other related companies..
- ◆ limits, but perhaps based on specifics, rather than a fixed 1%
- ◆ Maintain a system of limiting the rate of housing growth, but perhaps increase the rate or have a rate band
- ◆ Maintain rate; permit upward expansion.
- ◆ Need more affordable housing for regular income, not for low income
- ◆ Not limit lower income housing; should limit growth on units selling for more than \$300,000. We have enough expensive housing in Boulder Valley.
- ◆ Ongoing studies should be done to allow us to maintain a policy that is responsive to the needs of the people.
- ◆ Other metrics should be utilized that represent improved quality of life for all residents
- ◆ Quit focus on low income housing
- ◆ Reduce high price real estate - increase compact community
- ◆ should limit growth but also create balance with the market's demand to allow affordability
- ◆ Should limit housing growth to between 1% and 2%
- ◆ Something in between "not limit" and "1%", more flexibility
- ◆ Somewhere in between 1% and unlimited
- ◆ Somewhere in between option #1 & #2
- ◆ The 1% rate should be increased but still limited. More in keeping with the state rate of increase. This is the only way to make housing more affordable.
- ◆ The city should allocate current housing to an affordable cost of living equitable to a living wage (not less than \$15 per hour). Rent control is also an important law that needs to be taken into consideration.

- ◆ The city should drastically increase the amount of moderate and low income housing available in Boulder and re-zone commercial land to do so.
- ◆ The city should encourage single family neighborhoods and patio homes - no more mixed use buildings
- ◆ The city should focus on ambiance, i.e. parks, open space, and recreation while also finding ways to improve non-automobile transportation (like the Folsom St. conversion), all with an eye on the need to make living in a compact and growing city as pleasant as possible.
- ◆ The City should increase beyond 1%; maybe 1.5% but not normal market fluctuations
- ◆ The city should increase its rate of housing growth (more than 1% per year), but not drop all limits on housing growth.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.9: Which of the following best reflects your views regarding the rate of housing unit growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ The City should index job growth and housing growth to each other and housing growth should be a multiple of job growth
- ◆ The city should maintain its system of limiting market housing growth, while increasing capacity for low/mod income affordable housing growth.
- ◆ The city should maintain system of limiting, and also allow fluctuations in normal growth rate.
- ◆ The city should make it less onerous to convert existing residential buildings to multiple units and allow a higher, though not unlimited, growth in housing.
- ◆ The city should temper housing growth with its ability to maintain proper infrastructure and with consideration for the growth of moderately priced retailers
- ◆ The current growth appears to focus on high density housing-- and so-called affordable housing. These trends do not improve housing for families and concentrates the population in areas where there is already a lot of traffic and congestion. The height of new buildings has already made what used to be a unique area look like any other overcrowded city. I think besides the rate of growth, the type of growth is important.
- ◆ The density of low and middle income housing is too great this should be limited as well.
- ◆ The diminishing availability to build housing on we regulate the growth
- ◆ The rate should recognize the need for diversity - the City is grossly expanding commercial development, e.g., old Daily Camera space
- ◆ The real need is for more creative use of existing high-density corridor - not more catering to the 1%. The hassles on the only reasonably-priced single family dwellings on small lots are just discriminatory hogwash - Baseline 4 and Martin Acres could be far better and have decent transit and access; the real issues are about noise, parking, and light pollution, not how many students does it take to handle the obscene rents or fight with neighbors.
- ◆ There has to be something over 1% that keeps Boulder weird and full of green.
- ◆ There should be limits on the rate of growth of luxury housing.
- ◆ Use policy to encourage living small. Reduce costs/regs for single family houses under 1200 SF. Make this "starter" home easy and cheap (even if it's not "smart" and over-insulated, a SMALL home means a smaller footprint).
- ◆ We should continue to limit the growth of housing but provide more low-income housing options
- ◆ With more affordable and mixed use
- ◆ Without knowing the regulations and standards this is very hard to comment on. This seems to just manage the workloads of those responsible for maintaining the regulations and standards.
- ◆ yes let market fluctuations determine growth, but let's not become beaver creek, not every billionaire needs to own a mansion in boulder or luxury condo on pearl street

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.10: Which of the following best reflects your view about the rate of new commercial growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ all new growth should pay its own way. e.g. fire stations, police stations, hospitals
- ◆ As long as commercial/jobs growth pays for itself and affordable housing I'm OK with it
- ◆ Boulder needs to encourage commercial building and renewal of commercial areas for commercial use
- ◆ city should encourage more 'bread and butter' stores so we don't have to go to Louisville or Longmont to get everyday items.
- ◆ Commercial and residential growth need to be managed together. Clearly I have homework to do regarding reading the plan.
- ◆ Commercial development should directly serve residents. Every neighborhood needs a grocery store, gas station, etc. So, rather than giving all the commercial allowance to Google, keep it local.
- ◆ Commercial growth is a broad term. Maybe a blend of options for overseeing the commercial area of the Plan
- ◆ Commercial growth is important, but the city need to review zoning and land use regulations rather than trying to cap growth.
- ◆ Commercial growth needs to be adjusted to housing market. Commercial interests should NOT superceed housing and community interests.
- ◆ Commercial growth needs to be tied to infrastructure improvements.
- ◆ Commercial growth shouldn't pay for 'permanently affordable' housing.
- ◆ City needs to evaluate each commercial development on an individual basis and decide whether each project is in the best interest for the community as a whole.
- ◆ I agree with the idea of linkage fees. Allow the market to determine commercial growth, but ensure that the growth supports a livable/workable community.
- ◆ I don't equate commercial growth and jobs. Productive, healthy jobs can grow within reasonable limitations on the footprint of commercial growth.
- ◆ I would prefer not to encourage large corporations to move into Boulder because they tend to be self-interested and do not reflect common Boulder values.
- ◆ I'm satisfied with the curret balance
- ◆ Industrial/large commercial development must be linked with affordable housing development
- ◆ It helps to promote companies and organizations in Boulder whose missions fit with a progressive agenda.
- ◆ It is not fair to new commercial development to be responsible for affordable housing. That is the city's responsibility.
- ◆ Linkage fees and assessments are appropriate.
- ◆ manage growth
- ◆ Manage growth (not limit or slow) according to community values (not market conditions).
- ◆ Manage the rate of commercial growth
- ◆ Monitor growth and be sure it is done responsibly with a focus on the community
- ◆ need to have balance of good commercial jobs for diversity
- ◆ Not much faster than residential
- ◆ Our roads are not large enough to handle a huge increase in new businesses. We must keep easy access to Downtown Boulder or else it will starve. We might consider a moratorium on commercial building permits, until we can see how the 1000+ new google employees affect Folsom, 28th and 30th streets. I realize jobs keep the economy going, but, if the quality of life goes down for everyone, growth is not worth it. I know the City can not control what CU does, but each time they have had a major increase in Students/staff the prices on rents and housing have had a significant increase.
- ◆ Promote jobs that can be filled by residents or close to area. Reduce commuting by car/truck.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.10: Which of the following best reflects your view about the rate of new commercial growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ Reduce existing commercial development and convert to housing until we reach a jobs/housing ratio that can sustain a diversity of housing costs and thus family wealth.
- ◆ Same response as above. Metrics should be utilized to determine optimal growth.
- ◆ Somewhere between no management and some management as dictated by having necessary infrastructure in place to support new commercial growth.
- ◆ Stop the building variances; let growth do what it will within current rules
- ◆ support local businesses
- ◆ The city especially needs to focus on the sustainability and environmental-friendliness of new commercial buildings, but not limit it otherwise.
- ◆ The city needs a system that genuinely assures affordable housing. Commercial development needs to be well researched and methodically planned. I remember when East Pearl was reworked and there were a number of buildings that sat empty much later than the recession years. There was also a building built in South Boulder off Marshal Road where they tore down a liquor store and Ras Kass Restaurant, built a 3 story office building that sat empty then it was torn down. Building for building sake will ruin Boulder. I can't really see how we can reduce carbon emissions if we continue to have a much larger work force that commutes in.
- ◆ The city needs a system to limit and manage the current rate of commercial growth
- ◆ The city needs to help commercial 'housing' just as much as residential. Find a way to NOT cannibalize commercial space for residential. They can coexist if you think vertically.
- ◆ The city needs to limit commercial growth and carefully evaluate the community's benefit in allowing expansion.
- ◆ The city needs to maintain and promote an environment supporting small business growth
- ◆ The city needs to manage growth
- ◆ The city needs to reform its regulations regarding commercial growth, particularly in regard to the cannabis industry. Currently the regulations go much farther than the state and serve only to stifle the potential economic benefits of the cannabis industry, most notably job creation.
- ◆ The city should encourage the growth of high-quality commercial/jobs and remove 'artificial' linkages to pet projects such as affordable housing units.
- ◆ The City should index job growth and housing growth to each other and housing growth should be a multiple of job growth
- ◆ The city should manage the rate with pro/con cost benefit analysis
- ◆ The city should manage the rate of commercial growth to ensure adequate housing, transportation, and education needs, as well as community infrastructure and maintenance.
- ◆ The City should mandate that new development help pay for affordable housing but also impacts to infrastructure and services
- ◆ The market is imperfect and creates a lot of externalities. I think the first statement may not reflect the need for better zoning and land use regulations or better enforcement of existing provisions related to 'paying its way' as is reflected in the recent initiatives (which I opposed)
- ◆ The rate of job growth must be matched by improved public transportation, both within the city and to the city.
- ◆ There does need to be a balance. Boulder should retain its uniqueness
- ◆ There is plenty of commercial space, with new space added all the time. We need to provide better infrastructure, including traffic and internet municipalization, otherwise we will lose commercial entities to more enticing places like Longmont.
- ◆ There should NOT be a linkage fee.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.10: Which of the following best reflects your view about the rate of new commercial growth? (OTHER)

- ◆ there you go again, giving incentives for 'affordable' housing and hurting office/business opportunities. at this rate, Boulder will be as bad as most large cities.
- ◆ this question is skewed. It is possible to limit, but not slow growth
- ◆ unrestricted commercial growth can have a negative impact on affordable housing and the number of commuters driving into the city. a balance between growth and the associated increases in traffic and pollution would be a mistake.
- ◆ Use existing empty commercial/manufacturing sites.
- ◆ Use land use regulations to manage quantity, quality and location of commercial building. Not just numbers.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? (OTHER)

- ♦ high density should be discouraged due to substantial negative impact on traffic and quality of life.
- ♦ I am generally supportive of mixed use developments if it IS NOT high end housing. With luxury apartments and condos, people will still drive mostly. Also this doesn't allow middle and lower class workers to live close to work.
- ♦ I am in favor of mixed-use developments under certain conditions only
- ♦ I am pro mixed use, and want developments to be encouraged in more locations than is currently considered appropriate.
- ♦ I encourage mixed-use--without increased height and crowding buildings together like they are on 30th and Pearl and along 28th St.
- ♦ I support it! AND we need to be sure it meets the needs of diverse populations. Recent studies have shown mixed-use can reduce ethnic and economic diversity. We don't want that.
- ♦ I support mixed use but not to the extent that height restrictions are ignored/exempted.
- ♦ I support mixed use; we need more affordable housing options
- ♦ It is generally wealthy homeowners in their sprawling McMansions that oppose a chance for the middle class to have a piece of Boulder pie. I support innovative housing such as alley homes, mother-in-law units, and group housing.
- ♦ it is more than a little naive, that the 'planners' on this 'plan' understand what 'mixed' use really needs to be. for instance you are letting housing units be developed right on Broadway.. the most obvious place for pure business/ office above, with housing in back...
- ♦ Let neighborhoods decide, not developers
- ♦ Mixed use development could be good, but so far much has included very high-end housing. Don't do any more like that.
- ♦ Mixed use is good but poorly done with parking
- ♦ Mixed use is good in theory but does not perform in practice with people changing jobs every 2-4 years.
- ♦ Prefer more lawn and trees in mixed use areas and smaller height buildings
- ♦ There are both positive and negative tradeoffs, it should be handled on a case by case basis even within some defined areas.
- ♦ These need to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Look at neighborhood impact first.
- ♦ Would rather have no additional concentrated activity areas within the city

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Support A review of housing density and mixed use development are necessary to become more inclusive (for workforce traveling into Boulder) and sustainable. Public transportation needs to be kept affordable. Reduce commuters to Boulder to maintain clean air and reduce pollution. Higher population density makes public transport automatically more efficient and affordable.
- ◆ Support An improved housing situation for City of Boulder is a good goal which we support, but it should be implemented an intelligent manner so as to not negatively impact current neighborhoods. For example, in South Boulder developers wish to build a high density development on the Hogan-Pancost land. I am not against growth or additional housing, but this project is being done in a way the will very negatively impact the surrounding neighborhoods with additional traffic, groundwater, and possibly flooding problems. Our flood prone neighborhood is still recovering from the flood of 2013 and does not need additional environmental pressures. Rather I would like to see City of Boulder mitigate the South Boulder flooding risk before additional development moves forward.
- ◆ Support are there reports/ observations for existing mixed use development to account for generated daily traffic? Can you identify major causes of weekday congestion? Is it possible to create incentives to to encourage flexible work hours? (to mitigate peak rush hour conditions)
- ◆ Support As a business owner it is frustrating to not be able to rent commercial space in the city because it is so expensive. That is sad and I wish Boulder supported local businesses more.
- ◆ Support As previously noted, I don't support increasing the height restriction. I am OK with increased mass associated with mixed use development if it doesn't include a height increase.
- ◆ Support Because of the restrictions in city boundaries and building height, you will not be able to build enough houses to impact price

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Support Boulder County's current unemployment rate hovers near 3.5%. Recall that during the Clinton administration, economists considered the national structural unemployment rate to be around 4%. Even in the aftermath of the Great Recession Boulder's economy is overheated and prosperous by any reasonable economic standards. Furthermore, Boulder has survived the Great Recession while consistently being several percentage points under the state and national unemployment rates. Boulder's economy is strong, has been strong, and so long as a diverse and educated workforce exists will remain strong. My concern for the future is that the rising cost of living here will suppress the start-up mentality that created so many of Boulder's great successes. If things are too expensive, people have less margin for error and cannot try new ventures. The talented workforce centralizes around large companies (Google, to name a recent example) with ample revenue that offers stability. If the cost of living in Boulder is not kept under control, we will quickly become a Company Town of the 21st Century. Nice, pleasant, everyone's affluent, but soulless and boring after having left anyone who can't fit into that particular economic model behind. Artists can't pay Google Developer Salary prices for rent, and artists contribute more to Boulder's sense of place than any single software developer.
- ◆ Support Boulder will continue to grow and the city should continue to be aware of that when it comes to development
- ◆ Support But Boulder should have no illusions that the smaller units generally being produced in these developments will reduce the in-commuting. Many people with families will continue to be unable to afford single-family homes in Boulder because of the basic limitation on the size of the city. When you reduce the amount of land, you will increase its cost- just that simple.
- ◆ Support County and city are "over-zoned" - PLAN is corrupt, nearsighted and ego-stupid. Do you really think small, tiny Boulder and Boulder County are going to change China, India, etc.???
- ◆ Support Don't see anything wrong with it, but all things that are in fashion now eventually go out, like Steelyards. Housing is just ugly there.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Support Don't shy away from upzoning along transit corridors. It is a shame that three blocks along North Broadway from Sumac to Upland could not have been 3-4 townhomes per lot rather than the lower density higher price spec homes that are going in. This site is on a transit corridor, walking distance to NoBo/Lucky's and walking distance to Crestview. Identify and preserve these types of opportunities in the BVCP, even if they are only three blocks long. Don't force Live-Work as the only option. The 15-minute neighborhoods in east coast cities have corner grocery stores and small retail near townhomes.
 - ◆ Support Europeans have been doing it for hundreds of years, and look at their amazing cities.
 - ◆ Support For each of these, I answered for market-driven growth. There should be an option between the status quo growth options and no management. I think the answer is somewhere between the two, but definitely closer to market-driven than it is now.
 - ◆ Support I am very supportive of 'Smart growth' rather than let the market control growth. The city needs to be actively involved in ensuring policies support growth that ensures quality of life. Market forces do not do this well. I fully support mixed use development and walkable/transit/bike friendly neighborhoods.
 - ◆ Support I applaud the city's efforts on mixed use developments. I live in Gunbarrel, one of the few areas of town where growth is possible. It has been discouraging to see some of the more established residents (often retired and with plenty of money) so vehemently oppose mixed-use developments. I am actually excited that the city is building these in Gunbarrel. They will bring more businesses, restaurants and services to Gunbarrel. I think that one aspect of mixed-use housing that the city needs to seriously reconsider is better access to ownership for middle income individuals and families. The income limits to qualify for affordable housing in Boulder are unreasonably low. The middle-class in Boulder -- i.e., the scientists, tech workers, engineers and professors who work here and whom are significant drivers of the local economy -- have very limited options when it comes to finding housing that fits their incomes (i.e, \$80-\$120 K/year).
 - ◆ Support I believe in general that mixed use developments are consistent with the vision of a unique community with a sense of place, as opposed to separate commercial and residential (suburban) areas which I most associate with suburban sprawl.
 - ◆ Support I do support mixed use, but also am concerned about traffic in some areas.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs I don't support mixed use development that adds more luxury condos. We need more affordable housing.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Support I feel continually amazed at the parochial attitudes in my home town, Boulder. After living in Europe I can see that mixed use is both natural and desirable. Build up, and give the ground floor (or even more) over to commercial purposes. This should happen from the CENTER OUT, thus the area around downtown, say from 6th to 28th, and from Arapahoe to Pine.
- ◆ Support I just wish the mixed use developments were architecturally interesting - consider Columbus, Indiana. The mixed use currently being build do not represent our unique identity and sense of place!
- ◆ Support I like mixed use but why does mixed use have to be ugly. The new mixed used project are architecturally sterile and unappealing in my opinion.
- ◆ Support I like the current examples of mixed-use developments along north Broadway, East Arapahoe, East Pearl etc. I think they add appropriate character to these areas.
- ◆ Support I prefer growth to stagnation
- ◆ Support I strongly support mixed use and would encourage a more widespread application of this while incorporating parks, community gardens and appropriate public services (transportation, education, entertainment and crime control)
- ◆ Support I support greater mixed use and higher density housing due to positive environmental impact, allows greater support for retail business, greater use of public transportation, less in-commuting, more of a welcoming community, will help keep housing costs down compared to the alternative so combats the "I've got mine too bad for everyone else" mentality
- ◆ Support I think growth is overrated! Quality of life has diminished significantly over the last couple of years. Traffic is horrible, parks and open space overused. I support redevelopment of commercial areas to meet needs of businesses. And mixed use is a popular option as well, especially in current declining retail areas like along 30th.
- ◆ Support I think it would be dangerous to try to limit job growth potential. Businesses come and go (as well as entire industries), and it would be wise for Boulder to be open to a wide range of employers that may want to have a presence here. Otherwise the risk is an unexpected spike in unemployment which is undesirable in any community.
- ◆ Support I think mixed use keeps all house prices up. Boulder does this very well.
- ◆ Support I think that it is important to carefully select areas for mixed use development - places with a high level of public transportation access in order to minimize congestion - including access to the Eco pass system.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Support I think that mixed use development is generally a good solution to the problem of increased population, people moving to nice areas, commuting into town with high cost of living etc. It can't solve everything but it is definitely the way of future development.
- ◆ Support I think that the City and County need to continue to pressure RTD to provide increased regional service to these developments - in particular Boulder Junction and the Google campus area. Some Flatiron Flyers should be direct. All should offer Wifi.
- ◆ Support I worked at Ball Aerospace for 23 years, and many of my co-workers had absolutely no desire to live in Boulder -- preferring to commute from areas that were more suburban and/or Republican. I don't think we should worry too much about the housing-commercial balance, for this reason, but should focus on housing that young families can afford.
- ◆ Support I would like to see more mixed use in East Boulder (55th & Arapahoe). I think switching over some of the space that is used for things like storage units to mixed use housing would benefit the neighborhood, add more housing, and more potential for higher paying jobs if the ground level was used for businesses.
- ◆ Support I would like to see support of smaller living spaces to help affordability and increase housing stock.
- ◆ Support I would prefer mixed use that does not include substantially increased height that has the sense of closing off an area rather than welcoming.
- ◆ Support I wouldn't want to see much more mixed use beyond the areas identified above, but I think development of those areas is good and adds to the vibrancy and dynamism of Boulder.
- ◆ Support I'd like to see everyone able to walk or bicycle to work. Employees who live in towns outside of Boulder could be shuttled in by fleets of vans.
- ◆ Support If commuting increases focus on roads and transportation needs to be addressed and given attention as traffic will severely bring down the quality of life in Boulder.
- ◆ Support I'm a huge fan of walkable cities - anything that gets people out of their cars is a plus. There are a few areas in Boulder where this model is not appropriate but there are many where it is workable.
- ◆ Support I'm also for increasing the occupancy numbers for unrelated people sharing single family homes. And allowing tiny homes.
- ◆ Support In order to make Boulder more affordable for local small businesses, having more mixed use developments might help. I would oppose mixed use expansion if this applied to large national chains or large commercial developments

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Support In order to make mixed use work with regard to limiting auto use, there needs to be a variety of commercial use that can support the needs of those who limit their use - grocery store (and liquor), some cafe/restaurants, etc. These can be within a short walk, or a single short journey on the bus. I don't think the issue is trying to stop people owning cars, it's getting to a point where they are comfortable to not have to use them for every single trip. I'm in a neighborhood near 55th and arapahoe, and we've looked forward to having the 55th/arapahoe develop to be more of a 'village center', however there's been some pushback from folks who seem to be quite happy to jump into the car and drive rather than walking over. It would be good to get the communication going again on what would make such a village work.
- ◆ Support In these areas and in other multi-family housing projects, too many apts/condos are too small for families. Need enough 3-4, 2 bath places so that it's not just young or old who live there.
- ◆ Support Infrastructure needs to keep up with the growth
- ◆ Support its great to have different levels of housing but seems like there isnt a ton of middle ground. seems like there is a ton of low income and a ton of high income.
- ◆ Support I've lived in suburbia (for a great analysis of it I recommend the book *_The Gegrphy of Nowhere_*; this is something no sane society would wish for, to be avoided!
- ◆ Support Keep current height limits
- ◆ Support Maintaining "affordable" housing is an extremely difficult task in the face of limited housing expansion, but I strongly support it
- ◆ Support Market mechanisms are pretty good at controlling development. Development in Boulder is already expensive. Combined with zoning and approvals there are already sufficient controls in place.
- ◆ Support Mix use is great, but stuffing apartments into every corner is not a sound mix use solution. Some high density is fine as long as we keep the density distribution uniform across the city and county.
- ◆ Support Mixed use and density are key factors for smart development and housing. One key factor in this whole conversation is the parking and traffic issues associated with these trends. We can not continue to have a one car/care space per every adult in the city.
- ◆ Support Mixed use could be the greatest model for creating diverse neighborhoods, individuality and creativity within units, all mode transportation networks, environmental friendliness, housing for wide range of income levels, welcoming environments, and probably many more undiscovered benefits.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Support Mixed use development is integral to meeting our housing, transportation and climate goals. Any opponent of mixed use is an opponent of these goals. The zoning map carefully defines the areas where it can occur.
 - ◆ Support Mixed use increases the opportunity for people to develop a sense of neighborhood. The fact that you always have to get in a car to get anywhere means that people become isolated. Mixed use can relieve the problem of congestion.
 - ◆ Support Mixed use is good. Increasing density without adding housing units enables less commuting. Increase the number of unrelated people in a home to equal the number of bedrooms. Allow communal living. And allow accessory dwelling units.
 - ◆ Support Mixed use is key to future sustainable growth. It provides the opportunity for people to live close to where they work. As long as public transit grows in tandem to support these new developments, they will flourish and add to Boulder's appeal and success.
 - ◆ Support Mixed use needs to be visually attractive, quality of design
 - ◆ Support Mixed use neighborhoods should not cause congestion because different types of housing will attract different types of people with different jobs/schedules
 - ◆ Support Mixed use seems like the most practical way to increase available housing and maintain economic growth
 - ◆ Support Mixed use should be encouraged in areas which enable more efficient public transportation and avoidance of automobile use.
 - ◆ Support Mixed use will help lessen the need for more cars and transportation. If people can live and shop in the same place, all the better. I believe mixed use should be expanded into residential neighborhoods. In the 1950s Mom and Pop stores made it possible for people to meet some retail needs without traveling far. For example, small coffee shops near public schools would be a great asset for parents waiting to pick up children.
 - ◆ Support Mixed use will help transportation and goals of a sense of community. Jobs/occupancy growth must be managed in tandem.
 - ◆ Support Mixed use with varying heights and reduced architectural regulations will allow for unique and creative architecture, not the same 3-material palet.
 - ◆ Support Mixed use works great when the size and location is appropriate for its environment. Not every mixed use project needs to be a huge development. It would be great to see more small mixed use infill projects in the right areas.
 - ◆ Support More housing should be affordable to low- and middle-income people. Create disincentives for scrapes and massive pops. I think HOW commercial development is done is more important than the fact of it. Mixed use is great if it is done properly.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ♦ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ♦ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ♦ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ♦ *Other*
 - ♦ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ♦ Support More mixed use! These neighborhoods promote community while reducing environmental impacts.
- ♦ Support More section 8 housing and no landlord discrimination based on income source
- ♦ Support More taller buildings seem to be essential.
- ♦ Support My response is based on the assumption that mixed use developments are planned to minimize environmental impact, noise pollution, traffic congestion, etc.
- ♦ Support Neighborhood-scale nodes would be nice. All necessary and frequented amenities should be available within walking distance from homes.
- ♦ Support New urbanism. It's necessary if Boulder is to maintain open space and a compact community. It satisfies environmental concern if developed correctly and not construed by the whim of the developer/marketplace. By this, I mean every mixed use area should have available the necessary services, banking, dry cleaner, a market or two, a café that doesn't start with an 'S', to reduce the need to travel for these so-called necessities.

- ♦ Support On advantages of mixed use, check out Paris.
- ♦ Support One of the most fantastic things about Boulder is that it is a small city. I hate the thought of Boulder growing in size and turning into another rambling suburb
- ♦ Support Part of the county's and city's challenge with growth arises from limitations on regional transportation options. We could continue to press for additional and improved options for regional travellers.
- ♦ Support Pedestrians have no rights in this town, so they need places to walk (mixed use should include parks and walks--and keep the bikes off them!
- ♦ Support Plenty of options exist that aren't mixed use. If we want younger and more diverse people living and working in Boulder, then do things that appeal to them.
- ♦ Support Public transport, bike lanes etc. an important element of growth
- ♦ Support Putting people near things they need regularly is a good idea. It also makes neighborhoods more complete. Continue to do so.
- ♦ Support regarding the 'values' set forth earlier, the Plan should allow for continued diversity of use and affordable rents for both housing and commercial uses so that we are an 'inclusive' rather than an 'exclusive' community.
- ♦ Support See all previous comments and answers to your questions
- ♦ Support 'Some people think the current system artificially limits housing potential and results in higher housing prices.' This of course, is an absolute fact; we ARE restricting housing which DOES result in higher prices. This simple reality has to be accepted in order to decide what to do about it.

- ♦ Support Stop wishing for Utopia

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Support The above response selections fail to capture / cover the True issue: Boulder has successfully enjoyed the benefit and taken great advantage of the fortuitous circumstance of: A. A nationally ranked University contributing great human capital talent, creativity and entrepreneurial zeal to the community; B. A blessedly scenic geographic location and climate that is attractive to highly capable individuals with the economic means to live where they wish and bring the financial capital to 'make business and pleasure' happen. Boulder civic and political leaders should consider the above benefits of educational and geographic / climate circumstance when considering changes to the Comprehensive Plan.
 - ◆ Support The concept is good, but I support better input into the aesthetics. Specifically, I find most of the mixed use areas vital and attractive, but Boulder Junction is too massive.
 - ◆ Support The county is far too limiting of mixed use development or redevelopment. Especially in small unincorporated towns such as Eldorado Springs, Marshall, Jamestown, etc.
 - ◆ Support the daily camera build is horrendous. the city needs to take a much closer look at what the occupancy rates really are.
 - ◆ Support The housing rate above is a lie. There have been more than 350 units built on city property for at least the last handful of years. Look at north Boulder, Steelyards, Gunbarrel, 28th Street, etc. While some of those areas where a good fit for new residential or mixed-use development, there are some areas that have been overbuilt or there was a promise of mixed-use in the plan, but it did not happen (the hundreds of new units in Gunbarrel are a good example of areas that were overbuilt and promised mixed-use in the published plan, but failed to deliver that promise). City hasn't been following its plan, but has been making deals that shouldn't have been allowed.
 - ◆ Support The increase traffic and building in the Transit Village area is not concerning me. If we are going to a vibrant, fresh community, this needs to happen in other areas of the city. We are beings of increase and growth. When this stops, personal growth stops as well. We must see the whole picture of a vibrant community. Being exclusive creates a stagnant exclusive community.
 - ◆ Support The mixed use concept prevents pockets of "wasteland" that are only used during the day and are dark uninhabited ghost areas at night

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Support The mixed use developments need to allow for more green space around or near them, be of a more attractive architecture, and the rents should be controlled. We do not need any more huge businesses to expand or grow in Boulder. There are enough already. We have to get over the need to grow. The only reason to grow the amount of housing is to bring the jobs and housing into better balance, reduce the in-commuting, and lower the price of housing in Boulder so that ordinary people (teachers, professors, lawyers, etc.) can afford to live here.
 - ◆ Support This is important! Mixed use is our best hope.
 - ◆ Support Too few people control commercial - slight monopoly
 - ◆ Support Up the incentives for developers who add more affordable units
 - ◆ Support Walking neighborhoods with retail stores and small parks are the most desirable areas for families to locate. These can be supplied by a mix of single-family residences, multi-family condos, and 3-story apt bldgs. (if set well back so as not to loom over sidewalks). Aim to maintain a balanced mix! (Encourage stability not turnover.) Bustling urban areas with theaters, specialty restaurants, and stylish shops are great destinations for everybody. Larger apartment buildings scattered around the perimeter of these urban areas would supply convenient housing. A successful city has plenty of the former (mixed neighborhoods) and a few of the latter (city 'downtowns').
 - ◆ Support We DEFINITELY need more housing. And NOT BIG HOUSES. There should be a moratorium on huge homes, and many many more small homes - condos, single family houses the size of mine, which is 1000 sq ft. The affordable housing program is WOEFULLY underfunded and completely misses the mark on a huge swath of 'middle income folks' who can't come close to home ownership in Boulder, but make too much money to get into the affordable housing program.
 - ◆ Support We had mixed use NATURALLY in 1950. It was interesting, it was fun, it worked well until the city decided to control and regulate like a bunch tin gods. Bureaucrats should never try to regulate anything - they always make a mess out of it and it always cost more (taxes).
 - ◆ Support We need more affordable housing options that do not contributed to sprawl - mixed land use is a great way of doing that, if it is in fact affordable - unlike "luxury" places like Boulder Junction (well, a mix of prices is good)
 - ◆ Support We need rent control based on 1/4 minimum wage per bedroom \$50 bonus for it not being a studio. Housing is a right not a privilege. Mansions are a privilege not a right.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Support We need rent control here. Badly. And any plan put in place must care for the quality of life - in particular, mitigate noise and additional car traffic, plus allow for walkability.)
 - ◆ Support We should aspire to mixed use, mixed income, mixed tenure a la Holiday neighborhood
 - ◆ Support While I GREATLY support mixed use developments I am often disappointed with the parking solutions associated with higher density. Higher density and mixed use are related but the results vary greatly on the amount of density and should be looked at more closely than presented in this question. Height and mass should be controlled and a focus should be placed on ownership opportunities for residents. For rent - high density developments can create isolated and homogeneous communities.
 - ◆ Support While I support mixed use development, the current design and implementation of Boulder's mixed used areas, to me, is appalling. The architecture is subpar and will not age well over time, the material selection looks cheap, and the space usage is not creative or inspiring.
 - ◆ Support With the increased focus on tech jobs in Boulder - which is great - I believe there still need to be affordable housing options for artists to maintain/have a rich culture
 - ◆ Tradeoffs Although it is unfortunate that FastTracks is not coming to Boulder, US36 is almost finished and that should alleviate most of the current traffic for in-commuters. Problems are that 1) people are still driving...need to carpool and 2) the in-commuters should be encouraged to park in a central area (like Boulder junction) and not rely on their cars during the day (lunch), this should alleviate congestion on roads such as 30th street during the day. Need to determine the most efficient way for the morning and evening commuters to get in/out of town on peripheral roads (Foothills) quickly so there aren't daily traffic jams.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs Be careful where development is approved. I'm opposed to blocking mountain views and cramming people in with high density housing being built in single family neighborhoods. I think Boulder Junction and the Steelyards were good area choices but not all areas can support that kind of change and would be very disruptive if development occurs. CU is certainly important for our town but maybe they need to alter their enrollment or become more involved with creative housing options. Plus, the problem with homeowners renting to CU students is they are horrible renters who do not know how to care for a house and be respectful to neighbors. This topic needs to be addressed in regards to housing concerns.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Tradeoffs Boulder is limited in size. I strongly feel open space needs to be maintained. Boulder needs to cap housing and business if it wishes to maintain a high quality of life. Continued growth (in-growth) is spoiling the city.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Boulder should maintain strict height limits for all building.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Build deeper (underground)
- ◆ Tradeoffs Commercial growth is fine as long as businesses who pay their taxes and make money aren't closed for 'concept ideas,' especially when those new buildings are hulking, mountain-blocking eyesores... The closure of Ras Kassas (a 20 year business in Boulder!) comes to mind...
- ◆ Tradeoffs Disagree with the background and premise stated above, namely that pay as you go development is a good plan. This strategy will lead to increase in business and other development in less expensive locations, outside of Boulder/Boulder county.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Do not grant set back and height variances. I feel that density of old Daily Camera site seems to be more than renderings and public meetings indicated. I am disappointed that it appears people cannot see the Flatirons and mountains from the Pearl Street mall anymore. That is a major blow to our tourism economy and reputation. I believe the pedestrian mall should be extended one or two blocks west.
- ◆ Tradeoffs don't like affordable housing and all that is involved...despite it's perceived need and 30+ years in the development business lived my family life in louisville where it was affordable only moving back to the city of boulder in retirement (where my small house in lowest cost sf neighborhood works for the two of us) don't think that was such a bad thing
- ◆ Tradeoffs Each housing unit often brings more than one car - what's the plan for parking and increases in traffic? Also, rents near Broadway and Yarmouth are too high for a lot of middle and lower middle class incomes. Where's the housing for folks that make too much for affordable housing and too little for the Boulder rents that are jumping upward?
- ◆ Tradeoffs Economic growth, redevelopment, and increased density should not be limited to only the city of Boulder but rather encouraged in all incorporated cities of the county. This would reduce commuting and congestion in Boulder proper.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Families who would like to live in Boulder (and can afford to do so) often choose to buy in Louisville or Superior, where there are more choices for single family homes. Boulder loses many young families to other communities because we favor 'mixed use' housing to the detriment of single family homes. Many 'mixed use' designated areas appear to have vacant commercial spaces.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Tradeoffs Free mass transportation (including Park and Rides into town) would solve many of the conflicts.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Generally mixed use appearance is not appealing. Lack of parking and accessibility means I do not use those businesses.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Glad to see you are working so hard to get input from the community.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Height limitations should be strictly enforced on any mixed-use project. In addition, strong consideration must be given to prevent mixed-use from destroying the views and/or sunlight of existing housing.
- ◆ Tradeoffs How big do we want Boulder to grow? This is something the citizens as a whole must decide - and then we can determine how to direct development to meet the needs of the community to reach that goal. If we do not want a lot more population, then we probably do not want a lot of developmental growth in either jobs, commercial, or residential assets.
- ◆ Tradeoffs However, I fear larger and denser footprints from 'redevelopment.'
- ◆ Tradeoffs I am becoming increasingly concerned about developments that are limiting views within the city. Specifically, there are many areas such as 30th St. where you can no longer see the Flatirons while driving, walking or biking.
- ◆ Tradeoffs I generally support mixed use, however, I do not support exemptions to the height regulations on new buildings. It is important to me that the view of the Flatirons remain visible from as many areas of the city as possible.
- ◆ Tradeoffs I have been in Boulder for 23 years. In the last 10-15 the character of the city has definitely begun to change due to growth and what I see as extremely ugly developments. I believe mixed use can work and work well. I think The Steelyards is one example. The city needs to be very careful with rezoning, if we lose all our light industrial areas there will be no place in the city for artists and small craftspeople, inventors, and innovators to work in the city.
- ◆ Tradeoffs I have mixed feelings about higher densities since I live in the Gunbarrel area. I think the three apt. developments that are/have been built anticipated more transit opportunities - e.g., use of the BN rail tracks, etc. - than we will ever see. And the largest development was allowed to build so close to the existing roads/streets, with additional access points, creating more on-street parking. Also, during the work day hours, the businesses (and all this space is not yet occupied) use the streets for parking since I am presuming the city did not require parking lots, thinking public transport of some type would be used by workers. Very short-sighted thinking, planning. Commuters really do need the automobile.
- ◆ Tradeoffs I have seen poorly regulated growth ruin large parts of Berkeley, California.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Tradeoffs I like the density and mixed use, but I think design is important and I'm concerned that some developments that are coming in look too generic and take away from the city's charm. For example the 30th and Pearl development and 29th Street developments look like they could be built anywhere USA. It would be great to keep the old Pearl Street and CU look in the architecture.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs I live in a 'mixed use' building (condos, offices and residences, built back in 1984). Great in theory, terrible in reality. The opposing needs of resident owners and commercial owners makes for troublesome conflicts. One example: increased HOA fees are a business tax write-off for commercial unit owners; not so for residential owners, an imbalance in fairness. Another example is that commercial owners feel entitled to more parking (for clients) and covered parking, while residents are often treated like second class citizens in that area.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs I live in an area marked for mixed use development (55th and Arapaho). The influx of hipsters keeps the neighborhood alive and fun but the traffic is awful and parking for stores and restaurants is impossible. I don't want a big transit hub nearby because its my neighborhood and I want it safe and calm and enjoyable. I wonder why the 55th St corridor between pearl and Arapaho is not better utilized. It's industrial with no sidewalks and has gangs of scary people from some rehab facility roaming along it, so no one goes there. We know to drive it and not try to walk or bike.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs I really don't know the answer to be able to answer fully. Typically if you cap something, then prices go up. That is already the problem.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs I support the growth of mixed use developments around the city IF IT IS NOT ACCOMPANIED BY INCREASED HEIGHT AND MASS. The 35 foot height limit should be considered the maximum in new construction for both commercial and housing structures. This is vitally important because it alone can ensure that the current open, village-like character of the city is preserved.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs I support the new Google campus - Google is the future, and more smart people in town is great. On the flip side, there is so much development going on in the Pearl St area between Folsom and Foothills that the inevitable traffic spike (despite Boulder Junction, despite mixed-use, despite right-sizing) will make Boulder a perpetual traffic jam. When is enough enough? This is EXACTLY why 300 and 301 are on the ballot.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs I think families might not necessarily want mixed use areas for living. It does create a vibrant personality.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs I think mixed use is great to increase housing in more urban areas. Why are we letting these ugly designs by built in Boulder? The Peleton's design is more reflective of better design. Every new building in Boulder seems to have been designed by a committee.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ♦ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ♦ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ♦ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ♦ *Other*
 - ♦ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ♦ Tradeoffs I think mixed use should be approached carefully. If we really want a mix of tenants then there needs to be real life design. To bring a family into a development there would need to be good storage for bikes and green spaces for young kids amongst many really well planned designs. I find the steel yards almost too dense. My dentist moved there recently and the parking is kind of a pain. I realize we want to discourage people from driving as much, but the parking in these dense developments should be balanced enough that people aren't turned away from the businesses.
- ♦ Tradeoffs I think the density makes sense in selective areas. It would be good to be able to vote on these selected areas.
- ♦ Tradeoffs I think there is a lot of potential for developing the old hospital on Broadway
- ♦ Tradeoffs I work in the Steelyards, and it seems to me to have a much greater sense of community than other parts of Boulder in which I have lived and worked, which makes me feel very friendly toward the idea of mixed-use areas.
- ♦ Tradeoffs I would refine my answer to say that Mixed use should be done on a very limited basis and after consultation with the existing neighborhoods on whether they want that type of development in their area.
- ♦ Tradeoffs If a company wants to move to Boulder, and they will employ smart educated people, why would we want to make it difficult? I have lived in the suburbs of many cities but have worked in the city. Most people live where they can afford and do not expect a city to provide affordable housing. Life is not fair at times.
- ♦ Tradeoffs If future questions don't address, I want to comment on annexation. I live in unincorporated Boulder and was given the option to annex to City, but the costs and restrictions are extremely prohibitive. Seems to me lowering the annexation costs for individual properties increases the supply of housing without new development and seems a no brainer. I can't fathom why the City forces such obscene fees with annexation.
- ♦ Tradeoffs I'm generally a believer in 'well-regulated-but-still-effectively-free' markets, hence my responses. At the same time, something I love about Boulder is the growth boundary, which of course results in restricted housing supply, and thus higher prices. That said, I own an historic home in the Mapleton neighborhood and mostly benefit from the increasing value of my house (despite meaning that I pay ever-increasing taxes on it). So I'm hardly impartial about maintaining current conditions and trends because I benefit from them, especially if/when I ever sell my house.
- ♦ Tradeoffs Is there any way to avoid ugly construction, such as Boulder Junction?

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Tradeoffs It is not sustainable to continue our current growth rate. It is unreasonable to not ask all new developments to add solar, to reduce to a minimum their use of resources, and their needs to be a plan to deal with the increase traffic --- how about offering electric solar cars for rent in addition to bikes for example. We can't just keep increasing the pollution and not think their won't be consequences -- there will be.
- ◆ Tradeoffs It really depends on how big we want Boulder to get on how much growth should be allowed. It seems that in the past 5 years Boulder has really grown. But yet there is not enough space for everyone. Getting around Boulder is very difficult. I am glad that I don't have to drive across Boulder to get to my job. Biking is not an option for me at this point and taking a bus would take too long. There seems to be so much road construction going on at all times that it takes longer to get across anywhere. It also seems that there are road projects in the same places month after month and seems like money is being wasted by tearing up roads that had just been fixed several months before.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Let the city grow -- It's natural and obviously this is a desirable place to live. That being said, it's damn near impossible to afford to live here. I really don't get how many people do it. I live in South Boulder, but will likely be moving away so that I can start a family. Can't afford that here.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use are primarily rental units. Promoting ownership will make our community healthy.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use areas usually attract highly mobile single or childless married folks, unless they are designed with a bit less density and private play areas with families in mind. This is does not to be the vision of our designers right now. And height restrictions should not be waived. Period.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use can work very well, e.g., look at major European cities with commerce below and housing above. But, our placing of housing on top of railroad tracks was pretty crazy, I think. There is a lot of potential for ADUs in back yards in areas where the neighborhoods would like to have those, e.g., in certain north Boulder areas (Melody-Catalpa neighborhood for example)--the house footprint in that area is often 500-1000 ft., less than the allowed size...why not allow a separate ADU of that size with some sort of rent control pricing so that lower income workers could afford to live in Boulder. And this carries to other cities in the BV as well. We are ignoring potential and instead cramming blocks of ugly poorly built boxes along busy streets...this is NOT China, yet.
- ◆ Tradeoffs Mixed use doesn't promote reduced reliance on autos. Many residents of those multimillion\$ units outside of Boulder and thereby can afford the price tag.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ♦ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ♦ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ♦ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ♦ *Other*
 - ♦ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ♦ Tradeoffs Mixed use has been blindly applied to foster small retail spaces which are part of the grotesquely high rate of business failure in Boulder -- the goal is not a store-front that goes out of business 3 times a year, but the ideals from Jane Jacobs and the old ICMA Greenbooks. The town is full of fake hobby businesses and chain store franchises and missing the kinds of facilities that center neighborhoods -- the Sun Deli and Pizza and small grocery is such a place; another nail salon about to die is not. One avenue to pursue is the use of incentives for locally-used businesses that have some life expectancy. I would like to see people come in with a plan that includes local bike shop, local coffee, local small deli and commitments from businesses to stay for a year after 3/4 occupancy and to be charged reasonable rental rates.
 - ♦ Tradeoffs Mixed use has to be done very carefully with regard to location since there is a high chance of negative impact on real estate value and quality of life in adjacent and nearby neighborhoods
 - ♦ Tradeoffs Mixed use is great in theory and in certain areas, like N. Broadway, but on the Hill, it's creating super-expensive housing with little parking. Parking for businesses and tenants is a big issue. Boulder underestimates this need.
 - ♦ Tradeoffs Mixed use seems to increase problems with no regard for residents.
 - ♦ Tradeoffs Mixed use should focus on outcomes such as increased people density, affordability, walkability, and the additional intensity should be focused on transit corridors and near employment centers.
 - ♦ Tradeoffs Mixed use shouldn't be a goal in and of itself. A development plan should stand on its own with no preferential bias for or against mixed use.
 - ♦ Tradeoffs more parking should be required for residential units. The plan seems to be that if less parking is provided people will somehow be less reliant on cars or less likely to have a car. In my mind it just creates parking problems. Look at the Uptown Broadway development as an example. Very difficult to park at night. Cars booted for parking in commercial spots but all the two bedroom units were provided with one parking space. It makes no sense. The units with two bedrooms are more likely than not occupied by two people. It is the rare couple or set or roommates that can rely on one car.
 - ♦ Tradeoffs Much depends on the scale and placement of build-out. Recent huge single-family dwellings have eroded the quality of life in some previously-modest housing areas.
 - ♦ Tradeoffs Need to change the number of non-related who may occupy housing
 - ♦ Tradeoffs Need to figure out better transportation into/out of Boulder to help economic growth without straining the housing capacity any further.
 - ♦ Tradeoffs Needs to be well planned and managed

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Tradeoffs No more apartment buildings like in Gunbarrel
 - ◆ Tradeoffs No.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs North Boulder is bombarded with mixed use, high density neighborhoods, homeless shelter, non-profit facilities/homes. Sometimes it feels like a dumping ground for the city. What will these areas look like in 10 years?!
 - ◆ Tradeoffs RE: housing unit growth, no distinction is made between single-family residences and condo complexes. Clearly, for the plan to be successful, development of high-density multi-family complexes like Boulder Junction, Steelyards, etc. should be regulated. Residents of these complexes do not have the long-term commitment to the Comp Plan priorities that residents in single-family houses have.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs Seems unwise and artificial to prohibit mixed-use entirely. But it would hopefully be limited to areas that have, or are likely to have a mixed-use 'feel', and not become more than a modest share of overall development.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs Some positives: young singles; negatives: few families with kids
 - ◆ Tradeoffs Somehow most of the mixed use housing involves super expensive condos and not mixed use as found in Portland and other vibrant cities
 - ◆ Tradeoffs Support co-ops, shared housing, infill, and other "non-growth" ways of increasing low-moderate housing options. Increase number of new commercial ventures, support entrepreneurs, push bigger firms to other cities in the county.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs The 29th Street mall area should have been a mixed use area. Shame on you and the developer. It's a disaster.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs The city is fine. Mixed use and high density in the county should be approved by neighborhoods
 - ◆ Tradeoffs The council should apply higher standards to the design of new buildings, both residential and commercial. What has been built over the last 5 years is aesthetically NOT very pleasing. Boulder should NOT look like every other small city just because it is cheaper to build cookie-cutter stuff.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs 'The intent of Boulder's Residential Growth Management System is to limit housing permits..' 'The city does not manage the rate of commercial growth..' At least we know that business-catering policy has created the problem. We have identified it and so we can fix it.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs The mixed-use development downtown (Canyon near Broadway) is OK but that should be the end of it downtown. Boulder Junction sounded like a good idea but the result is pretty terrible.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Tradeoffs There are ways to increase density without building the types of structures we are seeing go up on Pearl Street and elsewhere. Unless of course city counsel wants to start building these things west of Broadway where the majority of city counsel members actually live.

 - ◆ Tradeoffs There should be no variances granted for building heights, setbacks and parking, for any reason. The office/warehouse complex at Central Ave. east of 55th should be converted to a mixed use development.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs This is such a complex issue. Making predictions about how development will impact our current residents and businesses is the job of city staff, who have experience. I WISH I felt more confidence in them to do this job. Again, more EARLY communication with all stakeholders should be a mandatory part of the process.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs This should not be determined by anyone tied to the construction industry or any other profit motivated individual
 - ◆ Tradeoffs We are not New York City. I do not want my children to have to raise my grandchild in an apartment above a pizza place or garage, smelling of greasy food, motor oil, OR marijuana. I also don't like these tiny, tiny apartments that remind me of tenements. Conversely, so-called "luxury" apartments at nearly \$2K a month are hardly affordable to the average working person or couple. I do NOT know what the answer is; I just don't like it, and in many ways, it's more of a USA problem, not just Boulder's. I call it gentrification, where business, not people or the land, prospers.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs We need to manage the growth of housing costs and city/county tax burdens that will evolve Boulder into a Vail/Aspen exclusive community
 - ◆ Tradeoffs We're becoming too Aspenized
 - ◆ Tradeoffs While I believe there are positive and negative consequences of mixed use developments, I think they should be limited to central locations (encouraging walking, biking or using public transportation use to get to work, shopping, dining, etc.), close to major roads to prevent increased traffic congestion, and perhaps approved based on a combination of market demand and zoning to retain desired community character. I'm not sure I would agree with development of many more mixed use developments.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs While I support increased potential for jobs and housing, it seems to me that limited land for development will naturally result in some suppression of the potential. I suppose the scenario will continue to encourage redevelopment and I wonder if the fate of middle income residents will be adversely affected.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Tradeoffs Why not make use of spaces outside the city centers, such as the huge IBM site and others, for more industrial-type businesses that wish to locate in this area, such as the Google operation, which is now being situated in what should be a strictly retail-type area.
 - ◆ Tradeoffs With careful design considerations, mixed use development can include housing options for senior citizens who are independent and want to be near amenities without requiring use of a car or a long ride. I know some exists in Boulder, but it would be nice to see more.
 - ◆ Oppose Allowing dense development such as at Boulder Junction is too much. Adding mixed use makes it even more crowded feeling. Allowing building almost to curbs makes one feel you're in canyons and views are blocked.
 - ◆ Oppose Any business which is to be in close proximity with a residential area must be a quiet business. Example: a business that has alcohol, eating and music outside should not be permitted close to an area where people live.
 - ◆ Oppose As a Gunbarrel resident, I have been amazed at how it appears to be ,open season, on our area. Views are gone, traffic is horrible (seemingly few new residents are actually walking anywhere, surprise surprise), and the light pollution from the apartments - which claim they cannot reduce the use of inside or outside lighting - has created frustrated and stressed-out neighbors whose quality of life is being compromised. The developers have sold a bill of goods to the city, namely that if they build ,mixed use developments, people will live where they work and get out of their cars. This does not seem to be the case as we can't get out of our neighborhood for the traffic along Lookout, and the amazing number of cars parked along Spine of the workers who are driving in. A simple, telling sign that people are still in their cars is to look at the King Soopers parking lot...can't find a space anymore.
 - ◆ Oppose Bottom line...we need more housing or quit approving all these large communal projects that reck our views and increase congestion. Our roads in and out are the worst in the metro area. Meanwhile we talk a big game about carbon and the environment. Our politicians just love the tax money for their projects.
 - ◆ Oppose Boulder is not LoDo. The massive ugly dense towering buildings are not Boulder's character. The city should stop pursuing them.
 - ◆ Oppose Boulder is not the unique place that it used to be....
 - ◆ Oppose Boulder should be a city of single home neighborhoods with some shopping and schools close by. Steelyard, Boulder Junction, Uptown Broadway etc. are all eyesores.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ♦ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ♦ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ♦ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ♦ *Other*
 - ♦ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ♦ Oppose Canyon Blvd. has huge buildings that are designed to be mixed use. All I see is one bank after another on the bottom of these buildings and overpriced condominiums on the top that seem to be uninhabited. Their height is obnoxious. Their rental/leasing spaces are prohibitive and street people and bums love to sit on the ground next to these buildings all day long. While these buildings provide sufficient underground parking, they are built upon a foundation of pure greed!
 - ♦ Oppose City planners poor execution of Steelyards and Junction, casts doubt on ability to implement future plans
 - ♦ Oppose Enough mixed use already
 - ♦ Oppose I accept that there are positive and negative tradeoffs, but since the city cannot get the "formula" right, I oppose mixed-use. The amount of congestion grows every day.
 - ♦ Oppose I am a senior, and I am basically against change.
 - ♦ Oppose I am not opposed to mixed-use development in principle, but the examples cited -- Steel Yards, Boulder Junction -- are awful and a blight on the city.
 - ♦ Oppose I believe we have reached or maybe exceeded the right amount of mixed use development. We should discourage further growth.
 - ♦ Oppose I do not believe the current mixed use developments have included enough research on the impact on traffic and the surrounding communities. Continued growth as it is conducted now is undesirable.
 - ♦ Oppose I think Boulder is creating one large traffic jam by cramming too many units into a small space. Parking is a nightmare and leads to parking on the street (i.e. far north Boulder). The commercial establishments are not the kind needed to make a neighborhood (i.e. grocery stores, drug stores).
 - ♦ Oppose I think increasing density, by adding either commercial buildings or high density housing projects in otherwise rural neighborhoods, has a serious negative effect on the existing communities. If there must be more mixed use development, I think it should be added in downtown areas that are already fairly high density and are well serviced by mass transit.
 - ♦ Oppose If one desires more mass and height, move to New York City and leave Boulder alone!
 - ♦ Oppose I'm not against growth and change, but the 30th and Pearl area, and others like it in such an already congested area, is a good example of what I hate to see happening in Boulder!

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Oppose In Las Angeles, where I visit my son, I see the epitome of mixed use. In an area of wetland I saw new development based on the future of Google in the area (sound familiar?). The complexes were enormous and included Home Depots and supermarkets, etc, within living compounds. These store cannot exist solely on the resident's patronage but also attract customers from outside the complexes, leading to traffic whoredom, if that's a word. This is what the mixed use locally will amount to. The city is too happy to put high density in places where the increased traffic cannot be realistically dealt with. I would site the building of Violet on Broadway in north Boulder with only yarmouth on the North and Violet on the south and Broadway flowing past on the west. These roads are only two lanes, and I suppose that idiot doctor will probably get his velodrome approved out there on Yarmouth and those cyclist won't be cycling out, they'll be driving out. I live on Yarmouth and the the increase in traffic has been exponential. Enough already
 - ◆ Oppose In theory "mixed use" seems feasible. However, based on the quality and lack of aesthetic appeal current in Boulder what seems to be happening is a glut of cheap, unattractive, crowded areas that are expensive and encourage socioeconomic homogeneity. The standards of mixed use need to be upgraded to work in practice.
 - ◆ Oppose Is change inevitable? Of course. But that does not mean growth is inevitable. We can maintain one of the highest qualities of life in the world, but at least for now, we must control growth.
 - ◆ Oppose Mixed use areas tend to be compact, causing traffic congestion, limited parking, and detracts from the community feel and appearance
 - ◆ Oppose Mixed use destroys the loveable character of an area.
 - ◆ Oppose Mixed use developments and high density housing developments lead to future slums based on the experience in many cities throughout the country.
 - ◆ Oppose Mixed use developments dramatically change the look and feel of Boulder, add/invite bad housing and low-quality businesses, and are not likely to have the desired economic or ecological impacts. There is also additional risk from partial failure
 - ◆ Oppose Mixed use seems to bring more congestion and parking issues. It seems good in theory, but the compacted areas and lack of parking are problems. I am not a fan of most of the architectural facades which don't evoke in me the Colorado mountain feel.
 - ◆ Oppose No Baseline Zero. 2) extra housing is OK if detached single family.
 - ◆ Oppose No more condos/apts/high density housing! It is ruining the character of Boulder!
 - ◆ Oppose Not every new development should be mixed use.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ◆ Oppose On mixed use development: Take a look at Gunbarrel. The development isn't finished, and there are already negative impacts on traffic and noise. Lookout Road needed to be widened before this development started, not after. I call that VERY poor planning Boulder!
- ◆ Oppose packing more people into a limited space will never work - everybody needs to drive their individual cars, plus all of the worker/maintenance traffic without increasing the number of roads is never going to work - people don't ride their bikes or take the bus enough to offset the rampant growth Boulder has allowed over the past few years - very shortsighted planning is leaving us with overcrowded roads with too many angry people on them
- ◆ Oppose Plan to get your money, without raising taxes, by other means! Don't cover Boulder with high buildings.
- ◆ Oppose Please do not shoehorn any more people into Boulder. The city cannot maintain its high quality of life (no litter, bike-friendly) with more people.
- ◆ Oppose Should live within our means. There is not an infinite capacity for housing growth (e.g., 1%/yr will outgrow capacity in 20-40 years). 2) Boulder Junction and Uptown Broadway are ABOMINABLE and have changed the entire community character - who designs and approves these monotypic "boxes" construction? The prospect of more of this type of building design and construction at the soon-to-be-old National Guard complex on north Broadway is unconscionable! Boulder is losing its soul in addition to its character. "Mixed use," like "right-sizing," is a non sequitur and does not provide the desired, and promised, benefits.
- ◆ Oppose Some mixed use developments are great, such as Uptown Broadway. However, Boulder Junction is an eyesore and completely changes the character of the area in a negative way. I highly doubt the positive effects that mixed use supposedly has on reducing traffic, but would need to see the data before making a final decision.
- ◆ Oppose Specifically I view the commercial growth as the main driver for more housing growth; and not affordable housing at that. The city should actively *dis*courage new commercial growth in order for the markets to stabilize such that boulder is a city with limited scope and not one where we grow until nature is a park or two set aside in the middle of the city.
- ◆ Oppose Stop mixed use developments now. This will preserve what quality is still evident in Boulder City.
- ◆ Oppose Thank you for seeking community input.
- ◆ Oppose The city and county are quickly becoming overcrowded. Maintenance of roads and other areas are suffering greatly.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ♦ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ♦ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ♦ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ♦ *Other*
 - ♦ *Don't know / no opinion*
-

- ♦ Oppose The increased height of commercial and residential buildings AND the increased density, along with the traffic associated with them have already seriously affected Boulder in a negative way
- ♦ Oppose The mixed use development that has so far occurred has created congestion and soulless enclaves - the very opposite of what Boulder for so many years has offered. As an "answer" to accommodating more growth, both residential and commercial, it fails to recognize Prof. Al Bartlett's oft-repeated explanation that growth, even at a perceived low level, is still ultimately unsustainable.
- ♦ Oppose They don't work anywhere else in the country! Don't force this on us.
- ♦ Oppose Too much commercial development; too fast for the city.
- ♦ Oppose We need more stringent growth restrictions in the city for both residential and commercial growth. Outside of Boulder in Boulder County regular limited growth would be OK.
- ♦ Oppose Your building too much - your creating pollution - increasing carbon output - increasing traffic - increasing demand for water and sewage and not making builders pay for it?! Encourage growth outside the county where there is room. Core values. Vs. GREED.
- ♦ Other Allowing commercial development in exchange for affordable housing will only exacerbate the influx of new residents and commuters coming to Boulder. As noted above such large commercial structures are destroying the character of Boulder with their height and mass. Right now the current approved commercial development has done irreparable harm to Boulder.
- ♦ Other Commercial growth should be held at 0% or below. Mixed use development is still development, and should also be severely restricted.
- ♦ Other Improving transportation (NOT RTD) would solve many of the problems. A system like Hawaii uses to move large numbers of workers from Hilo to Waikoloa by free bus would be a start. Point-to-point bus systems from park and ride lots to employment centers works - not the RTD model.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ◆ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ◆ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ◆ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ◆ *Other*
 - ◆ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ◆ Other it is more than a little naive, that the 'planners' on this 'plan' understand what 'mixed' use really needs to be. for instance you are letting housing units be developed right on Broadway.. the most obvious place for pure business/ office above, with housing in back of this.... Malcom extolled the virtues of preventing a safeway to be built, only so North Boulder residents have to get into, god forbid 'cars' to drive to central boulder to go to a grocery store.... then had the gull to claim the 'Hollywood' community that replaced it was better, pure housing which increased traffic far more than the grocery store would have, worse, he/you made the problem worse by making everyone in north boulder drive to central and south boulder to go to a grocery store.... please don't speak of 'mixed' use until you actually understand what 'mixed' use means.... and driving out grocery stores in favor of 500 more housing units and 1000 more cars, only shows how much you need to learn about 'mixed' use in a city.... and thanks to Malcom, we get to see increased traffic on all streets because of a lack of understanding what a city needs to be to limit the number of car trips.
 - ◆ Other Mixed use and urban density saves the environment and our open space, and encourages healthy lifestyle with walkability and bikeability.
 - ◆ Other Mixed-used developments could be advantageous if they better met the aesthetic character of the city and heights did not exceed certain limits. The examples given above (except for some units in North Boulder) are modern and expensive. These developments have been changing the character of the town and contributing to congestion. I don't believe that most people moved to Boulder to live in an area that feels like LODO Denver. We live here for a small town feel and better quality of life. I live in a condo that is only 400 sf. These new ,high density, housing buildings are typically much larger and ,luxury,, so I don't think they are truly helping with affordability. The affordability of Boulder is forever constrained by the limited space available. I'd like to see more creative options for housing proposed by some new council member candidates.
 - ◆ Other Most concerned about congestion and lack of sufficient parking. 30th and Pearl look like any other city in the USA. We are being boxed in. Even though Home Depot is a big box store, you do not feel packed in like you do on Pearl. The building is set back far enough from the street.
 - ◆ Other Parking in mixed use is inadequate. New developments like Four Mile Creek, Nobo are too tight and closterphobic. I hate going there.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.11: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the encouragement of mixed use within commercial hubs and along major arterial roads? Any comments on your response?

Opinion

- ♦ *I generally support the encouragement of mixed use developments in these locations.*
 - ♦ *I believe there are positive and negative tradeoffs; mixed use is beneficial in limited areas of the city. Mixed use with higher densities should be encouraged only in carefully defined areas of Boulder.*
 - ♦ *I generally oppose more mixed use developments. Further mixed use development should be discouraged. Additional such developments are not desirable within the community and their negative impacts would outweigh any positive attributes.*
 - ♦ *Other*
 - ♦ *Don't know / no opinion*
-
- ♦ Other Several small apt. complexes in area of North St/Broadway/9th have a balance of landscaped areas and hardscape. Very walkable, bikeable and driveable, yet near the hub of stores and thoroughfares.
 - ♦ Other 'The Plan recognizes Boulder's role as a major employment center.' This is a cop-out. The plan should plan. This is a central decision to the type of community we want to be. This inferred, default, accidental goal needs to be reexamined. Else, we will be a wealthy enclave.
 - ♦ Other Underground parking needs to be provided for all new developments. I stay away from the Holiday development because it's impossible to park there, and the parking spots are striped for small cars when a large portion of cars in Boulder are SUVs.
 - ♦ Other What we really need are additions that decrease the wealth gap. NO houses over 4000 square feet; more allowability of mixed adult housing (with a caveat of not exploiting students and apply noise restrictions if concerned about too high density). We need to support individual capital accounts for low-income community members and we need a living wage - meaning minimum wage of at least \$15/hr.
 - ♦ DK / no opinion I agree with mixed use in an already built building. I do not agree with building new. It's a shame how much 30th and Pearl is now.
 - ♦ DK / no opinion Look at current mixed use and make determination based on that opinion
 - ♦ No response Does anyone think that development in one part of the city doesn't effect the whole city? After all, if one lives/works in one part, does that mean that one doesn't go to the other parts of the city?
 - ♦ No response High density housing usually excludes families. I'm not a fan of high density housing. However taller commercial buildings are fine.
 - ♦ No response Mixed use is appropriate for areas which have not had any development. Mixed use imposed in an existing residential area is not acceptable.
 - ♦ No response New mixed use projects have become sterile at best and blighted at worst

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.12: Which locations should the city emphasize for planning for redevelopment and future mixed use concentrated activity? (OTHER)

- ◆ 4th and Mapleton
- ◆ 6th to 28th, by Arapahoe to Pine
- ◆ A lot of these already have a lot of new development. (1,2,3,5,11) Mixed use is nice but I wouldn't force more development just for that.
- ◆ Airport area
- ◆ All of above 1-12
- ◆ Allow the whole city to develop naturally
- ◆ Arapaho East of 55th
- ◆ Baseline/Moorhead/27th
- ◆ Boulder reserve
- ◆ Broadway and Iris <http://irisandb.com/>
- ◆ Buy back land from government agencies (NOAA, NCAR, CU)
- ◆ can't comment on proposals south of Arapahoe, or east of 55th
- ◆ Community hospital site, all commercial locations (e.g., housing above shopping centers)
- ◆ CU land south of 36 and Table Mesa, land north of Jay and 36
- ◆ East of 30th on Walnut
- ◆ Former Community Hospital complex
- ◆ funny, I live the area near Gunbarrel Town Center and I do not believe there was community involvement or funding for the high impact of traffic and change to the surrounding area outside the city of Boulder's annexed property. I do not believe any of these areas should be emphasized until more research is conducted with the existing residents in the areas of development.
- ◆ i dont know
- ◆ I feel that the city will build no matter what the people say. I have experienced this personally.
- ◆ I support redevelopment in most places in the city IF the height and mass of the new construction remains at 35 feet or below
- ◆ Individual consideration for each -- look closely at neighborhood impact.
- ◆ Major development must have good public transport and alternative mode routes. All of these areas would be good locations if transit is provided. I've checked those that have good (Skip-like) transit.
- ◆ Martin Acres
- ◆ Mixed use is a great idea, but let's see it work in the most connected areas of town before we add density to other neighborhoods. If Boulder Junction is an example of 'mixed use' as it is currently practiced, then I certainly do not support it in other areas.
- ◆ no more condos/apts/high density !
- ◆ No opinion on this.
- ◆ None, if it means more variances to building restrictions
- ◆ Not sure. I am concerned about density, air pollution, everywhere in Boulder
- ◆ redevelopment and the 'comprehensive' plan has failed the people of boulder, because you concentrated as an example 'grocery' stores, in a single 3 block area... which is by the way, moronic... anyone who talks about 'right sizing' a street because of vehicle traffic, after turning away a grocery store in different parts of the city, which would have done 1000 times as much to reduce vehicle trips as anything this plan has done.... until you get your head in the right place, you have set boulder on a path of destruction.... seriously.
- ◆ SE Boulder
- ◆ Student zone of The Hill: Bway to 9th, College to University

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.12: Which locations should the city emphasize for planning for redevelopment and future mixed use concentrated activity? (OTHER)

- ◆ Table Mesa Center, but only if there is substantial underground parking. The parking lots there are already full with the current commercial development there.
- ◆ the city should fire their planners
- ◆ The Planning Reserve
- ◆ The warehouse areas east of Foothills Parkway might be considered.
- ◆ These need to be planned with the neighbors. It's very hard for me to say what is needed in Gunbarrel. 'The Hill' already has a parking problem.
- ◆ Valmont south of Kings Ridge

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 First Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Address traffic impacts with realistic expectations for growth, alternative transportation can't solve every problem.
- ◆ adequate streets and parking for any planned construction
- ◆ Affordability for small businesses
- ◆ Affordable for MIDDLE INCOME, not just the very poor.
- ◆ All Feel good above
- ◆ Annex county land east of the city
- ◆ architectural design
- ◆ As to quality and design, the modern architectural style of building at 30th and Pearl, on 28th south of Valmont and in Gunbarrel are entirely inconsistent with the Boulder's existing architecture.
- ◆ Attractive buildings that add to the character of the city
- ◆ Be attractive architecturally. Big square ugly buildings look like tenements.
- ◆ Build parking lots for those people who work here & have to use cars for whatever their reasons.
- ◆ Commonsense ideas that reflect the will of the public. Not Counsel members whimsical ideas
- ◆ Compatible, friendly aesthetics
- ◆ Contribute to culture and active lifestyle of Boulder
- ◆ ease of parking
- ◆ Eliminate low-slung strip malls with vast and inefficient parking plazas
- ◆ Energy consciousness
- ◆ Energy conservation
- ◆ Establish a limit of this density and have the communities or neighborhoods vote on the density
- ◆ F
- ◆ Fix roads and streets (for automobiles)
- ◆ Further the boulder aesthetic - more emphasis on creative centers, example more dancing fountains, public investment in art
- ◆ High energy efficiency as a separate development goal.
- ◆ high quality
- ◆ Housing housing housing for our youth, seniors, families (where appropriate) and work force
- ◆ ignition resistant building materials and design, including landscaping
- ◆ impact on traffic
- ◆ Include small apartments, condos, and homes for affordability
- ◆ Increase setbacks around multiple housing structures.
- ◆ jobs
- ◆ keep your hands off my city!
- ◆ make sense within the context of the space and surrounding areas
- ◆ Make sure it doesn't add congestion in immediate area - cars aren't going away for a long time
- ◆ minimize rental units
- ◆ no variances to setbacks, height, etc for any reason
- ◆ Not just energy conservation, but water, as well - e.g. instant heating and faucets that are designed to conserve water and promote sanitation
- ◆ parking
- ◆ Pay for any new schools.
- ◆ Pay for impact on auto impact. The city roads exceed capacity now.
- ◆ pay for necessary related new infrastructure

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 First Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Pay for new schools -- or improvements to existing schools/services given impact from the new development.
- ◆ pay for water, waste-water and storm water utilities.
- ◆ Plan plan for need of additional schools
- ◆ Preservation of historic neighborhoods
- ◆ Preserve open space
- ◆ Preserve the traditional character of the city
- ◆ Promote alternative transportation without purposefully limiting automobile use
- ◆ Provide a diversity of housing types
- ◆ Provide additional recreation facilities and mountain bike trails
- ◆ Provide adequate car parking
- ◆ Provide affordable goods or services that middle income people can afford
- ◆ provide affordable industrial spaces
- ◆ provide for a new school if needed
- ◆ Provide jobs
- ◆ Provide sites for new schools as needed.
- ◆ Provide some multiplier of more housing in the residual part of the mixed use than the job growth in the commercial portion.
- ◆ Providing funds for road maintenance for 5-10 years
- ◆ Raise property values of the surrounding areas
- ◆ Recreational opportunities
- ◆ Reduce housing unit growth
- ◆ replace community amenities destroyed by the new development, e.g., a warm water wellness center to replace the Mapleton Pool
- ◆ Require a reduction in square footage for any permit
- ◆ Smaller in scale to not overwhelm the area.
- ◆ Table Mesa, needs more parking not more density
- ◆ That developers not lie to homeowners as was the case at Vistoso
- ◆ This is not a role of government
- ◆ Tied for third place in my choices above is 'exceed standards for energy conservation'
- ◆ transportation
- ◆ UNIQUE LIFESTYLE
- ◆ Use the land as little as possible, it's too crowded

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 Second Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ 100% Net Positive Energy Producers - No Exceptions.
- ◆ add accessibly and usable public space that is nature oriented
- ◆ Architectural integrity (Boulder Junction is so ugly, as are those apts. facing 28th just south of Valmont...ugh. WE CAN DO A LOT BETTER!!
- ◆ Be built with exceptionally high-quality design (but not necessarily high-quality materials)
- ◆ Breaks for the middle class
- ◆ Build housing east of the city
- ◆ cap any residence to 2,000 SQ FT
- ◆ careful consideration of density
- ◆ Could new development pay into Special Taxing Districts, to fund the improvements which will be needed.
- ◆ D
- ◆ Encourage socio-economic diversity
- ◆ Establish or support the types of businesses permitted i.e. no pot growers
- ◆ Housing
- ◆ limit height
- ◆ Limit height
- ◆ no ugly high buidings
- ◆ Not be exclusive.
- ◆ Preserve open space
- ◆ Prove benefit to existing neighborhood
- ◆ Provide a DIVERSITY of housing both Market Rate and Affordable
- ◆ Provide middle income housing
- ◆ Provide space for new neighborhood parks.
- ◆ Road improvements!
- ◆ safety for all visitors
- ◆ Slow down future development

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.13 Third Priority: If the benefits that you believe should be required of new development are not listed above, please type in below:

- ◆ Accommodate the needs of the business which are already located within the City. Help them, don't make them move away to get what they need.
- ◆ Allow people to live where they work and go to school.
- ◆ B
- ◆ CoHousing for Seniors who are not Assisted Living Focused
- ◆ Community Gardens within the density development
- ◆ Ease traffic congestion with better streets
- ◆ Encourage Innovation in Design / Product Type / Density / Housing Stock
- ◆ Green Building Materials.
- ◆ lower rent levels - high rent dictates tenants and stifles variety
- ◆ More public spaces: pocket parks with greenery to improve the air quality, public gardens, outdoor gathering spaces..neighborhood pocket parks are super for this.
- ◆ No more commercial development what so ever
- ◆ parking
- ◆ Preserve open space
- ◆ provide retail amenities and sales tax
- ◆ provide storage for skis/kayaks/etc, provide a room besides the garage to work (called a hobby room in europe, commonly the garage in single family homes), build underground parking, generally make buildings more practical for 'living'
- ◆ Stop putting all the homeless, drunken, drug addicted, mentally ill people in North Boulder. I do not agree with the unfortunate position of the city that it provides services for the county. Put some homeless facilities out in Louisville and Erie and Superior. Why shouldn't they share the burden up close and personal

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of "community benefit" not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ "Permanently affordable housing" is incompatible with most of the other items
- ◆ A dedication to unique architecture that prevents the 'cookie cutter' design of buildings so common in areas. Public spaces need to be beautiful, and have quiet public spots with kiosks and vendors. A re-developed community should allow the possibility of window shopping and drinking a coffee without the constant background of road noise.
- ◆ A new building should never take away from the neighborhood it is in. In other words, a new building should add value to the neighborhood as a price of entry.
- ◆ A note on 'limiting height/protecting views' - while I think protecting views is extremely important, I don't think the height limitation should be strictly enforced in cases where views are not significantly impacted. I'd like to see some increased bus service to areas like Chautauqua where parking can be a problem (in the case of Chautauqua, weekend bus service would probably be sufficient).
- ◆ Access to art and the outdoors
- ◆ Add gardens to benefit "g" (public spaces)
- ◆ Aesthetically attractive (if that's not captured in "a" above). Too many of the new commercial and multi-family residential units in Boulder are unattractive, e.g., the units on the west side of 30th St. between Pearl and Walnut. That's a great place for the units but they're ugly.
- ◆ Affordable multi-use or light industrial space to promote interesting small business and innovation.
- ◆ All of the above were important, so it was hard to pick just 3.
- ◆ All of the requirements are very important!
- ◆ Allow building such as earthship and other environmentally friendly buildings. Make permit process easier.
- ◆ Allow old homes to be torn down - new single family detached to be built in their place
- ◆ Any new developments should be built to last - not necessarily built with 'exceptionally high-quality design and materials', but with common-sense quality standards that ensure that they will not need to be refurbished/rebuilt in the next 25-50 years.
- ◆ Assisting small local businesses with regulatory compliance, so that it is affordable and maintains the high standards of the City of Boulder.
- ◆ Basic need retailers and service centers should be contained within the various mixed neighborhoods e.g. grocers, pharmacies, medical clinics, to have units as self-contained as possible.
- ◆ Be supported by the community.
- ◆ boulder is becoming a city, will become a city, in the real city sense whether people like it or not. let's plan and build a great city.
- ◆ Bridge the gap between permanently affordable housing and the astronomically expensive single family housing that currently exists. There is very little owner-occupied housing available in Boulder that is not part of a subsidy program and less than \$800,000.00.
- ◆ Bring more moral consciousness to the community. Be moral leaders!
- ◆ Build in areas that make sense for 'foot traffic' - i.e. around the University, near the new Google campus, etc.
- ◆ Built with an intent to promote the cultural diversity of Boulder, specifically by bringing businesses of diverse cultural background and encouraging new residents with wider cultural diversity than the current community.
- ◆ Certain areas of City of Boulder--especially central, downtown, and the areas around campus--are quintessentially Boulder. But ironically, the single-dwelling family areas--in particular South Boulder, which includes the city's iconic Flatirons--are serviced by aging, single-level strip malls with vast outdoor parking lots that seem, at least to this uneducated eye, inefficient and anti-environmental, underserved by bike lines and pedestrian avenues.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ City council should not put the burden of affordable housing on individual developers. If done, the burden should be placed on all City Taxpayers. City council should work to ensure that there are effective and reasonably priced mass transit opportunities for workers to come to Boulder.
- ◆ Clean, safe, accessible shopping areas
- ◆ Coherent aesthetics for a given area.
- ◆ Community benefit - there is ZERO, the plan only calls for more GROWTH WHY? STOP STOP STOP pushing for growth! Why not encourage business to move to depressed communities - growth equals death! Growth the demand for it KILLS ALL the core values.
- ◆ Community benefit for aging population, and benefit that will address the issue of economic disparity.
- ◆ Community benefit requires road maintenance and other infrastructure fixes. Too much spending on bike paths and pedestrian ways with limited use. Development seems to cause more problems than it helps.
- ◆ Community college that is easy to get to for those who need that level of education, whether to get an AB or to get up to snuff for transfer to a state university. A well educated population makes a better community

- ◆ Community park/rec center
- ◆ Concentrate things like grocery stores, car shops, other stores, rec centers, parks, bike paths and bus stops in an area where people can get to what they need easily, like Table Mesa. By the way, DO NOT TOUCH Table Mesa - it's perfect!
- ◆ Conform with community standards in architectural appearance
- ◆ consider a special tax on residents who own more than one motor vehicle.
- ◆ Consider impact of development on adjacent neighborhoods (attempts to reduce vehicular traffic results in truck and auto traffic on narrow neighborhood streets, with many of the drivers angry and speeding)
- ◆ Considering current neighborhood residents
- ◆ Continue development of Valmont Park
- ◆ Continued growth is not good for an already overcrowded area. Breweries in Gunbarrel are great, but when they are across the street from quiet, residential neighborhoods, it creates too much noise, lots of littering and broken glass in the entire area surrounding the breweries. Dangerous traffic situations and has ruined the wildlife experience. The breweries are ignoring requests to keep the music down as well as the loud crowds.
- ◆ Continued purchase and development of parks and open space
- ◆ Create cultural center east of Broadway, south of Canyon downtown
- ◆ creating neighborhood centers that are safe and attractive during extended hours, and cater to variety of demographics.
- ◆ Creative/artist uses like proposed at the Armory.
- ◆ Density seems important when I now see what has been allowed to be built in the Gunbarrel 'town center' area behind the King Soopers. Seems too dense.
- ◆ Design new development into walkable, bikeable neighborhoods with grocery, dining and other necessities. I live on N. Broadway and that is pretty good. Put more multi-family along there.
- ◆ Develop or plan for infrastructure prior to extensive housing development as happening in Gunbarrel
- ◆ Development does not need to provide a community benefit! Population is increasing (in US), we should be welcoming vice increasing housing costs by requiring developments to provide benefits. Did people that moved into new houses in the 40s, 50s, 60s, 70s, 80s...pay their own way?
- ◆ Development of new living units must offset public services. Development must pay for schools - if they cause enrollment increase - roads, public services, landscape upkeep for 20+ years (watering, weeds, beautification).

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ Diversity of housing stock and Innovation in Housing. The City is too enamored of Top Down housing solutions to a problem largely created by the City by allowing a miss-match of commercial work force development growth while restricting / removing land available for housing growth.
- ◆ Do not limit parking! Need to be able to park!
- ◆ Efforts toward making them friendly for young professionals who appreciate mixed use, but may find it challenging with young kids.
- ◆ Eliminate item "e." We've given up too much already!
- ◆ Employers must help provide Eco Pass for employees and actively discourage single occupancy vehicles by eliminating parking spaces
- ◆ Encourage neighborhing and the development of social ties by applying design features that encourage community among residents
- ◆ Encourages community mixing and interaction, 'neighborliness,' as was recognized as essential for Boulder in the first part of this survey.
- ◆ Energy standards and minimizing auto use/providing alternate modes are huge mistakes
- ◆ Enhance arts & culture; Things that make Boulder a community rather than a disconnected collection of sub-interests
- ◆ Enhance the vibrancy of the community including pedestrian traffic and meeting places.
- ◆ Every permit for new building should be required to last 100 years in order to reduce waste of labor and materials
- ◆ ex: Diagonal Plaza should have been built with a mid- size Walmart. Many people drive out of town to spend their money.
- ◆ Excellent urban planning is a must.
- ◆ Free arts/music/dance events for the community. Free classes on various skills to gather different parts of the community together like art, dance.
- ◆ Gardens and alternative energy generation.
- ◆ Generally...new development should fit the neighborhood. Baseline Zero was a bad idea. That area could be redeveloped and provide parking on a smaller scale.
- ◆ Get rid of this department before it further damages this beautiful city!
- ◆ Good access to mass transit.
- ◆ Hard to limit choices to above 3. I think good design will lend to unique neighborhood feel and can incorporate energy conservation, non-auto transportation, etc
- ◆ How about a 1% for art in new buildings? Look what other communities have done with that.
- ◆ I believe the market in Boulder should determine the requirements for new development. All of the listed requirements will in fact drive housing prices up!
- ◆ I do believe the hospital should be exempt from the height restriction. I am employed at the hospital. We moved in last October and have been full ever since. The hospital needs more beds and there is nowhere to put them unless they add another floor. The hospital is a cornerstone of boulder. The city should support improvements to the facility
- ◆ I do not believe in the term permanently affordable. Even the affordability program is too expensive for some of us. I would not be able to buy in Boulder today, even in the affordable housing program, so I think it is impossible to provide that benefit to people long term.
- ◆ I don't agree with any of the community benefits. They are not realistic and generally naïve.
- ◆ I don't feel that every new development needs to meet all of the community's needs. I feel that many projects are required to solve so many issues they get diluted and ruined in the process of trying to be so many things at once.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ I live in a neighborhood with a high percentage of low-income and middle-income residents. Yet restaurants, shops and services in the neighborhood are geared to upper-middle income and the wealthy.
- ◆ I think Boulder has failed to ensure community benefit from development recently. Especially limiting height and minimize auto use. Also growth rarely pays for itself. Are they supporting new libraries, schools, parks, or rec centers?
- ◆ I think companies in Boulder should be encouraged to provide free annual RTD passes to those employees who want a pass. This would be an added benefit to the employees, reduce the amount of vehicle traffic in Boulder, and also reduce the need for people to actually live in Boulder if they have efficient, reliable, and free transportation into the city.
- ◆ I think having more of the people that are already here during the day, actually live here will be the biggest community benefit — allowing more of our commuting 'residents' to become engaged, actual citizens of Boulder.
- ◆ I think it's important for new development to be aesthetically pleasing and that it doesn't negatively impact the area surrounding it.
- ◆ I think the lettered list is fairly comprehensive and I would only like to see development that hits all of these requirements (even though I only got to select 3 top priorities).
- ◆ I value parks and quiet spaces more than high-density housing or businesses
- ◆ I would just like to emphasize how strongly I and my family (and friends) feel about limiting the height of new construction and ensuring that the adjacent views to the west remain open and available. This means that the height of approved new construction should almost never be approved higher than 35 feet.
- ◆ I would like to have RTD bus passes to the airport made available to Boulder residents without additional costs. Encourage DIA access by bus to lower Boulder's carbon footprint.
- ◆ I'd like to see neighborhood and business Eco Passes be more affordable. I fear the program may be lost with its price increases.
- ◆ I'm concerned that many of these places are on very busy roads. Traffic noise is unhealthy to live near, not to mention heavy traffic being unsafe for kids. And of course, this plan protects the most wealthy from it while subjecting the lower-income folks to it. Ideas for limiting or re-routing car traffic from being near residences? ---The plan to minimize auto use is a good idea, but rarely works out as it impacts residents instead of visitors. Restrictions aren't the way to go. Carrots, not sticks.
- ◆ I'm not so interested in economic opportunity for the city as I am in the ability of the city to plan those economic growth factors in accord with the needs and desires of the residents. It seems that the growth of the BV in the past few years has been at the expense of the citizens' welfare. We have to drive further, fouling our air, adding stress, etc. What ever happened to closures on Sundays when EVERYONE had a free day...maybe we need that. The people in the BV are stressed in so many ways, and much of that comes from added population, having to drive in nasty traffic conditions, working long hours...how can we relieve some of that?.
- ◆ If we want to preserve the green belt we need less restrictions on height and density
- ◆ Important to develop walkable neighborhoods. So few exist in boulder. Even south boulder by Table Mesa is not very walkable---The policies exist but the reality does not.
- ◆ Improved vehicle traffic flow and parking accessibility downtown.
- ◆ Is this the place to state concerns over exceptions to the height limitations which I thought was a long-standing part of Boulder's 'image'? Of course, I've been here some time; I remember the downtown Joslin building! But I did think the a view of the mountains was an important part of Boulder.
- ◆ It is an oxymoron that a developer can provide permanently affordable housing at the expense of others
- ◆ It was very difficult to pick my top 3. I think all the benefits listed above are important.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of "community benefit" not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ Landscaping to provide greenspaces including planting of native trees and plants. Some established neighborhoods like Maplewood show the benefit of this.
- ◆ Leave automobiles alone! Remember Folsom. You people have no idea how much damage you're doing to transportation in this town. This is a scary list you have.
- ◆ Less "cityscape" type development (ex. the look and crowded feel of Pearl east of 30th and "Steelyards" project). Keep the beautiful small town and elegantly classic look of most of Boulder. There are more than enough regulations for developers now.
- ◆ Let's have fewer ugly pointless retail and big box stores/chains and more local one of a kind places again.
- ◆ Library facilities in North Boulder are long overdue and recreational facility in central boulder is long overdue.
- ◆ Live, work, play projects that include amenities like restaurants and cafes and bakeries and wine shops
- ◆ Longevity in vision, architectural appeal, and unique character. We should be thinking about how such developments will affect Boulder for the longer term, not just the next 20 years-- but for the next 50-75 years.
- ◆ Look for centers of excellence in various disciplines. NGOs focused in an area. High-Tech in another area. Outdoor Focus in another. More opportunities for social mingling of like minded individuals.
- ◆ Looks good on paper, but not in reality. Boulder needs to take a pause. Boulder Junction is ugly and our downtown is now the playground of millionaires and law firms, and select developers.
- ◆ Maintain a unique Boulder experience for the commercial and residential offering. Limit the penetration of national chain stores and restaurants that are identical to those found in every suburb. Encourage the development of unique businesses by local entrepreneurs. Redevelop and revitalize areas that are old, tired and in disrepair (in-fill) rather than expand development to any open areas. Match all new development with equivalent or greater open space, parks and recreational areas.
- ◆ Maintain and expand parks and open spaces
- ◆ Maintaining a good quality of life for existing residents.
- ◆ Make it easier for cars to drive out of Boulder.
- ◆ Make it quick for car traffic to exit Boulder
- ◆ Minimize impact to adjacent areas in terms of views, aesthetics and congestion. Pay for additional burden placed on existing infrastructure and services.
- ◆ Mixed age neighborhoods, less isolation of mature adults
- ◆ More shops for middle class residents, less emphasis on super pricey places
- ◆ Most of the actions mentioned above will increase the cost of living in Boulder, leading to an exodus of jobs and affordable housing.
- ◆ Much better RTD and related services to outlying areas and the airport.
- ◆ New buildings should exceed standards for noise isolation, enabling denser units and reducing the impact of mixed usage which includes noise outside normal business hours.
- ◆ New development already pays far more than its "share" of development costs. Placing any more restrictions or taxes on development would be onerous!
- ◆ New development should not be subsidized by the Boulder taxpayer
- ◆ Nice people that are thoughtful of others
- ◆ NO MATCHBOX CONSTRUCTION, PLEASE
- ◆ No more boring boxes! Encourage creative and interesting architecture, even if it's a bit controversial.
- ◆ No more new development
- ◆ No option for the development of existing open spaces!
- ◆ Not dramatically change the character of any area
- ◆ Not impact neighborhoods already established in Boulder.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ Not sure where this belongs, but I am dismayed at the appallingly awful design and architecture of recent developments, designed with all the charm of San Quentin.
- ◆ Number of new houses! Only trust-fund, dot.com elitists can afford to live in Boulder.
- ◆ Orchestrate a new ordinance limiting fire hazardous grills on every balcony that one sees on all these recently built tall apartment/condo buildings. Smoke, stench, out of control grill fires make people think twice about renting or buying one of these new units.
- ◆ Our great tension is too many jobs and too few housing units yet many of these 'benefits' simply drive up the cost of housing and reduce the number of housing units. Something has to give. We need to provide affordable housing even if it means sacrificing some of these 'benefits.'
- ◆ parks parks parks....community gardens and parks
- ◆ passive solar designs, solar hot water collection
- ◆ Pedestrians should be able to walk without fear of being hit by a bicycle, walking in Boulder has become a nightmare
- ◆ People love the mix of urban life and outdoor life that Boulder offers. You can't go wrong making more urban space, especially if you follow the European model of mixed use, as long as you don't sacrifice the availability of outdoors living.
- ◆ Physical safety - reducing physical assaults and accidents. Support for locally-owned businesses.
- ◆ planners must recognize the fact that everybody will drive their private cars almost all the time - the dream of bike and bus is a good one and must be supported, but it will never offset the excessive growth the city has already allowed
- ◆ Plant plenty of trees. Very tall, wide trees.
- ◆ Playgrounds, sports courts, quiet meditation arbors
- ◆ Pocket parks. Bike/ped paths to connect with the rest of the system.
- ◆ Preserve historically or culturally important sites. For example, I think the train depot at Boulder Junction has been dwarfed by the large buildings surrounding it. This gives the impression that Boulder's quieter, smaller days are no longer of any interest in today's go-go world.
- ◆ Preserve the architectural character of the town. No more large blocky buildings!
- ◆ Preserve the historical, political and social culture of the Boulder lifestyle (while maintaining easy and quick access to hiking, biking and open spaces)
- ◆ Preserve the traditional character of the city. High-minded ideals and theories do not always translate into community improvements, and this has been demonstrated with Boulder's "concentrated activity" plan.
- ◆ Preserving affordable local businesses like the Boulder Cafe and the Army/Navy store which are both gone. We don't need 4 different jewelry stores on Pearl st.
- ◆ Promote alternative transportation usage by other means than intentionally designed auto congestion. Increase daytime traffic flow and subsidize alternative means.
- ◆ promote more social engagement/collaboration among the community as well as helping people become more resilient both personally and community wide
- ◆ Promotion of the arts and artists
- ◆ Protection of open space
- ◆ Provide a complete microcosm of businesses around housing. Walkable developments don't work if, say, no grocery stores or diverse restaurants are nearby forcing residents to drive.
- ◆ Provide adequate parking; encourage alternate modes some other way. Provide rental units based on income - not condos and not forever (think N.Y.).
- ◆ Provide civic event space
- ◆ provide commercial spaces that provide services such as mechanical/auto repair services, glass installation, tire services, etc

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ Provide funds for street maintenance and repairs. Not only primary streets, but secondary streets and neighborhood streets.
- ◆ Provide local services to support those near by to limit auto use and support alternative transport uses - grocery/convenience stores, cafes/restaurants, emergency care, credit union/no fee atms, satellite library.
- ◆ Provide multiple options for appropriate housing and social/community participation for aged and frail members of the population
- ◆ provide services needed in local area e.g. shops, health providers,etc
- ◆ Provide/enhance schools and teaching
- ◆ Proximity to shops, restaurants, local schools, parks.
- ◆ Public art spaces
- ◆ Raise property values of the surrounding areas
- ◆ Read the trends report
- ◆ Recreation. The science on exercise is incredible and conclusive: it's absolutely the best treatment for 1) Mental Health; 2) Emotional Health; 3) Physical Health. I find it shocking that you have not mentioned 'recreation' anywhere in this document.
- ◆ redevelopment and the 'comprehensive' plan has failed the people of boulder, because you concentrated (as an example 'grocery' stores) and many other car related tasks, in a single 3 block area... which is by the way, moronic... anyone who talks about 'right sizing' a street because of vehicle traffic, after turning away a grocery store in different parts of the city, which would have done 1000 times as much to reduce vehicle trips as anything this plan has done, is talking out of both ends.... until you get your head in the right place, you have set Boulder on a path of destruction.... seriously. if you don't figure out how to keep the city from growing it's housing stock over the 80,000 population figure mentioned before, you have set the city up to increase crime, lower standards of living, and make Boulder just another city of the thousands that have daily crime rates higher than they do police on their forces. This number has lots of data to back it up, going much over it, causes all the problems you are trying to 'build' into your comprehensive plan.
- ◆ Reduce housing prices
- ◆ Reduce in/out - flow of traffic
- ◆ Reduce smog and traffic. Have you noticed the brown cloud over the city? (I haven't seen it since the late 1980s, but it's back!) The city seems to be at cross purposes. If you want growth, you can't expect low use of cars, low traffic and smog. You have created the traffic and pollution you are trying to stop. Growth is not possible in a city with preserved open space and limited land.
- ◆ Reducing congestion. More bus pull-offs at stops so that buses don't block traffic. Destroy as many traffic lights as possible and replace them with roundabouts. Make Foothills Pkwy a proper freeway with interchanges instead of lights. Like Longmont, make traffic lights flashing-red/flashing-yellow between 10pm and 6am so that people aren't stopping at lights when there's no traffic and causing more air pollution.
- ◆ Responsible access from developed areas to open spaces and parks
- ◆ Retired people on fixed incomes can't afford to live in the very town they helped build! About the only place they can afford is a studio in a building filled with college students - NOT a good mix for anyone!
- ◆ roof top restaurant/microbrewery
- ◆ See all previous comments and answers
- ◆ Set an example other communities could follow of ecological design and being a liveable city. Sometimes it seems that there is a lot of money in Boulder, but it seems obvious that if the rest of the world lived as we do the planet would continue to be harmed.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ Should always provide for multi-modes of transportation. Wide sidewalks and off street ways for bikes etc.
- ◆ Should include plans for creating parking for any new building INCLUDING the Univ of CO
- ◆ Slow for additional parking because mass transit is very bad & inconvenient
- ◆ Stick with Excel Energy
- ◆ Support medium and low income workers who are required to maintain the community infrastructure
- ◆ Take an underused and somewhat dead area, and give it life.
- ◆ Tax income to support open space, schools; cooperation with University
- ◆ That's a good list. I like it.
- ◆ The 'benefit' does not encourage people to move to the area because it offers 'sanctuary' or free stuff
- ◆ The developments should provide commercial space for jobs, conferences, arts and innovation, housing for all income levels, hotels and attractions for tourism, retail amenities and associated tax revenue.
- ◆ The opportunities to developers needs to be spread around so the usual cronies don't always get first in line for opportunities. Maybe a lottery system to have the opportunity to present their ideas? We have to look to the developers to leverage their creativity (and not just their ROI) to help us solve this problem. If they want to earn money from their developments, the bar needs to be held high for them to be part of the solution.
- ◆ The plan should be more flexible to development. It will provide growth and vitality that will improve the quality of life for all. Regulating quality design has caused similarity of structures.
- ◆ The term "community benefit" seems open to interpretation, which allows people to use the term to serve their own ends at worst. At best "community benefit" allows people to flourish; unfortunately, because Boulder caters to upper class whites the term community is of a narrow bandwidth due to socioeconomic stratification.
- ◆ There are numbers of large homes occupied by one person that could be used by multiple individuals in community. This regulation needs to change.
- ◆ Think outside the box with new and unique ideas
- ◆ This is a bit off-topic . . . but please do not increase or augment 'Homeless Shelters/Transitional Housing' . . . as this is a 'community detriment.'
- ◆ This question is based on residents like me trusting the planning administration based on what's happened so far with the above noted hubs of development. That is a false premise. No one will trust the people who approved what has happened at 30th and Pearl. It already looks like an urban post apocalyptic landscape, with more monstrosities going in daily. You could have imported an ugly inner city concrete beehive empty of humanity directly from Chicago and saved time. Instant urban blight.
- ◆ Those items aren't benefits
- ◆ Throughout Boulder the commercial rents are very expensive and because of this there is a lack of experimentation and risk taking. If someone wants to open a restaurant it has to be a home run. There are no up an coming neighborhoods for artists to move into and revitalize. This is an extremely successful form of development in many large cities.
- ◆ Tranquility
- ◆ UPGRADING existing substandard infrastructure such as a missing bike link or portion of say fourmile creek ..ie the palmer/palmos development east of b'way redevelopment of rundown areas such as the google site
- ◆ Use as little open space as possible for development - it's what makes Boulder unique. Purchase land for open space and keep it that way. Monitor big chains (Walmart-Costco) from NOT coming in.
- ◆ Use universal design in buildings so that those with limited mobility can thrive; improve ALL street signage so that one can read them, etc. Boulder is not a livable city - look to California for help.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.13: What additional examples of “community benefit” not listed above do you believe are important?

- ◆ Varied and interesting architecture (not all alike). REQUIRE larger parking spaces for automobiles -- not the 'tiny, little spaces' that are so prevalent in Boulder (e.g., in the lot near REI).
- ◆ We need a community arts center for concerts and plays, like the Arvada Center or Lincoln Center in Ft. Collins
- ◆ We're getting old: how about adding mixed-income retirement communities next to or nearby neighborhood stores and bus stops? We retirees drive less and less so we're not adding to traffic problems.
- ◆ what about schools? what happened to neighborhood schools? Why is it designed so everybody drives their kids to school?
- ◆ What? Really? Gunbarrell Town Center was planned when? I never heard about it and lived here for 16 years. The amount of development there is unbelievable. I can't imagine what traffic we will have in the coming future. No infrastructure has accomodated this.
- ◆ When and if you add art, could we NOT have another bronze sculpture of an animal or child? Boulder is a progressive city could some of the art represent that progressive nature or enhance nature. Kinetic sculpture, but the other things listed above are obviously a priority.
- ◆ Why can't the city work to get everyone in the area of the survey an Eco-Pass? I would use the bus much more if I had a pass. I will NEVER use the bike paths!
- ◆ Yes, provide neighborhoods serving retail adjacent to neighborhoods particularly in South Boulder so neighborhood residents can walk and drive less.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? (OTHER)

- ◆ Above 35 or 40 ft prohibited in residential areas
- ◆ Allow up to 55 ft where it in East Boulder/Gunbarrel where it does not block existing views.
- ◆ Building height needs to be balanced with setback. Too high and too close creates deep, dark urban canyons that limit viewsapes and sunlight.
- ◆ buildings need to be less than 55 feet high or not obstruct views even if lower
- ◆ buildings should be designed to fit in with similiar historical construction that fits the neighborhood. DT is a mish mash of architecture that does not blend well together. big new brick boxes next to older smaller buildings with a bit of style.
- ◆ Buildings taller than 55 feet past 55th off Arapahoe in the industrial park are the only areas I would agree with exceeding the height restrictions
- ◆ Case by Case basis, as long as lots of parking is provided for the public
- ◆ Depends
- ◆ For the most part answer 4 is what I support however quality of design is quite subjective. Somewhere along the redevelopment of downtown a ratio of brick to glass must have been implemented. I find many of these buildings boring. Wonderful old facades on East Pearl were torn down and replaced with boring brick and glass. I would be concerned about who gets to decide the designs.
- ◆ I would combine 3 and 4 into a single possibility.
- ◆ It depends on the view shed affected and the value provided. Impact vs benefit
- ◆ Keep it as it is now
- ◆ keep the existing building height regulations
- ◆ This limit should be dropped
- ◆ Up to 55' in mixed-use, including affordable housing, excluding central Boulder

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 1 55 foot or taller buildings can be appropriate for housing, but careful consideration as to where these buildings are needs to be made so as to not block residential views to their east. For example, 30th/Pearl would have been a great area for taller buildings because no homes, and mostly industrial properties are to the east - areas that can handle blocked views.
 - 1 Allowing taller buildings in the east part of town could help control sprawl without compromising views.
 - 1 Best way to reduce carbon emissions is to allow more people to live here
 - 1 Buildings taller than 55 feet likely are more environmentally friendly; city council make money from charging developer for the extra height
 - 1 Doesn't a CU dorm exceed the limit?
 - 1 Hard to have "affordable" housing with all the limitations currently in place
 - 1 If we're unwilling to expand OUT we must give some thought to UP - done well
 - 1 Out east, fine. Downtown? Hell no. What is happening where the old Daily Camera building used to be is tragic.
 - 1 Really high buildings that stick out (CU dorms), think Manhattan high rises is not what we want. Building like those downtown 4-5 stories tall (similar to what many cities in the world have) are fine. They are about the height of a tall tree and I don't think stick out or block anyones view that isn't already blocked by a tree. Rules that limit the height of the building from the lowest point to the highest when the building is built on a hill (dakota ridge condos for example) is just dumb and ignores the topography common to the western part of boulder, and causes many negative impacts to the way the building must be built for no good reason.
 - 1 Since Boulder is obviously growing and there are limitations to building outward, it seems silly to me that there even is a 55 ft limit. If we want Boulder to grow, and we can't grow out, we must grow up!
 - 1 Sprawl is not possible so the only degree of freedom is up.
 - 1 Taller buildings can concentrate development in a smaller footprint, and thus protect some of our outdoor views and lands. They could also make public transportation easier. Recently I have noticed some of the buildings near 29th Street Mall. I wonder if those do enough to keep residents from feeling the need to own cars. It seems that the grocery stores are often several blocks of busy traffic away, and this seems counterproductive.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-

- 1 Taller buildings may be accepted, even desired, by residents of certain parts of the City. Taller buildings can allow for greater diversity of roof lines, including towers, pitched roofs, and other features that are currently unavailable to developers. Taller buildings can also make more efficient use of limited land near transit, helping to achieve transportation, housing and climate goals. Boulder Junction would be a place to consider taller buildings.
- 1 The absolute 55 foot limit seems artificial. I would allow buildings higher than 55 in areas east of Foothills/Diagonal (for example) if there are no direct mountain views anyway, such as industrial areas, as a trade off for keeping building heights in residential areas and those nearer the mountains lower than 55.
- 1 The building height needs to be coupled with size of the footprint and the location. A 35-foot building with a large footprint can be more detrimental to views than a taller building with a small footprint.
- 1 The height limit has outlived its usefulness. If open space and view corridors are really important, then it would make sense to build taller buildings farther apart. In other words, two 8-story buildings would be better than four 4-story buildings. Upper levels would provide the views that seem to be important to people. Ironically, the best views from downtown Boulder are from the top of the parking structures rather than stunning rooftop restaurants and other facilities.

- 1 We can't be afraid of taller buildings in some areas of the city
- 1 We need (badly) more density in Boulder and taller buildings would help
- 1 We need density to accommodate housing otherwise Boulder will become a playground for the affluent only (it's nearly there already). With tightly-controlled development zones, little available land, and height limits, something has to give. It seems reasonable that some parts of Boulder would necessarily have buildings taller than 55 feet.
- 1 We should tread cautiously, but Boulder could benefit from more variety of buildings heights - with some taller buildings but only if they provide something of benefit, in places that are near services and transit, and in places that would not mar views. All the flat roofs are monotonous. Would like to see more variety.
- 1 Without blocking views of already existing living spaces
- 1 Would really like to see the regulations require more 'green' building materials!

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 2 The 25 ft. variance should be reconsidered. It creates an arbitrary problem for construction on the side of a hill. Perhaps new hillside construction should be eliminated.
 - 2 To avoid building out, we're going to have to build up at least somewhat
 - 2 along with actually buying buildings and bulldozing them to create a 'housing' free zone... an inner 'open' space plan... the rings of Open space were thought up and carried out long before your comprehensive plan, and you do not need to take credit for that. but you can take credit for an 'open space' plan that buys properties within Boulder, to preserve the sustainable city size... and yes there is a 'sustainable' city size. going above it brings every problem you are trying to prevent.
 - 2 As mentioned earlier, this should be allowed on a case-by-case basis if there isn't impact to the neighbors.
 - 2 I think up to 55 feet should be more permissible in eastern Boulder, less as the buildings are closer to downtown and the foothills.
 - 2 I'm not personally bothered by high rises in Boulder, but I don't think they really fit with the character of the city, and they block views.
 - 2 Method of measuring height may need to change too so it starts from ground floor.
 - 2 See all previous comments and answers
 - 2 The 25-foot-out rule works if one residence looms above another. But this is often not the case, especially when steep yards decline into each other. In my limited experience, the Planning Board appears ill-equipped to objectively gauge a surrounding neighborhood, and resorts to deferring to the ephemeral whims of immediate neighbors, who are understandably wary and protective, but rarely the best adjudicators of city planning.
 - 2 There are many other factors that go into designing neighborhoods with building that are at least 55 feet tall. We also need to take into consideration the width of the streets and sidewalks. We need to look at tree lawns and the density of trees and benches. We need to look at the street level architectural elements that make a tall building feel proportional and inviting. All together these create amazing place to live, work and meet.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 2 While I generally think the 55 foot limit is a good one, I believe that building heights should be considered on a case-by-case basis by the planning board. If a new building will not block views from a public space or residential area, I don't see a problem with that building being up to 55 feet tall. In some situations, a 55 foot building might be too tall but a 40 foot building would work. The planning board should be able to resolve the issues, with public review and the city council as checks and balances.
 - 3 Ample parking must accompany vertical buildings
 - 3 Boulder needs to be careful not to allow lax development to change the unique quality of the city, which provides much of the quality of life
 - 3 Cap the number of buildings in the city allowed to be taller than 35-40 feet
 - 3 East is more appropriate
 - 3 I believe that flexibility is key. We have some very ugly high constructions in Boulder that we are "stuck with." If the community benefit is large, flexibility in rules is necessary.
 - 3 If you limit the views of the mountains and create an industrial look to the city, it would highly decrease in quality of living here
 - 3 It is all political on who gets the height exemption! \$\$
 - 3 Only in already dense areas and IF they don't interfere with views. The downtown formerly Daily Camera space is FAR too big/tall for the area.
 - 3 Should maintain views from ALL city and county funded parks - 35 ft. limit near there
 - 3 The building that went up near Chez Thuy is ugly and sticks out terribly. What was the benefit with that building?
 - 3 The leadership should embrace policies that will help to change the image of Boulder - "the land surrounded by reality"
 - 3 A tall building here and there might work fine. It doesn't really block views. But developments like Boulder Junction or the current one downtown are inescapable.
 - 3 Buildings should not be so high that the view of the foothills is eliminated
 - 3 do like the lack of tall buildings ... but might make sense on 'x site' if instead of more buildings there is some 'open space/view corridor' instead
 - 3 Do Not Skimp on Parking! Parking is horrible in some of these newest developments. The developers got away with not putting enough parking spots in several newer developments and now I avoid them like the plague.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 3 Hard to make a good call on this with the University having decided that the football team is the dominant feature of Boulder forever... Nauseating.
 - 3 I don't support height modifications in the historic downtown Pearl Street area. Buildings should be the same height and character as existing buildings. Buildings that are too tall obstruct the view shed and take away from the character of this iconic area.
 - 3 I have lived here since 1978 & feel that there has been a number of questionable exemptions re building height. That is, some buildings seem too high, have changed the view/character of Boulder. So, I have mixed feelings re the up to 55 ft height. I think the site review committee should be very selective in making exceptions, particularly above 40 ft.
 - 3 I support higher density if it brings affordable housing, but not for luxury condos
 - 3 I think location is really the key here - does it 'fit in' with existing development, does it limit views for other already existing buildings?
 - 3 I think that although preserving our views and our small town city skyline is important, some openness to building up is a way to relieve some of the pressure that our open space programs (which is also value) has placed on us.
 - 3 I think that the current system is working well and that if a project is looking at increased height they can pursue that through planning board and city council.
 - 3 I understand the value of density that comes with height, but today was a day in Boulder where my breath was taken away by the beauty of my surroundings, and the views of the mountains and the neighborhood that I had walking west on Pearl Street. If Boulder became a tall, dense, and shaded downtown, I wouldn't feel (and would greatly miss) the bliss I feel being a resident on these bluebird days, surrounded by eclectic businesses and residents.
 - 3 I would be against taller development in downtown.
 - 3 In general, I prefer the shorter buildings (35-40 ft) however community needs may be a higher priority.
 - 3 just look at the 55 foot high canyon that west pearl is now
 - 3 The hospital should be an exception. Otherwise, there should not be exceptions to this rule. This height restriction has enabled Boulder to maintain its high quality of living. I think we should support our forefathers in preventing blockage of the magnificent flatirons.
 - 3 View and solar corridors are important in Boulder so buildings up to 55' must meet all criteria in order to be considered.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 3 what is more important is regulating CU - the south campus caused a re-defined flood plain and hence causes Greenbelt meadows residents to deal with flood insurance, etc. CUs buildings seem to not fall into the 55 and under limit, why is that ok? similarly, sommerset built houses that did not meet the county regs for energy, why have regs if the rich can bypass them via threatened law suits etc.?
 - 4 55' should not be permitted in downtown, 29th/28th-30th, north of Arapahoe between 30th-38th, or Boulder Junction. These areas are overcrowded and traffic is increasing each year. The Folsom experiment has not "forced" people onto bikes.
 - 4 A few 55-foot 'jewels' might add visually and culturally to Boulder but these should be few in number, infrequent in approval, and situated carefully to add sparkle to their immediate surroundings.
 - 4 Affordable builds NOT luxury builds. May not be ideal, but we gotta do it! Can't become any more elite than we are!
 - 4 Again, each project needs to be evaluated with respect to impact on existing neighborhoods.
 - 4 Again, if a compact community, this exceptional can be available. However, my general feeling is downtown is now a mess because of all the new height over the last 15 years. The new developments, around Boulder Junction for instance, don't look like they are particularly noteworthy or appealing, which means the definition of what constitutes exemplary is fuzzy at best.
 - 4 Allowing buildings to be taller than 35 or 40 feet should be extremely rare. Encourage future developments to go below ground.
 - 4 Any new buildings in the city should be of exceptional design and quality and should have direct tangible benefits to the community.
 - 4 BCH area would be appropriate place for this as well as sites further east, but not downtown or along the Broadway corridor or ANYWHERE near the foothills.
 - 4 Be careful here. I would want to know more about a plan before going above 55 ft. For example, CU's Williams Village is fine, but don't want it everywhere.
 - 4 Boulder is such a unique city, that in order to maintain its quaintness, the quality of construction should be the first priority, but without sacrificing its character.
 - 4 Community benefit is not currently listed as a requirement in the City site review criteria. This should be remedied as part of the comp plan update.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 4 Have you seen how ugly California is with random high rises and traffic etc? Please don't turn us into that.
 - 4 I do NOT trust the Planning Commission/Dept, nor the City Council, to adequately vet building design plans that meet the quality, design, public needs, standards, regulations. For but one example, I work on the Pearl St Mall. The new redevelopment of the old Daily Camera building is an abomination. There are now no views of the Flatirons from the cafes and restaurants on the north side of Pearl. In one corner is there a set-back so that diners at El Centro do not feel like they're eating in an alley. #EpicFail
 - 4 I don't think tall buildings are consistent with what I like about Boulder - the CU campus excepted
 - 4 I personally love the height restrictions imposed on builders. Sure the ground is hard and folks love windows, but we can always park our vehicles below ground (for example)... I generally prefer a 35 foot restriction!
 - 4 I think downtown Boulder should be limited to 35 or 40 feet in redevelopment.
 - 4 I would allow heights consistent with 4 - 5 story buildings in mixed use areas only. And even there, they would have to be built with masonry and of the highest quality.
 - 4 If setbacks are adequate, 55 ft height works downtown in some places. Some buildings seem to too massive and built right up to the sidewalk or street. The new building north of Conner O'neils is a good example as well as the old Daily Camera site.
 - 4 Many areas would accommodate 55 Feet buildings without blocking views for large numbers of people and help create additional housing.
 - 4 Modifications should require offsets such as land dedications in other areas for parks, schools or funds for affordable housing or transportation.
 - 4 Need to restrict high rise housing. Too many exceptions to the building standards are allowed.
 - 4 No more massive extensive walls of bland blocks! A continuous 40' mass blocks views more than an occasional high building, especially if it's an interesting design.
 - 4 No new buildings over 55 feet should be allowed ever in the future in the city or the county
 - 4 some new buildings on Pearl St, east of Foothills Pkwy are too bulky and mask the mountain views.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 4 The building design and materials should be aesthetically pleasing, environmentally neutral (using recycled, non-toxic materials and systems which minimize environmental impact) and include a balance of natural common space.
 - 4 The height and limited setbacks of many of the newer developments create a canyon-like feeling to being in the street, and prevent view scapes that tell you where you are.
 - 4 The number of these buildings should be greatly limited and the quality and design of the buildings and public is exemplary; must be well defined and strictly adhered to.
 - 4 Very few areas in downtown and only if other resident's views are protected (ie: to the west of parking space or parks)
 - 4 VERY few selected areas, if any
 - 4 We have to realize that these tall buildings block others' view of the mountains. A good example is the new apartments on 28th frontage road especially bad for residents of Spanish Towers.
 - 5 A limitation on height is a unique feature of Boulder. To build higher takes away from natural views and causes Boulder to be citified.
 - 5 As a Boulder native I have watched firsthand the degradation of this policy. For example, when I am downtown I often cannot see the mountains/nature at all anymore. This is not okay.
 - 5 Entities which receive the higher-limit exemption are usually those which are primarily profit-driven with NO interest in the quality of life of the majority
 - 5 Height limit is intended to maintain scenic views and natural setting. Much of the natural lands around Boulder are of national park quality and are the primary reason people like Boulder. The natural "feel" of Boulder contributes to the community character. Most people don't want to live in an urban "canyon" (tall buildings).
 - 5 I really don't care if developers have a problem getting richer if building heights were limited to 35-40 feet or if increased density were prohibited - tough.
 - 5 I wold vote for OK in a few selected areas with quality design, except that the result is terrible in practice
 - 5 If we continue to have higher density, Boulder will become a hassle to live in
 - 5 If you allow "selected areas" it's the camel's nose under the tent - one variance leads to another. Views of Flatirons are priceless, and we see them steadily vanishing.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 5 It took 20 million years for the Flatirons to form. It took 20 years for city councilors to OK projects that obliterate these beautiful natural icons from our view.
 - 5 Loaded question
 - 5 No adjacent buildings should be the same height ever again
 - 5 Our view of the mountains has already been blocked in some areas
 - 5 Our views of the Flatirons and Front Range are precious! Don't destroy those views!!
 - 5 Taller buildings bring more density and traffic - parking structures etc. - Boulder may be better by not increasing density
 - 5 Taller buildings detract from the natural beauty of Boulder. Recent construction in the downtown areas have blocked off mountain views from most of Pearl St. Mall.
 - 5 The citizens gain little from 55 foot buildings. The designs are pretty awful, plus the values of paragraph 13 are not obtained.
 - 5 The city once strongly protected the height restrictions. In recent years, those were overlooked to obtain tax revenue from certain properties. Other deals were struck for financial gain. The view of the mountains can never be regained once it is lost.
 - 5 The road system is at its limits. Increased height means higher road use and traffic.
 - 5 The strict height limits should not be eased!
 - 5 This city is based on the mountains and open space. It is NOT a major urban city such as Denver.
 - 5 This rule has been in place a long time and it has had a positive effect in many areas. Where it has been compromised the results were not good.
 - 5 Too many exceptions and under-the-table deals with developers. Total mass is also a problem, as are shoulder-to-shoulder big boxes.
 - 5 We already voted on height - are you deaf/blind?
 - 5 We must preserve our natural views and openness!
 - 5 You downsized much of our residential communities a few years ago yet let commercial get taller and more unsightly. I don't trust you to make good decisions.
 - 5 Absolutely we should value the view being accessible to as many as possible. It is our gold. We all thrive on it. The building heights are obnoxious to me.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 5 An integral part of the quality of life in Boulder is the maintenance of the city's mountain backdrop and the unique feel of a human-scale environment not marred by the usual American cityscape of towering concrete and glass canyons and ugly, obtrusive outdoor advertising. The recent trend of encouraging maximum height concrete rectangles threatens to destroy what is unique about Boulder.
 - 5 As noted, what has happened recently does not encourage trust in planning administration of the city.
 - 5 Building higher than this will ruin the uniqueness of Boulder. This is what gives Boulder it's character and charm otherwise it would be Denver or another major city.
 - 5 By blocking views for folks in lower income areas, aren't we just encouraging exclusivity?
 - 5 By making exemptions to the 35 foot limits, you merely dump the high density building with all the negative impact (bulk, obliteration of foothill, traffic, degradation of property) to specific neighborhoods, those typically in the county that have no representation rights.
 - 5 Don't let Boulder begin to look like every other big city.....we want to see our beautiful mountains
 - 5 Have you looked the the solar shadow that results with living next to a building. The sun is one our most valuable energy resources. it also melts snow and ice on the sidewalks. Removing the opportunity for others to use solar energy and creating tunnels that trap car exhaust and fumes is not what we need to do. This is OLD thinking.
 - 5 How the city council has gotten around this, we will never understand! They have, through their greediness, destroyed the city we once knew!
 - 5 I am just adjusting to the new density of Boulder with all the new construction of larger multistory buildings - I am not ready to deal with taller buildings yet.
 - 5 I believe exceptions to the height rule are too easily granted.
 - 5 I don't support anything over 3 stories West of 28th, but going up to 4 East of Folsom seems wise. Don't start making exceptions or it will be the beginning of the end of height restrictions here. In-fill is a much better way to fit in more housing units than letting people go tall, even though I know that's what most city planners really want to hear :)
 - 5 I feel they are overbuilding in Boulder. Traffic is so congested now and they keep building.
 - 5 I think it's a shame that we've lost a lot of the mountain views from downtown Boulder as a result of tall buildings.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 5 I voted for that height limit and everywhere I look I see taller buildings blocking the view. I went to a talk in a church group with a friend back when the thing was coming up for a vote. The speaker was a developer. He showed lots of slides of trees in full leaf blocking the view of the mountains to show that we already had our views blocked so why not taller buildings. What an idiot. The variances granted to give higher buildings the right to clog up the sky are an insult and a betrayal by the city counsel.
 - 5 If we lose the views, we lose the quality of the setting of the city. If you continue to build upward, you will destroy what is unique about this city.
 - 5 Keep Boulder skies and views open and accessible to ALL citizens, not just the economically advantaged!!!!!!! Completely opposed to any exceptions to modify the height requirement.
 - 5 New buildings moving forward should not block views. Many less affluent people live in these ,certain areas, and we would like views, too. That's why we live here.
 - 5 New construction shouldn't be allowed to obscure existing views whether commercial or residential. If original owners were subjected to standard height requirements, they should be entitled to the view they paid for.
 - 5 No more condos/apts/ high density buildings!
 - 5 Nothing will compensate for the obliteration of the view - there's no way to put a price on it.
 - 5 only sites already identified should go above 40 ft
 - 5 Our biggest asset is our mountain views. This should be preserved aggressively.
 - 5 Our mountain views need to be protected. I do not think we should allow any tall buildings.
 - 5 People move the Boulder to be by the mountains. Mountain views add value to properties. Every time another development is allowed to exceed the established height limit, the community suffers. The city does not enforce these limits enough with developers (or lets them pay for an exception) and the community loses again.
 - 5 Taller buildings block views of the Flatirons, result in too much density in an area, and increases urban pollution.
 - 5 Taller buildings should be limited to the edge of Bldr.
 - 5 The 'prohibited' answer is closest to what I think. I would allow new buildings up to 55 feet only in the interior of existing tall areas.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-

- 5 The foothills and flatirons backdrop are the most valuable asset of this community, and the setting is why the majority of people choose to live in Boulder. Obliterating the view harms this value. Allowing 55ft tall buildings in the city limits (believe the Exeter is one) begins a slippery slope of height variations to come.
- 5 The historic open, small town-like character of the city is being destroyed by the recent construction of those tall, urbanesque buildings and building complexes! It is precisely this historic Western flavor that is one of the premiere qualities that attracts so many appreciative people to Boulder.
- 5 The new building where the Daily Camera parking lot used to be is huge/too tall and not good development for that area of downtown. Blocks view?!?!?!?
- 5 The purpose of the height restriction is to make sure everyone has a view of the mountains. If we litter the 'city skyline' with tall buildings, only the rich or exceptionally lucky will get that benefit. It is a social good, and the most important part of giving Boulder a unique sense of place. Start building high rises and anybody east of, say, 30th street might as well live anywhere else in the country.
- 5 The Site Review process has obviously been corrupted by developers.
- 5 The views are an essential part of Boulder. Developers who want to build tall buildings should do so in big cities instead (Denver etc.)
- 5 The views to the west are a large part of Boulder's character and charm; let's not ruin any more of these views!!
- 5 There are too many variances given already. Limit the height. Limit the growth. Encourage small buildings and small businesses.
- 5 There is a reason that most people live here, the views and the sun. Let's try to keep that part as best we can. Whenever I have moved away, coming back and seeing the mountains made me feel at home because I missed them. We should do everything we can to maintain that.
- 5 There may a FEW exceptions to this, but it seems like the exceptions are numerous. Whoever approved W Pearl & 11th should be fired!!! This is such a shame because now no one who walks Peal Street can see the Flatirons from any place - the very central joy of our community. There is literally no place that it could have been worse. Maybe stoned and not just fired is more in alignment with this huge mistake.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 5 We are lucky to have a view of the Flatirons so it doesn't make sense to have buildings built that block that view.
- 5 We have lost our view of the mountains. We need to get a handle on building heights.
- 5 why make a rule to have exceptions?
- 5 Without the view of the mountains, we might as well be in Kansas.
- 5 Yes the towering bldg are destroying the unique character of Boulder. I live near Williams Village and I see its towering view every day.
- 6 Before building tall and dense, we need to improve public transit
- 6 Increase height when it provides more affordable housing than required
- 6 The main issue with height is how adjoining properties will also build high. There should be a % maximum on any one block area. First to develop = 1 to go highh, the rest needs to be kept lower - diverse skyline! Height
- 6 1, Case by Case basis. 2. Okay for BCH to have what they need, providing the fix the existing parking problem at the same time. (if not before) 3. I don't know enough about where 55' is allowed now, other than what I can see on Walnut St. It should not be allowed all over town. 4. I'm most concerned about the negative impact it has on the public and the neighboring land owners. (congestion, lack of parking for the public, lack of views, etc.
- 6 The higher the residential/commercial density of the area, the shorter the buildings should be. To have BCH at Foothills & Arapahoe doesn't significantly disrupt views, traffic, etc. In downtown Boulder, this isn't true. Boulder is losing an trace of its small town feel. At least some of that needs to be preserved.
- 6 The tall buildings downtown like the new Camera building are sacrilige. The exemption for Foothills Hospital reeks of favoritism. The Council made a low ball offer for the Community Hospital building in return for a height exemption they had said would not be granted. Hypocrisy. Favoritism. Arrogance.
- 7 Hard to imagine how a taller building would NOT compromise views for some
- 2,4 It seems the officials do not care about the views & the paint colors are bad.
- 2,4 most recent development ruined the view of the mountains.
- 1,2 Boulder cannot expand outward, so it must expand upward. Preserving views is a nice sentiment but the reality of the 21st century is that more people live & work here now and need to be accommodated.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 1,2 I think the height limit is giving us bad architecture and design, and we should be more creative in the building profiles we allow
- 1,2 Keep the majority of residential buildings to 4 stories or less, with occasional exceptions. And it is possible for non-residential to exceed this limit.
- 1,2 Location of the building site is important. For instance, a building taller than 55 feet at the new hospital location at Foothills makes sense as it would be a more efficient building for health professionals while not blocking views from other buildings around it.
- 1,2 Requiring a higher level of quality than by-right developments increase costs. It seems a consistent high level of quality, already in place for a 35 foot building, should be good for a 55 foot building, too. The idea being to have more units the working populace can actually afford, than another multi-use building with \$800K+ luxury units.
- 1,2 Tall buildings should accommodate multiple use and multiple families, not just trophy-condos and mansions.
- 1,2 The height limit has been OK, but one effect is excessive uniformity of height in some areas.
- 1,2,3 We love our views here, but let's be honest... expanding vertically is better for the environment (both in terms of utilities efficiencies, i.e. heating, and preventing urban sprawl) than continuing to grow horizontally, or pushing our growth out of Boulder into neighboring communities.
- 1,2,3,4 I don't see a problem with a few 55ft + buildings interspersed among the more standard buildings as long as they are east of 30th street (or along Foothills parkway and east) as long as they are interspersed and not a corridor of tall buildings.
- 1,2,3,4 I don't want skyscrapers to start popping up in Boulder, but I think maintaining the green space around Boulder and providing housing options are more important than preserving views. I think there should be some restrictions on building heights, particularly in where they are located.
- 1,2,3,4 I fully support buildings greater than 55' in certain specific areas if built to appropriate scale, have community benefit, (ie affordable housing, public plazas, transit/bike friendly, etc)
- 1,2,4 Building height, especially east of Broadway, is less important than design, quality, sufficiency of set back, pleasurable variety of façades, and wide enough streets so that pedestrians don't feel walled in. We want a 'Walking' city!
- 1,2,4 I do not think Boulder should ever have 'high rises' however, a maximum height of 35-40 feet should not be the requirement across the board for all developments. Variances should be granted if they are help bring in great new projects to the area.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)	
1	<i>Buildings <u>taller than</u> 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.</i>
2	<i>Buildings <u>up to</u> 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.</i>
3	<i>Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.</i>
4	<i>Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.</i>
5	<i>Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.</i>
6	<i>Other</i>
7	<i>Don't know/no opinion</i>

1,2,4	Height limitation and too little land reduces housing units. Increasing height to 55' is an easy way to provide more housing in the available space.
1,3	Let's be flexible, but don't turn this over to the greedheads. Offer taller buildings in return for conversion of commercial development to multi-family (or wise mixed use).
1,3,4	If the open space limits horizontal expansion, then the only expansion is up (or down).
1,3,4	My complaint is with the boxiness of developed buildings. Would be amenable to buildings that exceeded the height limit, if the roof lines were visually interesting. Care, though, must be given to shaded sidewalks in the winter caused by tall buildings (so, in general, I prefer taller buildings on the north side of an east-west street.
1,4	I think a more concentrated downtown area which allows taller Boulder is both okay and necessary in Boulder to allow for growth while avoiding sprawl and maintaining environmental standards.
1,4	It is the design and location that matters to me, not the height. We can't get our other goals met with a 35 foot limit.
2,3,4	If we insist on compactness in land area, we will have to go up at some point in our future.
2,3,4	For homes or locations on hills, the location 25 feet away could be a poor indicator or misleading
2,5	The redevelopment of the daily camera building is a perfect example of poor planning and an appalling use of the height allowance. There used to be a view of the flatirons from pearl, now its gone.
3,4	Buildings up to 55 feet should be carefully allowed where they will not ruin views for others around them (eg, in front of business/commercial space or near a park that will protect the views for people east of the building. They should NOT look like Williams Village which is the ugliest construction I have ever seen. They should be somewhat spread around town, not totally concentrated so the city looks like a mass block 55 feet high.
3,4	I find myself thinking NIMBY about the height of buildings potentially obstructing my view from my home. But generally, if a building can be of benefit to the general community and be aesthetically pleasing and unique, I would be ok with a tall height.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-
- 3,4 I wish that the height limitation was 40 feet but realistically, we have already seen that some companies do not want to move to Boulder because of this height limitation, and obviously there is little room for a company to spread out horizontally. I believe that the number of structures up to 55 feet should be severely limited. Special attention should be given to the quality and design of these buildings..
- 3,4 The height limit serves Boulder well except for limiting the available housing. However, I expect that adding more height would not decrease the cost of housing. However, in some places in Boulder, a height variance may be fine if it serves a specific community purpose that requires space in a taller building. For example, senior housing is already a problem...how tall is the Presbyterian Manor on Arapahoe? That building seems higher than the limit, but in its location and for its purpose, it's also Ok by me. However, to stick such a building in the middle of Table Mesa or near Ideal Market would be not so acceptable architecturally or for maintaining the backdrop. I think this height variance needs to be considered on a per-plan individual basis...and that we ought not to simply raise the limit to suit those who want to develop whatever suits their profit margin. And such projects as the Armory site with the consideration of streets as open space, or the Ground Zero project in the flood plain simply do not make sense...look what happened to Frasier Meadows in the flood of 2013: that area was approved for housing, etc. even after there was a realization of high ground water all year as well as the former lake/wetlands that filled that basin...and the little pond in Burke Park simply doesn't do the trick in terms of flood protection. BTW, that pond/lake needs cleaning...it's filling with reeds and such and will soon be a wetland swamp full of mosquitoes/other problems...that's not such a good idea in the middle of the city.
- 3,4 We're all ok with it till some steel monstrosity blocks our view of the mountains
- 3,4 If the buildings most provide half-million dollar apt. to wealthy people who only live here 4 months a year, no point in building them. We have enough housing for the rich.
- 3,4 Take hill areas and view interruptions into account
- 3,4,6 I worry about the Planning Board's definitions of community benefits and exemplary design. They haven't don't well in the past.
- 3,4,6 Buildings above 35-40 feet should be prohibited unless in a commercial area

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.14: Which of the following best represents your opinion regarding the height of new buildings in the City of Boulder? Any comments on your response?

Answer(s)

- 1 *Buildings taller than 55 feet might be OK in some parts of Boulder.*
 - 2 *Buildings up to 55 feet are generally OK in most commercial areas of Boulder or if they are consistent with a specific area plan.*
 - 3 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder only if they provide a number of community benefits listed in Question 13 above and meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 4 *Buildings up to 55 feet might be OK in a few selected areas of Boulder if the quality and design of the buildings and public spaces is exemplary and they meet all other standards and regulations.*
 - 5 *Buildings above 35 or 40 feet should be prohibited in the City of Boulder.*
 - 6 *Other*
 - 7 *Don't know/no opinion*
-

- 3,5 I agree most with the statement that buildings above 40 feet should be prohibited, however, I do agree with my other checked statement as long as 'few selected areas' is emphasized and the community benefits are not only exemplary design and usable public space, as that benefits a small number of Boulder residents while further disenfranchising lower income residents. Buildings higher than 40 feet should provide benefits to low and middle income residents and young residents, eg, affordable housing and more opportunities for public transportation/non-automobile transportation.
- 4,5 Generally, I think buildings within the heart of the city should be limited to 35-40 feet. Up to 55 feet in eastern areas (55th St. and beyond) could be OK with the above provisions, as they are less likely to restrict views within the city.
- 4,5 The mountains make Boulder. Up to 55 feet should be allowed further east; as you go west 35-40 feet should be the norm (approx. west of 28th)
- 4,5 Height limits should be firm and set by policy/zoning. Variances/modifications should be extremely rare. With the current system, variances/modifications are the norm, which creates an environment where approval of every project boils down to a decision by personal prerogative by a few individual board (infallible zealots) or council member. The city should be governed by policy, not people.
- 5,6 new buildings are blocking views and looking too industrial. where are the architects?

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ 10th and Canyon
- ◆ 30th and Iris
- ◆ 55th and Arapaho
- ◆ 55th and Baseline
- ◆ 6th and University
- ◆ 76th / baseline
- ◆ 9th and Alpine/North Boulder Park
- ◆ Appleridge Park
- ◆ arapaho ridge
- ◆ Arapaho ridge
- ◆ Arapahoe Ridge Adult House Association
- ◆ Aspen Grove
- ◆ ASPEN GROVE
- ◆ aurora 7
- ◆ Aurora 7
- ◆ AURORA PARK AREA
- ◆ BASEMAR
- ◆ BAYLOR/HARTFORD
- ◆ BEAR CANYON
- ◆ BEAR CREEK
- ◆ BEAR CREEK
- ◆ Bear Creek area
- ◆ Boulder Country Club
- ◆ Boulder Country Club
- ◆ Boulder Creek apartments
- ◆ Boulder Junction
- ◆ Boulder Meadows
- ◆ Boulder Meadows
- ◆ BOULDER MEADOWS MOBILE HOME PK
- ◆ Boulder View Apartments
- ◆ Brandon Creek
- ◆ Buckingham Ridge
- ◆ Buena Vista
- ◆ catalpa/kalmia
- ◆ CELESTIAL SEASONINGS
- ◆ Centennial Meadows

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Central Boulder
- ◆ central boulder.
- ◆ Chatauqua
- ◆ Chatauqua neighborhood
- ◆ Chatauqua/Hill
- ◆ Cherryvale area
- ◆ Cherryvale neighborhood
- ◆ choose not to answer
- ◆ Colorado University
- ◆ Colorado University
- ◆ Colorado University
- ◆ columbine
- ◆ Community Gardens/North Central Boulder
- ◆ Country Club
- ◆ country club estates
- ◆ COUNTRY CLUB REPLAT
- ◆ COUNTRY MEADOWS
- ◆ County appraisers call the area 'Highland Park' but it most certainly not a single neighborhood.
- ◆ Courtside (NE corner of 19th and Iris)
- ◆ crestview
- ◆ Crossroads
- ◆ Crossroads
- ◆ CU FAMILY HOUSING
- ◆ dakota ridge
- ◆ DARTMOUTH
- ◆ Devil's Thumb
- ◆ Devil's Thumb
- ◆ DEVIL'S THUMB
- ◆ DEVIL'S THUMB

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ DEVIL'S THUMB
- ◆ DEVIL'S THUMB
- ◆ Devils Thumb
- ◆ Downtown
- ◆ Downtown Boulder
- ◆ Downtown/Whittier
- ◆ East Aurora (new parking permit area)
- ◆ East College
- ◆ East Valmont
- ◆ EAST VALMONT
- ◆ EAST YARMOUTH
- ◆ edge of Eisenhower neighborhood
- ◆ EDGEWOOD
- ◆ EISENHOWER
- ◆ ELDORADO SPRINGS
- ◆ ELDORADO SPRINGS
- ◆ Evergreen Apartments
- ◆ FAIRVIEW ESTATES
- ◆ Fairview Estates (76th)
- ◆ fairview high school neighborhood
- ◆ Flagstaff/Chautauqua area
- ◆ Flatirons
- ◆ FLATIRONS
- ◆ Flatirons or Highlands
- ◆ Fountain Greens
- ◆ Four Mile Creek
- ◆ Four Mile Creek
- ◆ FOUR MILE CREEK
- ◆ FOURMILE CREEK
- ◆ Fox Run
- ◆ Frasier Meadows
- ◆ FRazier Meadows
- ◆ Gapter Rd.
- ◆ Gapter/Old Tale
- ◆ GITHENES ACRES
- ◆ GOLD RUN
- ◆ GOSS-GROVE
- ◆ GOSS-GROVE
- ◆ Green Meadows
- ◆ Green Meadows

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Greenbelt Meadows
- ◆ GREENBELT MEADOWS
- ◆ GREENBRIAR
- ◆ GREENWOOD COMMONS
- ◆ gunbarrel
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ Gunbarrel
- ◆ GUNBARREL COMMONS
- ◆ gunbarrel estates
- ◆ Gunbarrel Green
- ◆ Gunbarrel Green
- ◆ Gunbarrel Green
- ◆ Gunbarrel Greens
- ◆ GUNBARREL GREENS
- ◆ GUNBARREL GREENS
- ◆ GUNBARREL NORTH
- ◆ HABITAT
- ◆ Hawthorn
- ◆ HAWTHORN
- ◆ Heatherwood
- ◆ Heritage Meadows
- ◆ Heritage Meadows
- ◆ HERITAGE MEADOWS
- ◆ High View in South Boulder
- ◆ Highland Lawn
- ◆ Highland Lawn
- ◆ HIGHLAND LAWN
- ◆ Highland Park
- ◆ HIGHLAND PARK
- ◆ HIGHLAND PARK
- ◆ HIGHLAND PARK
- ◆ Highlands
- ◆ HighView
- ◆ hillcrest

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Holiday
- ◆ Holiday Community
- ◆ Homestead
- ◆ Homestead
- ◆ howard heuston
- ◆ Hunter Creek
- ◆ Hyview
- ◆ I live at 28th & Mapleton; I consider my neighborhood ,Central Boulder.,
- ◆ I live in Vista Village MHP
- ◆ INTERURBAN PARK
- ◆ iris gardens
- ◆ Iris Hollow
- ◆ IRIS PARK
- ◆ Ironwood
- ◆ Jenny Park
- ◆ JUNCTION PLACE
- ◆ Kalmia Court
- ◆ keewayden
- ◆ Keewayden Meadows
- ◆ KEEWAYDIN
- ◆ Keewaydin East
- ◆ Keewaydin East
- ◆ Keewaydin Meadows
- ◆ keller farm
- ◆ Kewadyn Meadows
- ◆ Keywadin Meadows
- ◆ King's Ridge
- ◆ King's Ridge
- ◆ Kings Ridge
- ◆ Kings Ridge
- ◆ KINGS RIDGE
- ◆ Knollwood

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Newlands
- ◆ Newlands addition
- ◆ NEWLANDS EAST
- ◆ Next to Newlands (North St btwn 9th & 10th)
- ◆ Noble Park
- ◆ North
- ◆ north Boulder
- ◆ north boulder community gardens
- ◆ NORTH BOULDER PARK
- ◆ NORTH BOULDER PARK
- ◆ NORTH BRIAR
- ◆ north rim
- ◆ north wonderland
- ◆ North Wonderland
- ◆ NORTHBRIAR
- ◆ Northbriar Estates
- ◆ Northcreek
- ◆ Northfield Commons
- ◆ Northfield Commons
- ◆ NORTHFIELD COMMONS
- ◆ Northfield Village
- ◆ NORTHFIELD VILLAGE
- ◆ NORTHFIELD VILLAGE
- ◆ NORTHFIELD VILLAGE
- ◆ NORWOOD-CRESTVIEW
- ◆ old north boulder
- ◆ Old North Boulder

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Old North Boulder
- ◆ Old North Boulder
- ◆ OLD NORTH BOULDER
- ◆ old north boulder/Edgewood
- ◆ Old Tale Road - newly annexed member of Boulder
- ◆ Orange Orchard
- ◆ ORCHARD CREEK
- ◆ ORCHARD CREEK
- ◆ Panorama Heights
- ◆ Panorama Park
- ◆ PANORAMA PARK
- ◆ Paragon
- ◆ Paragon estates
- ◆ Paragon Estates
- ◆ park east
- ◆ parkside
- ◆ Parkside
- ◆ Parkside
- ◆ PARKSIDE
- ◆ paul nor
- ◆ Paul Nor
- ◆ Paul Nor
- ◆ PAUL NOR
- ◆ PELOTON
- ◆ PENDLETON SQUARE
- ◆ Pineview Park
- ◆ Red fox hills
- ◆ Remington post condos
- ◆ RESERVOIR ROAD
- ◆ RIDGELA HILLS
- ◆ RIDGLEA
- ◆ ROLLING HILLS
- ◆ ROLLING HILLS

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ ROLLING HILLS
- ◆ ROLLING HILLS
- ◆ Salberg park
- ◆ Sale Lake
- ◆ SALE LAKE
- ◆ San Lazaro Mobile Home Community
- ◆ Sans Souci Mobile Home Park
- ◆ SHADOW CREEK
- ◆ Shanahan Ridge
- ◆ Shanahan Ridge (Devil's Thumb)
- ◆ Shanahan Ridge 2
- ◆ Shanahan Ridge, South Boulder
- ◆ Shanahan Ridge. It's the best but the influx of CU students is evident.
- ◆ Silver Lake Orchard
- ◆ SOMBRERO RANCH
- ◆ south boulder
- ◆ South Creek
- ◆ South Meadow
- ◆ SOUTH MEADOW
- ◆ southeast Boulder
- ◆ SOUTHERN HILLS
- ◆ Spanish Hills
- ◆ Spanish Hills
- ◆ Spanish Hills area
- ◆ STEELYARDS
- ◆ Stonegate
- ◆ Sumac Ave
- ◆ SUNDANCE
- ◆ Table Masa North
- ◆ table mesa
- ◆ table mesa
- ◆ Table Mesa

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ Table Mesa North
- ◆ Table mess
- ◆ TANTRA LAKE
- ◆ The Hill
- ◆ The Reserve
- ◆ The Reserve
- ◆ The Reserve
- ◆ Tobys Lane
- ◆ Twin Lakes
- ◆ Ugly Mis-oriented Condo Zone -- brilliantly designed to ignore light, views, wind and site potential.
- ◆ Uni Hill
- ◆ Uni Hill
- ◆ Uni Hill
- ◆ UNIVERSITY
- ◆ University Hill
- ◆ University Hill/Chautauqua
- ◆ University Hill/Lower Chautauqua
- ◆ UPPER CHAUTAUQUA
- ◆ Upper Table Mesa
- ◆ UPPER TABLE MESA
- ◆ VALMONT
- ◆ Vista Village
- ◆ Vista Village
- ◆ vista village manufactured home park
- ◆ WASHINGTON SCHOOL AREA
- ◆ WASHINGTON-JEFFERSON
- ◆ Waterstone

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ WELLINGTON GARDENS
- ◆ Wellman Creek
- ◆ WEST ARAPAHOE
- ◆ West Boulder
- ◆ WEST END
- ◆ West Highland Park
- ◆ west pearl
- ◆ West Pearl
- ◆ west table mesa
- ◆ WEST TABLE MESA
- ◆ whitier
- ◆ whittier
- ◆ Whittier South
- ◆ Wildwood
- ◆ willow glen
- ◆ Willow Glen
- ◆ Willowbrook
- ◆ WILLOWS
- ◆ Winding Trail Village
- ◆ Wonderland
- ◆ Wonderland

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.16: Which neighborhood do you live in?

- ◆ WONDERLAND
- ◆ Wonderland Hill
- ◆ Wonderland Hill Area
- ◆ Wonderland Hills
- ◆ Wonderland Lake
- ◆ WONDERLAND LAKE
- ◆ WONDERLAND LAKE
- ◆ Wonderland Lake area
- ◆ wonderland lake/hills
- ◆ wonderland north
- ◆ YARMOUTH

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.18: What do you like MOST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that should be preserved or protected? (OTHER)

- ♦ 1. low density, 2. available parking when I do drive to the grocery store, 3. short walk to Table Mesa Shopping Center, 4. ability to have views of Mts. City and Plains, as I walk or drive around the area (I live on a very steep street so biking is not an option for me)
- ♦ access to bike paths
- ♦ Access to US 36 and Denver
- ♦ Accessibility to 36, 91 and the Diagonal
- ♦ All of the places I go are within a 15-minute walk, bike ride, or drive.
- ♦ away from city & county corruption.
- ♦ Bike lanes - Folsom
- ♦ Birdsong in spring/summer
- ♦ Close to Diagonal
- ♦ close to downtown mall and north Boulder shopping center
- ♦ Close to shopping
- ♦ community garden/long's/nbrc
- ♦ convenience to grocery and coffee shop
- ♦ Diversity of houses
- ♦ Doesn't need protection
- ♦ Easy access to Denver and the Library
- ♦ Easy and safe commutes to schools and library.
- ♦ Easy to get to CU
- ♦ Golf course adjacent
- ♦ Good bike lane on Balsam
- ♦ Great tree canopy
- ♦ Higher density
- ♦ I could afford a house here.
- ♦ I joined and enjoy Boulder CC
- ♦ I live right next to a multi-use path
- ♦ Immediate neighbors
- ♦ interaction w neighbors
- ♦ Lakes and wildlife
- ♦ large acreages
- ♦ Large land parcels, single family houses
- ♦ Library branch nearby , and shopping center
- ♦ Lighting restrictions. No streetlights.
- ♦ location near bike paths
- ♦ Lots of children - huge asset to neighborhood
- ♦ mix of condos and homes - near pearl street shops and dining, historic structures
- ♦ mountain views maintained
- ♦ My neighborhood has a lot of families doing the best with their homes and making it a kid-friendly place, but the mix of student rentals and student parking and the total lack of a single coffee shop, grocery store or restaurant that I would enjoy dining at is a bummer.
- ♦ Near Chautauqua
- ♦ Neighborhood grocery and restaurants
- ♦ other neighborhoods easily accessible via bike paths

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.18: What do you like MOST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that should be preserved or protected? (OTHER)

- ◆ Pave the streets
- ◆ Police are quick to respond (seldom needed)
- ◆ Proximity to childrens school
- ◆ Proximity to schools
- ◆ proximity to schools, convenience of Table Mesa shopping center
- ◆ Recreation facilities
- ◆ Rural feeling
- ◆ rural/urban interface
- ◆ School
- ◆ Schools
- ◆ Schools
- ◆ Sense of community with neighbors.
- ◆ Space
- ◆ The Boulder Creek multi use path
- ◆ The neighborhood is quiet except as noted in next question
- ◆ The neighbors are wonderful!
- ◆ the people, neighbors
- ◆ The safety & desirability of our neighborhood has declined due to many apartment buildings having been built nearby. A 'transitional housing project' will soon be built nearby, as well. Due to the fact I have teens (and one teen has already been raped by a homeless person 3 years ago), we are considering moving.
- ◆ The view
- ◆ The views!!
- ◆ Trees
- ◆ Trees and Boulder Creek
- ◆ Trees, lawns, flowers - a good mix with buildings and nature
- ◆ views
- ◆ Views that should be protected
- ◆ views to the mountains
- ◆ Walking distance to business district

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)

- ◆ 1. I enjoy going to downtown Boulder, traffic on Broadway moves very well most of the time and there enough parking. But, as soon as, congestion gets bad, I will limit my visits.
- ◆ a '15' min walk would have been made by me, and 1000 of my neighbors to a 'grocery' store that the City is so pleased with preventing, now we all 'dive' to central and south boulder to buy groceries use the post office, use a fed ex, use EVERYTHING simply because your plan actually doesn't understand what 'mixed' use means....
- ◆ Affordable housing is against industrial in which noise ordinances don't apply, so it's loud and unpleasant
- ◆ after a snow our street doesn't get ploughed
- ◆ Barking dogs
- ◆ Being surrounded by L.A.
- ◆ Better bike lanes on some major roads
- ◆ Bicycles on sidewalks are a problem
- ◆ Biking to stores, downtown, N. Boulder, doesn't feel safe or comfortable
- ◆ Boulder county isn't performing their duty and maintaining subdivision roads
- ◆ Boulder does not want to maintain our neighborhood roads
- ◆ Build the trail around Boulder. People park their RVs on the streets. It's very ugly.
- ◆ Bus transit is only 1/2 mile walk, but it is way too limited service to be of real use. SEE my earlier comment about no evening or Sun svc. THIS means if I want to do anything after work, I have to drive in order to get back home after.
- ◆ cannot mountain bike from home, feel shunned by elite neighbors
- ◆ Character is changing with new super-huge houses, filling the lots. Bus transit not close for west areas of neighborhood.
- ◆ City installs traffic medians etc without consulting people who live in area. Trails in area are maintained poorly.
- ◆ College rentals which are not taken care of.
- ◆ Commuters
- ◆ Concerned about the high density moving in for low income. I support low income housing but the access to the neighborhood is already challenging the traffic will be too great and overwhelm the neighborhood the density should be similar or less than the current density permitted to Northfield commons
- ◆ Concerned that it may be re-zoned and residents displaced. Like the Valmont Mobile Home park.
- ◆ congestion!!!
- ◆ Constant construction 8 years
- ◆ constant construction noise
- ◆ Constant sirens and traffic
- ◆ County has refused to repave its roads in our neighborhood!
- ◆ Current construction
- ◆ cut off from nearby retail areas by Foothills
- ◆ deer problem
- ◆ Development of Kalmia/28th triangle
- ◆ Difficult to drive, roads don't make sense
- ◆ disrespectful renters
- ◆ Don't plow the streets
- ◆ Fewer rentals
- ◆ Flooding/Old Pipes
- ◆ Generally noise OK except garage next door

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)

- ◆ getting way to dense
- ◆ half-way house on the block
- ◆ HOA aesthetic requires grass and lawns vs. native look
- ◆ Homeless contingency at Elmer's Dash
- ◆ homeless hanging out
- ◆ homeless shelter
- ◆ homeless shelters
- ◆ Homeless shelters close by
- ◆ Homeless/crime problem worse in the last year
- ◆ I live in the Peloton. City View may sell half of the complex as a rental product to a rental property investor thus dramatically and perhaps permanently changing the character of the community and committing fraud against the owners if not the City of Boulder.
- ◆ Inadequate street lighting
- ◆ inconsiderate dog owners allowing their dogs to bark at all hours
- ◆ Increase in rentals and related decrease in good landscape
- ◆ Increasing number of houses being used as rental properties. Also worry about whether any proposed development will worsen the flood risk
- ◆ Increasing rental units
- ◆ Intense development by Boulder in Gunbarrel.
- ◆ It is great walking east, west is dangerous.
- ◆ Lack of support services, ie. Medical, fuel, grocery choices,
- ◆ Lack of an affordable grocery store
- ◆ Lack of city/county maintenance of roads
- ◆ lack of diversity
- ◆ Lack of socio-economic diversity in residents of my neighborhood. Also lack of age diversity.
- ◆ Lack of street parking
- ◆ Lack of sufficient care for trees in parks; open space fences falling down, look sleazy
- ◆ Lacks a healthy grocery store. Must go on streets to get to bike paths, Needs more places to walk to
- ◆ Lacks diversity
- ◆ Lacks grocery, drug store, difficult to cross Broadway
- ◆ limited bus service on weekends
- ◆ Little racial diversity
- ◆ local schools (elementary and middle) are not geared toward my children,
- ◆ Lots of building and density going up in this region, making it increasingly unpleasant to live due to traffic, ugly buildings, not nice for walking, pollution. It has gotten worse as this area has been marked for growth.
- ◆ management
- ◆ Management of park
- ◆ Many rentals are trashy, not maintained
- ◆ Many roads need repair/maintenance.
- ◆ Mental health center in our vicinity has brought drug user homeless asleep on our lawn, break ins and thefts, peeping toms
- ◆ Mixed use area, lack of parking
- ◆ more business to walk to, time to redevelop parts of the neighborhood with higher density (townhomes)
- ◆ More neighborhood parks/green space
- ◆ mosquitos

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)

- ◆ My neighbors dog barks constantly
- ◆ Need better quality main arterials, specifically extend Pearl to Gunbarrel
- ◆ Need safe way to cross over Jay to access trails
- ◆ Need to tie the bike paths together, for safer bike riding.
- ◆ Need traffic light Yarmouth and 28th
- ◆ Needs more trees lining Arapahoe Ave.
- ◆ Needs sidewalks
- ◆ Neglected maintenance of TRhunderbird Lk by city Water dept despite its use by 200 seniors resident in FMRC and lots of us families in the area. The concentration of seniors in this neighborhood is clear; despite representation at City Council mtgs, senoor needs continue to be excluded
- ◆ New businesses have created too much traffic and lots of noise and lack of parking at Twin Lakes. Littering of glass as well.
- ◆ Next to water reclamation plant
- ◆ NIMBYism
- ◆ no bus availability on Sundays
- ◆ No car wash nearby
- ◆ no no bike between 75 and 55th connecting to boulder creek trail at 55th. Would be much safer for teenagers and adults to bike to town.
- ◆ No parking in the area. The permit zone has moved all of the Pearl St. employees into parking in the Whittier neighborhood, no one can park near their own homes
- ◆ No snow removal
- ◆ no spring city cleanup
- ◆ no street maintenance
- ◆ Noise from Fairview Students and Band
- ◆ not enough neighborhood retail
- ◆ Nothing commercial nearby
- ◆ over-development occurring
- ◆ Overdeveloping student rentals
- ◆ Please see above.
- ◆ Pollution due to proximity to US 36
- ◆ poor bus service
- ◆ Poor homeowner/renter maintenance
- ◆ poor quality apartments
- ◆ Poor road conditions/potholes
- ◆ Poorly lit at night
- ◆ Preponderance of shelters and social services at the expense of neighborhood serving commercial
- ◆ Proximity to downtown leads to parking hassles from folks seeking free parking
- ◆ Rental units tend to be noisy
- ◆ Rental/student housing has greatly increased the density over the years and lack of landlord/or renter respect for living in a 'neighborhood', mobile population with no connection to long term effects to those in owner-based properties
- ◆ road maintenance is inadequate
- ◆ Roads
- ◆ roads have been ignored and are just slightly better than dirt which they will be soon
- ◆ School bells ring during vacation periods

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)

- ◆ shopping center in flux - small businesses closing
- ◆ Snow never removed
- ◆ streets and sidewalks are in poor repair/dangerous.
- ◆ Streets are a mess and have not been paved for 20+ years. Also people drive to fast down the side streets (avoiding Balsam)
- ◆ table mesa shopping center dated and could use some better stores and less vacancies and less cooking school
- ◆ terrible road maintenance, traffic cuts through our neighborhood to avoid Broadway and Iris intersection, cars routinely run stop signs and endanger people
- ◆ That we don't have more open swim time at rec center
- ◆ The area is nothing but houses, one after another. It would be nice to have more pocket parks, food trucks, coffee carts, public art, etc.
- ◆ The growing lights against the foothills, traffic noise along Diagonal
- ◆ the potential for creating massive housing developments that have no infrastructure to support it.
- ◆ The roads in and around Gunbarrell are in poor shape
- ◆ the strong possibility of Boulder forcing high density housing on us
- ◆ The trains in the middle of the night and being able to see 2 of 3 power plant stacks that are out of use. Having to see the back side of CHARM and Resource, with bus storage.
- ◆ The university is in the way in getting access to central or north Boulder. My wife's business (which employs residents of Boulder) is in North Boulder and it regularly takes longer to get there than it would to get to Denver.
- ◆ Theft
- ◆ There is constant construction of megamasions. The character of the neighborhood has completely changed. Most of the large lots have been paved over with huge houses, 3-4 car garages, swimming pools, huge driveways, out buildings, etc. so that flooding will be MUCH worse because there is no free land left to absorb the water coming from 2 mile creek. There is constant truck traffic and noise for the last 15 years and more to come.
- ◆ Tiny path, tiny park area
- ◆ Too crowded, only street parking
- ◆ Too far from restaurants and coffee shops
- ◆ Too many bums, construction
- ◆ Too many homeless people in the summer. Shooing them out of downtown doesn't solve anything, it just makes them congregate in other places, like Scott Carpenter.
- ◆ too many rentals
- ◆ Too much development
- ◆ Too much noise from Hwy 36
- ◆ Too much noise, traffic, parking congestion on weekends
- ◆ Too much traffic and non-local parking
- ◆ Too much train noise
- ◆ Traffic
- ◆ Traffic laws not enforced
- ◆ traffic on Broadway
- ◆ Traffic on Iris
- ◆ train noise

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.19: What do you like LEAST about your neighborhood (or the area where you live) that you would most like to improve? (OTHER)

- ♦ train noise, noise from foothills parkway
- ♦ Train noise, White Rock Ditch leakage
- ♦ Transient nature due to \$
- ♦ transportation on weekends
- ♦ Transportation to town is tedious
- ♦ Trend toward increasing rental units from what 15 years ago was primarily owner-occupied housing.
- ♦ Unmanaged traffic from open space visitors who seem to come from out of town.
- ♦ unpredictable changes coming
- ♦ unsafe pedestrian crossing opportunities to Fairview High
- ♦ used aa a parking lot by the cu research center
- ♦ Very little interaction with neighbors
- ♦ very poor transit that does not work.
- ♦ Walking/biking on arapaho & arapaho/55th junction area
- ♦ WASHINGTON VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT THAT THE CITY ERRED ON
- ♦ We desperately need a speedbump on my street and the Intersection at 30th and Colorado makes me feel like I'm risking my life every day I have to turn left there (going Southbound)
- ♦ We need more young children.
- ♦ Wildlife safety issues, constant construction and scraping to build new homes
- ♦ Wish there were more families with children, but they can't afford it. Two, our street (Del Rosa) never not ever gets plowed and the street resurfacing work done twice in the last 10 years has been unsatisfactory.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Improved	A group of 6 houses were constructed. Last one sold for over \$1,000,000.
◆ Improved	Access to parks and open space/trail system, commerce (Valmont)
◆ Improved	As one of the first homeowners here, we lived with construction for many years. Now it is quieter.
◆ Improved	As residents have moved out, newer, younger families have moved in. It is comforting to see young kids in the neighborhood again.
◆ Improved	Better job of road maintenance.
◆ Improved	Building and landscape improvements and upgrades made throughout neighborhood. Plus, as Boulder grows more and more expensive, we've begun to see our location as about as 'central' as we can afford. Five years ago, there were definitely comparable options available closer to Downtown and trails/paths.
◆ Improved	Building of newer homes to replace older, dated homes.
◆ Improved	Continued improvement of homes
◆ Improved	Dated housing is getting redeveloped; some new restaurants in Table Mesa.
◆ Improved	East Boulder Community Center Open Space
◆ Improved	Firetraining site was relocated, Trail Crossing neighborhood is being built- adds more families and increased investment in safe neighborhood.
◆ Improved	Folsom has gotten quite busy, and I wish the city would turn this into a boulevard (or similar) with more vegetation, perhaps little parks, and redevelopment of the commercial spaces (like the 7Eleven and the shops next door). We do not need another 29th or 30th Street; I think the traffic flow could be controlled in other ways. I realize the new bike lanes could be a part of what I am mentioning above, and I thought this was a great idea, even if it wasn't executed in the way I imagined (I will try to address this elsewhere).
◆ Improved	for the most part improved but there's a lot of investors buying houses just for the lot, scraping the already expensive home and putting up whatever lot lined structure they can get by with. there's just as much bad that comes with the good. i mean yay for us as our property values shoot through the roof, but it's sad to think how hard it would be for many of us that have been in the neighborhood to be able to walk into our neighborhood and afford to buy our same house.
◆ Improved	Good HOA leadership of our small community of townhouses
◆ Improved	Good maintenance
◆ Improved	Good people moved into the neighborhood
◆ Improved	Good: Homes being re-modeled, improved landscaping, great trails and links to creek and goose creek paths Bad: damage to cottonwood trail/trees from flood, no commercial/coffee shop/restaurant within 15 min walking distance; no good bike access to North Boulder/28th/Diagonal shops and restaurants -- no way to cross train tracks under foothills safely -- even though people do it all the time!; train horns are loud; traffic on foothills is sometimes loud
◆ Improved	Greater involvement by community, more community gathering places in nearby shopping area (restaurants with outdoor seating, coffee shops, etc)

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Improved	Gunbarrel has lacked quality restaurants, but has changed (and will) with Snarfs and the newly built Gunbarrel Town Center.
♦ Improved	Home improvement
♦ Improved	Home owners continue to do constant maintenance and many improvements and additions as well.
♦ Improved	Home ownership creates much nice neighborhoods than renters, and there are a lot of student renters in our neighborhood. They are disrespectful, loud, scary drivers, ugly lawns, lots of cars, etc.
♦ Improved	Home rehabs/one park improved
♦ Improved	Homeowners are extensively remodeling and improving their homes
♦ Improved	Housing remodels and updating
♦ Improved	I do not like that the bike path is being moved from the Boulders to the Aspen Grove side. This seems short sighted on the planning part. The Aspen Grove side is always occupied with truck for plumbers, electricians, moving vans, etc. This is a necessity for Aspen Grove. The boulders wants it on their side of the creek, Aspen Grove residents want it on the Boulders side. Otherwise, people on the paths will be within 5 feet of residents bedrooms. It is asinine. A pedestrian bridge over the creek would fix this huge issue that will have people up in arms as a consequence. The planners did not take into account how often the Aspen Grove easement sidewalk is used. This will lead to large problems in the future. Aspen Grove collectively shared this info with the planner - I felt unheard. The planner was extremely dismissive.
♦ Improved	I love my neighborhood. Literally the only downside is that the traffic is a little busier than I'd like (e.g., the through-traffic on Mapleton is significant compared to other east-west streets in the neighborhood, and the intersections at Mapleton/Broadway and Mapleton/9th can be dangerous due to cross-traffic on the north-south arteries).
♦ Improved	I love the Holiday neighborhood. I wish that east/west bike/walking corridors could be improved fom Open Space to the neighborhood. From 2mile creek/Violet to Lee Hill is a long stretch in which to access Open Space. A nice improvement would be to create a walk/bike corridor through some of the west Broadway commercial areas for access, BUT NOT A ROAD.
♦ Improved	Improved multi-use path facilities
♦ Improved	In five years, we've gotten two microbreweries, two restaurants, a doughnut shop, and a video store.
♦ Improved	It has improved, oddly, because many other parts of the city have gotten worse. The growth in Boulder is obvious, and a plan is needed for the Table Mesa/Broadway commercial area to grow in concert with the needs of its community. Also, growth is underway around the Table Mesa/36 area, and a variety of mixed-use businesses are in need. That area has to be made more walkable.
♦ Improved	it would be nice if some of the building restrictions could be lifted in our neighborhood (for houses in the flood zone) so that we can make the houses bigger. many people in our neighborhood feel stuck b/c they can't afford to move to a larger house and can't add on to current home.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Improved	It's master plan is almost complete
◆ Improved	Less noisy.
◆ Improved	lots of people updating their homes, new stores in the table mesa shopping center
◆ Improved	More families moving in, not so many old people
◆ Improved	more interesting restaurants starting to pop up within biking (especially) and walking distance. People are improving their homes. Some re-builds happening.
◆ Improved	More neighborhood (Heritage Meadows) activity on 'greening up' with new plantings
◆ Improved	more owner occupied housing.
◆ Improved	More owner-occupied houses
◆ Improved	More owners and longer-term renters make is such that residents have a stake in the well-being of the neighborhood.
◆ Improved	My park is well maintained. When I first moved in there were still some very run down trailers but the park has worked hard to upgrade the area. I am aware of the Ponderosa Park on the West of Broadway north of Violet with its dirt streets (all two of them) and packed in units and no facilities so I know the extreme. I want to say this, I live with my daughter and grandchildren. My daughter moved in when her rental town home in Denver was foreclosed out from under her. As my grandchildren moved thru school my trailer park was where all their friends came to swim in the pool or play soccer on the green. I tried to encourage tennis but didn't get any takers. those kids for the most part came from the crowded Holiday and whatever else that area north of Yarmouth is called (Thistle has a piece there). They have no yards, no pools, the streets appear to narrow for safe driving, but hey. I have a nice lot with trees and we barbeque all summer. I admit I would have a difficult time with the rent on my social security without my daughter helping out. I guess I think multigenerational houses or neighborhoods are better than the artificially manufactured social structure of your planned developments
◆ Improved	My street was 50/50 owners/renters when we moved in in the late 90's. There have been interesting people who rent that we have enjoyed getting to know but the overall feel of the street changed once the rental homes were sold. The homes are so much better cared for which makes the street more pleasing. Some of the rentals we really trashed and the occupants usually didn't shovel or care much about being neighborly.
◆ Improved	Neighborhood has invested in improving common areas, which has increased the usability and beauty of those spaces.
◆ Improved	neighbors improving their home
◆ Improved	New houses built that are really nice but still works with old character of the neighborhood farther up the hill New shops close by like Whole Pets at Basemar and grocery store right there, too.
◆ Improved	New library and art programs are great. Still few affordable places to shop, eat and socialize. Crime is up.
◆ Improved	New restaurants and shops, trail improvements, remodeled homes, jobs attracting new and interesting residents.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Improved	New thriving restaurants are hubs for neighborhood walks and visitor fun stops. Boulder Digital Arts is a fantastic addition to the neighborhood and great use of commercial space. What I don't want to see happen is the ruination of this neighborhood with a takeover of rushing pressured aggressive drivers pushing to buy or find the next trendy thing... similar to what's happened at 28th St. I will do anything to avoid 28th St nowadays.
◆ Improved	On a relative basis, it has not seen the intense development of other North Boulder residential neighborhoods (e.g. newlands)
◆ Improved	Over the last 10 years, the neighborhood has changed from mostly rentals to owner occupied young professionals some starting families and adding to these bottom end boulder 3 bedroom 1 bath houses. These upgrades along w a couple old-timers (40year residents) makes our block in particular an outstanding community. (For reference, i bought my house in late 70's , was a slumlord for 30 yrs before deciding to move back in , fix up and flip...i decided to stay...)
◆ Improved	People are improving their homes. The local elementary is much improved.
◆ Improved	People are putting more money into their properties in Martin Acres, increasing the number of owner occupied properties, and increasing property values. WE NEED A SOUND BARRIER WALL BETWEEN 36 & MARTIN ACRES!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
◆ Improved	People care in our neighborhood - we have lots of beautiful gardens and bee friendly yards
◆ Improved	Quality of local businesses and newer housing remodels
◆ Improved	Recent park renovation, re-grading of creek and wetlands following 2013 floods.
◆ Improved	Redevelopment of old housing stock
◆ Improved	Remodeled homes. Fewer rentals?
◆ Improved	Remodels are happening! The more the better. Existing housing stock is garbage; we should strongly encourage all re-development, remodels, etc.
◆ Improved	Renovations since flood
◆ Improved	Repaving
◆ Improved	Right-sizing
◆ Improved	Rise in housing prices, (slow) decrease in rentals
◆ Improved	school/parks
◆ Improved	Several of the older apartment buildings and houses have been updated and the exteriors improved.
◆ Improved	Some of the dumpy looking houses were torn down and replaced by nicer houses.
◆ Improved	Some older homes have been redone or replaced
◆ Improved	Street paved, local owners investing in renovation and property investment.
◆ Improved	Table Mesa shopping area is getting new businesses that I like to visit
◆ Improved	Table mesa shopping center now has more to offer
◆ Improved	The construction of bigger homes that do not fit into the community has been a problem in recent years.. More restrictions on building size and designed would be helpful.
◆ Improved	The HOA runs a tight ship.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Improved	The home owners have invested in their homes to make the whole neighborhood better.
◆ Improved	The modified (July 2015) updates and improvements to Harlow Platts Community Park, including 2 new shelters and bathrooms. Also, families moving into the neighborhood who are putting money into their homes and the schools and are invested in the community.
◆ Improved	The neighborhood has improved due to increased housing prices. The increased housing prices has in turn driven owners of rental units to sell. This leads to new owners remodeling and improving the conditions of the houses in the neighborhood.
◆ Improved	The Table Mesa shopping center has gotten better but still has a long way to go. The former gas station at the corner of Broadway and Table Mesa drive was going to be a Walgreens but it has taken FOREVER to redevelop, it is an eyesore in a prime location and this should not be allowed to happen. Redevelopment of the former Savers store should help, hopefully it doesn't take too long.
◆ Improved	The type of development has been positive. The multi-purpose paths are being maintained.
◆ Improved	There are more families with children. Martin Acres used to be primarily students with attendant noise and lack of maintenance. It's better now, although there are still too many people with loud cars and motorcycles.
◆ Improved	Though I have lived in Gunbarrel for less than a year (moved from Central Boulder), I like the fact that more residential and commercial development is moving into the area such as Gunbarrel Town Centre, many microbreweries, restaurants, etc. This will in turn continue to improve public transportation options, diversity of residents, and access to amenities. Boulder simply must grow to meet demand, and Gunbarrel is one area with some physical room for growth. I do hear long-time Gunbarrel residents complain that they have trouble finding a parking place at King Soopers at peak times of day and that traffic is becoming too heavy; however, these same residents enjoy the new shopping, restaurants, breweries, etc this new growth has enabled. It is all a delicate balancing act and thinking beyond only oneself is imperative.
◆ Improved	Too much government regulation inside city limits makes our community better all the time.
◆ Improved	Traffic, noise of surrounding residents, affordability
◆ Improved	Upgrades in housing, fewer rentals, more young people moving in to area.
◆ Improved	upgrades to houses - remodels and new homes on existing sites
◆ Improved	upkeep of homes type of new homes built city services are kept up values have increased
◆ Improved	Valmont park, bike park
◆ Improved	Very nice redevelopment of homes in our area. Some scrape and rebuild, some pop-top, but overall general improvement of properties around us. This is positive for the whole area.
◆ Improved	We have worked hard to attract young families, with satisfying results.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Improved	with new condos a few blocks away came improved sidewalk, lighting, and walk to downtown (used to be an abandoned parking lot and retail)
◆ Improved	Young couples of starting families have built a community and are improving their homes with remodels or renovations.
◆ Improved	Young folks are moving in again. Neighborhood is maturing with more large trees. New city park with bike park and disk golf course is taking shape, has replaced some of the less desirable elements along Valmont.
◆ Gotten worse	1. commuter traffic on 75th st and Lookout Road. 2. Gun shots at night in pubic park 3. Night time noise and load music from Boulder Country Club. 4. Very ugly multi use development in Gunbarrel Center.
◆ Gotten worse	Absentee owners and rentals are a real pain. Also AirBnB is becoming a problem, with room rentals.....
◆ Gotten worse	Affordability being lost and management company bringing in rentals to fill in empty lots at owners' expense. Lot rent is becoming higher than anticipated for retirement. Traffic is rush-hour level most days including weekends. Not everyone is able or chooses to take the bus depending on their schedule.
◆ Gotten worse	Age and state of maintenance of the oldest (least expensive) homes has degraded in the older part of the neighborhood. The sidewalks and roads are in very bad repair and are dangerous to walk/drive at night. Many sidewalks are overgrown to the extent they are impassible, forcing pedestrians to walk on the roadways. The open areas (road shoulders, school grounds and park are very poorly maintained (mowed).
◆ Gotten worse	Annexation in this area has put pressure on middle and lower (retired) income folks who are financially unable or unwilling (there is no clear return on investment) to annex. Increased traffic on Arapahoe is not being managed well.
◆ Gotten worse	Aurora 7 school (not current name)
◆ Gotten worse	Basement flooding and the threat of a high density affordable housing development in Twin Lakes
◆ Gotten worse	BJA development
◆ Gotten worse	Boulder has made traffic worse on Lookout Road ever since it installed a stop sign on Lookout at 75th. Boulder's intense development in Gunbarrel is changing an area that is technically part of City of Boulder but in essence is not part of the City.
◆ Gotten worse	bus service reduced, roads not maintained well, increased traffic noise
◆ Gotten worse	Can't always park in front of my house
◆ Gotten worse	City traffic getting home, decreased friendliness of neighbors and community feel. More long term RV/temp housing parked in area.
◆ Gotten worse	CityView is attempting to force the balance of the units they said would be condo's into permanent rentals. This was not supposed to be a college rental area.
◆ Gotten worse	Construction noise from the CU Research Park, increased traffic, will get worse (medical center at corner of Foothills and Colorado)
◆ Gotten worse	County not maintaining roads and enforcing speed limits
◆ Gotten worse	density of population and activity and overuse of the Creek path
◆ Gotten worse	Density.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Gotten worse	DEVELOPMEN OF WASH. VILLAGE -- DESPITE NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT
♦ Gotten worse	Development in-process is over-done and traffic congestion is getting worse
♦ Gotten worse	Development, congestion
♦ Gotten worse	Downtown has become overgrown, not as user friendly and getting aorund town has gotten much worse do to traffic
♦ Gotten worse	ease of doing business - grocery store, etc. ease of going into central Boulder which is more and more difficult
♦ Gotten worse	Exploding rent costs, development
♦ Gotten worse	Extensive development with no regard to transit impact of additional housing.
♦ Gotten worse	flood and train noise
♦ Gotten worse	Getting too expensive. Some obnoxiously wealthy people are moving in and building ostentatious houses. Every time an original house turns over, it is rebuilt. The neighbors are getting snooty. One house on 4th St. has been under construction for 2+ years with construction vehicles in the neighborhood daily. There are 2 others on Iris and at least one on Juniper which causes street congestion, especially when kids are walking to/from Foothill Elementary. I went to an open house of a new neighbor who was showing off their new house. The other neighbors were behaving so obnoxious about how they also needed to update/rebuild to keep up (one had a 5 year old house and was planning remodeling to keep up). They were complaining because the house next door was older and not kept up to their standards, and they needed to look at it. There are more important issues. Newlands is losing its character and diversity.
♦ Gotten worse	Growth with high density apartments to support commercial development.
♦ Gotten worse	Gunbarrel Town Square is horrible!! There will be a massive traffic jam when the rentals are filled. It is an eyesore! Much too dense. No open space, no parks, etc. Also, where is the light at Lookout and Idylwild? Do not wait for someone to get killed before that is implemented.
♦ Gotten worse	Heavy on-street parking
♦ Gotten worse	Heavy traffic noise on Foothills starts at 5 AM! Steady replacement of owner-occupied by rentals esp. to students....block parties are Band-aids. Students don't give a fig about being neighborly. Require landlords to fix their homes, keep landscape up and be liable for overoccupancy.
♦ Gotten worse	Heavy traffic on all area streets, noise, smog
♦ Gotten worse	High fences (over 8'), high bushes (over 10'), higher houses!
♦ Gotten worse	High housing prices
♦ Gotten worse	high speed traffic cutting through the neighborhood, running stop signs and speeding mostly to avoid Broadway and Iris light.
♦ Gotten worse	High traffic and speeding
♦ Gotten worse	Hiking trail out the backyard---increased traffic, people won't pick up their dogs' waste, and generally, more attention to our neighborhood.
♦ Gotten worse	Homeless shelter close by

**2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments**

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Gotten worse	houses are being scraped and built two or three times the size of the original house. City is inconsistant in applying the rules for planning and development.
♦ Gotten worse	I live on the upper end of 'The Hill' just N. of Baseline. I can point out 8 houses near us that were owner (responsibly) occupied and are now rentals that are trashed, over-occupied and not cared for. The party noise is also bad. It is like dominos: one falling after another, and once the houses become 'investment properties' they NEVER return to what they once were
♦ Gotten worse	Improvements are few and for the wealthy
♦ Gotten worse	Increase in crime - I blame legalization of pot on some of the increase
♦ Gotten worse	Increase in rentals - lack of maintenance of these, and increased occupancy - neighborhood degradation
♦ Gotten worse	Increase in shelters, social services, subsidized housing and not enough convenience commercial to support local population
♦ Gotten worse	Increase in traffic and placement of pedestrian crosswalk makes area dangerous for both drivers and bike/foot traffic.
♦ Gotten worse	Increased density of housing
♦ Gotten worse	Increased traffic. Build out of empty lots in area. Lack of road maintenance.
♦ Gotten worse	It used to be a working class neighborhood. All my school mates have been priced out. Multi-generational Boulder families had to move.
♦ Gotten worse	I've lived in the same house for 20 years and it is still a very nice place. The vacant lots have filled in with houses that run from setback to setback. I would have rather have seen higher-density developments like the Cottages, which are across the street from me.
♦ Gotten worse	Lack of att. Vista Village
♦ Gotten worse	Little response to rebuilding trails after flood
♦ Gotten worse	Local HOA not maintaining property (funds and foolishness)
♦ Gotten worse	many homes in my neighborhood were flooded in 2013 due to Four Mile Creek flooding. So far, there has been no substantial mitigation or stream bank improvement to help prevent such a disaster in the future. the cost of rebuilding most of these homes was not covered by flood insurance and created hardships for the residents who were forced to find another place to live for an extended period.
♦ Gotten worse	More development equals more population, traffic and trash
♦ Gotten worse	More homes have become rentals. Houses are so expensive that they have become investment properties. An owner moves out and the house becomes a rental. People moving in and out every year or two and the houses and yards look like rentals.
♦ Gotten worse	More negative impact from Fairview HS. Banned from neighboring Open Space, while neighbors use it as a backyard.
♦ Gotten worse	more problems with noise and trash in nearby rental units
♦ Gotten worse	More traffic, noise, rentals
♦ Gotten worse	Mt. Sanitas development on 4th St. Pending Mapleton Academy

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Gotten worse	My 99 year old mother can no longer walk the multi-use paths because of the extreme speed of the bikers. I, although younger, also avoid the multi-use paths because of the rudeness of 90% of the bikers.
♦ Gotten worse	My area is mostly condos, and in the last 5-10 years, many have been bought up as investment properties and turned into rental units. Unfortunately renters don't tend to care about a neighborhood as much as owners whom occupy. So I've seen more trash, less kept-up yards, less cleanliness on open space trails (more dog feces, etc)... we also have more open space users from other areas using our trailheads and parking on our roads, perhaps to avoid fees at Marshall Mesa, South Mesa trailheads. It's been a real uptick in the last year alone. Luckily much which makes this area great has stayed the same - having the SKIP bus line is a godsend, we feel safe, etc.
♦ Gotten worse	My street is often used as a shortcut to circumvent waiting at stoplights. Most drivers are attentive, but it isn't rare to see someone drive down my short street at more than 40 mph. Nearby streets are much quieter.
♦ Gotten worse	Neglect of maintenance of Thunderbird Lake by the city Water dept by classifying it as a 'wetland'.
♦ Gotten worse	New building in Gunbarrel Town Center has made traffic during morning and afternoon rush hours impossible. Traffic has increased significantly in the area. I do see that there is hope that retail shops will open in the many areas provided in the area. New business have not traditionally flocked to this area and I am highly suspicious there may be many vacant storefronts or undesirable retail attempts. Increased high speed bike traffic on what should be multi-use trails without monitoring regulations for actual safety of walkers, runners, or regular speed bikers. Trail maintenance is very poor by Boulder Open Space ever since they took over the control of Cottontail trail.
♦ Gotten worse	Old houses in the neighborhood are being torn down and replaced with even more expensive houses reduces the affordability of the area and reduces the character of the block. Bicyclists in the area also more frequently fail to obey traffic laws creating dangerous situations for them and drivers. Increased traffic on the streets and a lack of sidewalks or curbs on our street also lead to a less desirable experience.
♦ Gotten worse	Out of town rental property owners don't care what kind of people they rent out to, and do not work with me when I have concerns
♦ Gotten worse	Parking and garbage problems - many of these are related to the high number of rentals and the illegal number of people living in these units. I have several houses without sight of mine that have 5 or 6 unrelated students living in them - every year. But if all of people are not listed on the lease, how do you prove this? We definitely have increased problems with wildlife here but in this case it's not the cute, cuddly bears but rats. Garbage control - or lack of it - is a major concern
♦ Gotten worse	Pops and scrapes

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Gotten worse	Reducing the number of lanes on Folsom from 2 in each direction to 1 in each direction. This has caused a noticeable increase in the number of vehicles on 20th street which is a largely residential street. It was also very safe for walking and cycling prior to the 'right-sizing' project. Hopefully after we return most of Folsom to 2 lanes in each direction the traffic will die down again as drivers resume their normal routes on Folsom.
◆ Gotten worse	Rentals are not being maintained on the outside - affects the look of the neighborhood
◆ Gotten worse	Right sizing made traffic a nightmare
◆ Gotten worse	road conditions, traffic congestion, homes poorly maintained, still no parks or public spaces
◆ Gotten worse	Scraping of existing houses and replacing them with multi-story mansions of dubious design and appearance.
◆ Gotten worse	Since I moved in there have been multiple new developments of huge new apartment complexes. Three have already been constructed around king soopers. Removing open space and fields in the process. In addition new commercial complexes have been built. There are plans for more of both currently working though the approval and build process.
◆ Gotten worse	Street maintenance is lousy!
◆ Gotten worse	Streets are in disrepair
◆ Gotten worse	Taller, high density buildings (residential and commercial) don't fit character of town, block views, add traffic and pollution, have made it less pleasant for walking (lack of trees, grass). I no longer love my neighborhood. In fact, I avoid 28th St. now, and go down Folsom as much as possible.
◆ Gotten worse	The amount of traffic on the main road closest to my house (30th street) has significantly increased in the past 5 years.
◆ Gotten worse	The biggest thing I am talking about above is traffic noise. Most places I have lived in Boulder, there is some sort of traffic noise. Now it is worse. We looked for over a year to buy and the only thing in our price range is right next to 28th Street. And now with more traffic and possibly expanding lanes or the new construction, I hope it doesn't get even worse.
◆ Gotten worse	The city of Boulder does not enforce its existing ordinances regarding unrelated-person occupancy, noise, trash and litter, and camping in public parks.
◆ Gotten worse	The city removed our trees and wood fence to accommodate a bike path. This increased the noise from 28th St and the bike path has caused a transient homeless problem.
◆ Gotten worse	The density of people has changed the area significantly to too much noise and difficulty accessing our neighborhood safely.
◆ Gotten worse	The developer lied to the owners and the City of Boulder when it stated it's intentions to only temporarily rent buildings E&F at the Peloton. This is the strongest seller's market in history and they are trying to sell off half the community as a rental product rather than as condos as originally marketed and planned.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Gotten worse	The encouragement of high density growth in an area of Boulder that has been established as an area with a more rural feel, is not appropriate. The benefits of mixed use areas would be better utilized in spaces already closer in to the city with easier access to schools, businesses and jobs.
♦ Gotten worse	The huge houses (6000 to 10,000 sq feet), etc. See above. The only thing that is better is the Skip on Broadway.
♦ Gotten worse	The increase in burglary and theft in our neighborhood is very concerning and doesn't fit with joy of this city.
♦ Gotten worse	The level of fumes from development and constant building is overwhelming for any travel through the streets, not to mention the amount of truck and traffic, infrastructure damage, noise dust, extra traffic. The amount and length of construction and size of houses are stressing the neighborhood. It's become dangerous to bike here.
♦ Gotten worse	The 'mall' near the diagonal is hideous and has a big mostly empty parking lot. I also wish the buses ran more frequently until 8pm that would make it easier for me to get home from work.
♦ Gotten worse	The noise and general havoc created by the widening of Highway 36 has gone beyond the pale.
♦ Gotten worse	The open spaces around me have been developed. I used to be able to walk into the foothills without crossing a sidewalk.. Now housing occupies those spaces.
♦ Gotten worse	The proposal to annex the property at 6655 Twin Lakes Rd into the city and then rezone the parcel in order to build a high density affordable housing development has created a lot of worries about the future of our rural, residential neighborhood for my family and all of the neighbors I've talked to.
♦ Gotten worse	The standoff between county commissioners and neighborhoods that expected that road maintenance was part of the original neighborhood agreements.
♦ Gotten worse	The traffic on 19th Street has gotten so bad, that it is now very dangerous. The speed limit is 30 mph and people drive 45 mph on a regular basis. There are 2 parks on 19th and 2 elementary schools (one 2 blocks away), plus 2 pre-schools. There definitely needs to be speed bumps put in before a child is hurt, or worse. This was done on Cherryvale which has only one school, a middle school, one block away.
♦ Gotten worse	The traffic on Broadway has increased so much that it takes a long time to get out of Poplar Avenue at all times of the day. Often I will eventually turn right and then turn on to Norwood Avenue, make a 3-turn and then head North on Broadway.
♦ Gotten worse	The volume of visitors to our open space and chautauqua is having a detrimental effect on the environment, including erosion of the open space, traffic in our neighborhood when people search for parking, and lack of parking for residents as visitors fill our streets. It is not that we don't want to share our wonderful surroundings, however the city has completely failed to address the negative impacts of our popularity with visitors.
♦ Gotten worse	There has been new, tall housing construction right on Broadway which has permanently blocked wonderful views of the foothills.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Gotten worse	There is too much high density housing being built in Gunbarrel - a semi-rural area that is an outpost of Boulder, with limited transportation and connectivity options. Traffic, congestion, and pollution are worsening. This is not good for the environment, which contradicts the comprehensive plan's goal. It feels as though Gunbarrel is a fringe dumping ground where the well to do City Council members, the majority of whom live west of Broadway, and the Planning Board members can put high density housing with no impact on their lifestyle.
♦ Gotten worse	Things are worse. We had wells and septic systems but were forced into a \$50,000 per property annexation. We had to spend another \$12,000 to get rid of our good wood shingle roof and put on a asphalt shingle roof with no warning or time to save. And we are miles from forest. Our ability to modify our homes/properties is now under the control of the city council and is severely limited.
♦ Gotten worse	This condo development area now has too many renters, who don't care for the quality of neighborhood life - too transient
♦ Gotten worse	Too many rentals
♦ Gotten worse	Too much growth, no parking, horrible road conditions that are not being addressed. Too much traffic and noise. The roadways can not accommodate all the traffic. Too much traffic back up during rush hours.
♦ Gotten worse	Too much infill and low quality housing. The homeless shelter and cronicly homeless housing facility recently built did not improve the neighborhood.
♦ Gotten worse	too much new construction, too expensive, loss of established businesses and restaurants.
♦ Gotten worse	Too much rental development and not enough mass transit, lack of road improvements
♦ Gotten worse	Total failure of county to maintain all roads at the county's cost because they are greedy & don't care.
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic - can't get out of my subdivision!
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic and bicyclists
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic coming up 9th and down baseline. Students housing is not well taken care of at all.
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic has increased. See note above about extending Pearl to Gunbarrel
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic increase
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic is more congested since right-sizing on Folsom, as a bike commuter, this has got worse.
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic noise
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic on 55th is difficult. City should reroute traffic to encourage more people to drive on Foothills, 30th, etc. 55th is a Residential street between Baseline and Arapahoe. Also, WAY too many pot shops nearby. Not interested in dealing with stoners and pot users driving to and from pot shops while high as I run or bike to the Boulder Creek Path. Sidewalks on Arapahoe are completely unsafe due to the interactions of cars and pedestrians.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic on Broadway
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic on Marshall Road, used as a bypass to access Highway 93
♦ Gotten worse	traffic!
♦ Gotten worse	Traffic, density, noise, congestion
♦ Gotten worse	traffic/parking from hikers
♦ Gotten worse	Very dense housing created around the Lookout/Spine area have put more pressure on the Twin Lakes Open Space. The new Avery Brewery has brought more people to the open space, more traffic and congestion and has blocked views.
♦ Gotten worse	Weekend traffic for Chatauqua makes the neighborhood feel crowded, litter, dog waste, noise, disrespect of property are all evident on weekends and holidays
♦ Gotten worse	What little neighborhood retail we have is being threatened by greedy developers ie Baseline Zero. There are too many illegally over-occupied houses in the city that are not being enforced.
♦ Gotten worse	When I first moved into Stonegate 13 years ago, most of the units were owner occupied. Today approximately 40% are rental units. Experience shows that renters care little of the neighborhood where they live. Every end of the month when renters move out the dumpsters are overflowing with mattresses and other furniture, and the HOA is stuck paying for the additional cost.
♦ Gotten worse	Whenever homes sell, good houses are scraped and huge houses few can afford are put in their place. This changes drastically the diversity of people living here. Local bus was eliminated.
♦ Gotten worse	While apartments can attract students, young professionals, tight-knit family of immigrants trying to improve their lot in life, etc. - apartments can also house a disproportionately high number of sex offenders and druggies. The same is true of the apartments by our home. This, in addition to the Transitional Housing Project coming to our neighborhood, have compelled us to consider selling our home (in our family for 49 years) and moving to a safer location. As a woman, and a concerned parent, I celebrate safety over celebrating diversity of criminal elements now sprinkled in and around our neighborhood.
♦ Gotten worse	While the Gunbarrel Town Center concept seemed to be a good idea, the other developments weren't widely advertised. We now have 3 new apartment complexes and no additional infrastructure to support them. And there are proposals of another complex being built in Twin Lakes, which will further exacerbate the negative issues of noise, traffic, and less elbow room. In the past year, I and neighbors are seeing less wild life (we had an abundance of fox, coyotes, raccoons, birds); this is NOT progress.
♦ Gotten worse	With the voume of people moving to Boulder, the traffic has worsened in our neighborhood
♦ Mixed	A number of homes in this neighborhood are being updated (a good thing), and parks have recently been improved; wish renters or landlords took better care of the exterior and landscape for their properties. We have a great email distribution list that has improved communication and 'neighborliness' in the neighborhood.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	Attention by code enforcement + police to keep lawful behavior as dominant so that there can be peaceful enjoyment of home/property.
♦ Mixed	Boulder county isn't performing their duty and maintaining subdivision roads as required by the judges decision
♦ Mixed	Commute to South Boulder much worse because of increasing traffic. Crime/homeless activity increasing in the last year. No local supermarket (walking distance). Development seems focused on housing, we need business development support in NoBo.
♦ Mixed	Don't care for the influx of megamansions which end up making the area less affordable for people to age in place.
♦ Mixed	Downzoning 15 years ago hurt the area
♦ Mixed	Fix roads, mow the medians
♦ Mixed	Homeless people and noise
♦ Mixed	Hospital traffic, noise
♦ Mixed	Houses gotten bigger with less land - no buffer to next house
♦ Mixed	Houses have been remodeled but the county roads are falling apart
♦ Mixed	houses in our neighborhood have been scraped and HUGE homes have been rebuilt in their places. the affordability is nonexistent in this part of town, and the feel has completely changed in last 5 years.
♦ Mixed	Housing cost and consideration if this would be a place I could afford to buy.
♦ Mixed	I am concerned about the increased density and traffic
♦ Mixed	I have mixed feelings about the Gunbarrel Town Center. While I like having more options to walk or bike to I anticipate that the community is going to be overcrowded. The reason I live out here and not IN Boulder is because Boulder has gotten too overcrowded with people, lines, and traffic.
♦ Mixed	I love the immediate neighborhood and people take care of their homes. My issues are more with the Table Mesa shopping center--looks dated, traffic congestion, needs more unique affordable restaurants, lost Savers, supposedly getting Walgreens (yuk), cooking school taking over, lost gym. Other nearby neighborhood shopping centers similarly dated--Basemar, Meadows. Downtown/north Boulder much cuter.
♦ Mixed	I think the children in my neighborhood are growing up and without adult supervision these teenagers are a threat to neighbor safety and happiness.
♦ Mixed	Improved: trees are bigger and more beautiful. More families moving into neighborhood - we enjoy this immensely, even though our kids are grown. Worse: housing prices have gotten too high. Only wealthy people can afford to buy in our neighborhood now.
♦ Mixed	increased through traffic which increases the noise level. parking is hard to find. I am a homeowner and my one block is the only block in whittier where you can't get a resident parking pass I love that I am downtown, but with that comes many events where my street is closed down and many times there is no notification. Then I park in the neighborhood and get a ticket
♦ Mixed	Iris/47th intersection is an eysore, construction mostly done in hood

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	It's one of the more affordable neighborhoods in Boulder but it's becoming too expensive for many middle class people. I would like people not to be priced out of Boulder and therefore be required to live in the sprawling neighboring communities and drive into Boulder for work. If we truly want to maintain environmental standards, we need to make our city a place where more people can live and not have to drive into town to work, not create sprawl in the surrounding communities.
♦ Mixed	Light and sound pollution, overpopulation, more cars
♦ Mixed	Lots of property and housing improvements, which is nice but also bad because the neighborhood is getting richer and richer. Very homogenous now. Used to have more elderly. People cannot afford to live here. Improvement to Columbine Elementary School and Casey are a big plus. Lack of small neighborhood schools is a minus (Mapleton, Washington, Lincoln, Baseline Middle School). Improvements (like trees and landscaping) at public spaces like parks are a big plus.
♦ Mixed	Lots of turnover in ownership and rentals. Fairview Students still are noisy with their music and their cars. Band practice is something we have to live with. At least it is over by the end of October. They are better in keeping their trash at a minimum. Thank you.
♦ Mixed	Main negatives are fewer children and more owners of multiple residences who are away much of the year.
♦ Mixed	Many of the small single family homes have been demolished with much larger, taller homes replacing them. The development of the old Washington Elementary School area, while mixed and preserving a very small city park, doesn't seem to be consistent with the Plan. Huge, \$1.5 million homes, on small lots, though mixed with smaller apartments/condominiums seems to be inconsistent with the smaller and more affordable single family homes in the area.
♦ Mixed	Most new buyers are scraping small homes and building large, expensive homes
♦ Mixed	Much has changed and not for the better. It is a street, not a neighborhood.
♦ Mixed	much upgrading of homes; results in substantial property tax increases.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	Negative: The expansion of almost every home that is being sold. Dealing with construction noise, nails in the street, etc. Negative: The City recently allowed modifications to set-backs to both the front and side of a corner lot without neighborhood input. The same house was allowed to building up the height of the ground, so that their extremely high fence could be higher than original allowed. (SW corner of Drake and Stanford) Fortunately, the Planning Board refused a height variance up the street from me, when the new owners wanted to almost triple the size of the home, increasing the footprint by a huge amount and wanting a 4' height variance. THANK YOU By the Way: I think the way they measure the 35' on a sloped lot could be improved upon. (The same thing that was done on the above mentioned fence, could potentially be done to a home.) And, many times the a variance could actually have less impact then what is allowed. I feel what needs to be maintained, is the ability to have views and not feel boxed in. Which is the opposite of what it feels like at 30th and Pearl and, as soon as the hotels are built at 28th and Canyon will boxed in again. I also feel that the new Bill Bower Park is a very nice new addition to our neighborhood, it is used frequently, however, no one is maintaining the planted areas along Table Mesa. The weeds are taking over.
♦ Mixed	New local businesses (good), flood damage (bad)
♦ Mixed	No longer affordable; getting onto Broadway at rush hour nearly impossible
♦ Mixed	noise associated with the Boulder Country Club expanding its athletic club
♦ Mixed	Not a fan of rental units. Renters do not maintain their properties and owners seem lax about holding them accountable. Airbnb problem although HOA covenants specifically prohibit such activity. Summertime homeless activity in Elmer Two-Mile Park.
♦ Mixed	Our HOA fees have doubled...without notice to us. So now our HOA fees are almost \$800/month. This is all due to the flood, which happened before we moved into this neighborhood.
♦ Mixed	Our neighborhood generally sits tucked away which is wonderful. However Jay Road suffers from increased traffic between Diagonal and 28th St is beginning to change the whole tenor of the area. Road paving has become non existent in our area and neighborhood. County is supposed to provide paving services. Rural, agricultural and equine nature of north Boulder is unfortunately disappearing
♦ Mixed	Our neighborhood was hit pretty hard during the flood of 2013. There have been a lot of improvements to the sewer systems here and to the roads which I'm pleased with.
♦ Mixed	Parking on street more crowded
♦ Mixed	Parking worse; age mix of residents better
♦ Mixed	People sleeping in vehicles, noise, trash from renovation, lack of city oversight of building permits
♦ Mixed	prices have risen, making it impossible for middle class families to live even in modest neighborhoods.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	Property values have gone up, but this is a double-edged sword. More of the houses are now rental properties with multiple unrelated people living in them, so there are more cars, increased traffic, less investment in the community. A young family can't easily afford to buy and stay here if there is only one income per house. I used to know all our neighbors and now they come and go before I've even met them.
♦ Mixed	Really just concern that rising housing prices have led to more use of houses as rental properties instead of owner-occupied homes
♦ Mixed	Rental houses are not maintained consistent with owner occupied houses. Rental houses have many more automobiles than owner occupied houses and creat parking and snow removal problems.
♦ Mixed	Rental of single family homes, with more than 3 unrelated residents.
♦ Mixed	rental units enforcement of amount of people living together
♦ Mixed	Road conditions are bad
♦ Mixed	road maintenance has been ignored
♦ Mixed	Safety in streets or on bike paths
♦ Mixed	Some improvement in upkeep, but becoming less affordable.
♦ Mixed	Some residences and common areas not as well maintained
♦ Mixed	Street conditions have deteriorated, after collecting taxes to maintain them
♦ Mixed	Street repairs; rentals way up
♦ Mixed	Streets need work.
♦ Mixed	Table Mesa Center - losing small businesses Broadway traffic increasing
♦ Mixed	the constant 'improvements' and construction seems to be pushing the neighborhood into a very very expensive and elite place to live. I find that a pity.
♦ Mixed	The Foothills Parkway has become very busy, clogged and very noisy...dangerous in some cases. We now have a recreation center and a private sports facility which are super. And we have generally safe streets and a few bike paths, which are also good. Some buses do not run on weekends, which is a problem (209) in some cases. Most people maintain their homes and apartments, and the apartments generally seem to have good management. There is a pretty good mix of ages, but not of races or income levels...those may be impossible to achieve given Boulder's high prices/income, but it would be worth trying to improve on that. Some streets are in good shape..others not so.Burke Park serves a lot of elders and children, but the lake needs attention pronto.
♦ Mixed	The HOA re-sided and painted our condos. Most condos were ruined in the flood and have been remodeled from their 1979 nastiness. The buildings are aging and we still have electric heat and metal-paned windows, driers that vent indoors, leaky ceilings and cracks in walls. It's the least efficient housing unit I've ever lived in. Meanwhile, prices go up. My rent went up by \$125 this year and my landlord refuses to do anything about leaky windows and walls.
♦ Mixed	The neighborhood was almost completely forgotten and ignored during the immediate aftermath of 2013 flood. project to improve crucial confluence of ditch and Fourmile Canyon Creek has been put off for years and continues to be delayed.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	the potential for massive construction and loss of open spaces. loss of rural feel of community.
♦ Mixed	The Table Mesa shopping center is an eyesore. It is dirty and run down, and the King Soopers needs a serious remodeling inside. The traffic going into and out of the Table Mesa area has gotten worse. It is unsafe.
♦ Mixed	There is a loss of economic diversity as Newlands becomes more and more affluent. Allowing some mixed use development (beyond the zoning of single family homes only) should be encouraged.
♦ Mixed	There is increasing traffic to the recreation fields near the East Boulder Rec Center and much of that traffic speeds along 55th. I intentionally avoid going near Manhattan Middle School in the morning and afternoons during the school year because traffic around the school is horrible when parents are dropping off or picking up their kids. Allowing families to choose which schools their children attend has greatly increased the volume of traffic in the neighborhoods. I grew up in Boulder and attended the schools that were near my home. I either walked or rode my bike to attend school. Why have we lost that concept in Boulder?
♦ Mixed	There is more housing available in Gunbarrel now, which is good, however housing prices are still very high and getting higher. In the case of Boulder View Apartments, the quality of the housing is poor due what seems to be cheap construction. There are many new places to eat & drink in Gunbarrel now, which is a huge improvement. No small part of the allure of Gunbarrel is the amount of breweries it is home to.
♦ Mixed	too many apartments being built
♦ Mixed	Too many condominiums have been built.
♦ Mixed	Too many giant single family houses now
♦ Mixed	Too many good houses have scraped away and very large houses have been built in their place. The neighborhood used to be affordable for first time home buyers of middle income. It is not now. Also, we've lost green space because the new houses fill entire lots and eliminated many trees and other vegetation. Also, too many homes have so many vehicles that are parked on the street that it is getting very congested and difficult to park (some homes have more vehicles parked on the street than have people living in the homes).
♦ Mixed	Traffic
♦ Mixed	Traffic is worse
♦ Mixed	Traffic on 19th/20th St.
♦ Mixed	Traffic on Broadway has been getting much worse with it only being one lane each way and more people living in North Boulder. I'm not sure how traffic on Broadway can flow once North Boulder is built up.
♦ Mixed	traffic worse
♦ Mixed	Trees along Arapahoe cut down and not replaced

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	Vista Village Mobile Home park has had a turbulent year with owner and resident relations. The city has been supportive of the residents and has also worked with the owner. The clear conclusion that I have reached based on this is that Mobile Homes require a \$20,000 - \$40,000 purchase investment initially. Then once the home is purchased the lot rent to house the home is about \$600 per month. If there were ways to work out a type of Mobile Home mortgage system that is good for the seller and the buyer this would be a very real way that there could be TRULY affordable living in Boulder. \$600 - \$650 per month lot rent plus a \$300 - \$350 per month mobile home mortgage plan. Where else in Boulder can you own (or rent) a small home for \$1000 per month? It seems like the decision to work out a payment plan would be for the seller of the mobile home, and in most cases the seller wants the money for the home up front. How could Mobile Home mortgage plans be set up to entice sellers to do this? Perhaps an certain percentage up front, and then a mortgage like payment plan after that could have reasonable interest rates that benefit the seller. I feel strongly that mobile home living is the only TRULY affordable living in Boulder.
♦ Mixed	We are unable to control speeding on our dead-end street. Because the street is straight, people ignore or don't see the 30mph signs at either end of the road and zoom down the street. Lots of dead bunnies result -- but thankfully no children or pets have been caught in the cross hairs yet.
♦ Mixed	WE were affected by the 2013 flood and neighbors have not repaired their home. it is an eyesore to the neighborhood.
♦ Mixed	We were hopeful that since Martin Acres is relatively affordable it would be the neighborhood where young couples like ourselves would be able to buy a lot of the run-down rentals to fix them up and make the neighborhood more of a community. Instead, I like the cost is just above what many young couples can afford so many investors swoop in and on our street more houses have turned from owner occupied to rentals since we have lived here. I also really wish that we had a concrete traffic barrier between our neighborhoods and 36 like so many other cities do. I think that would have a positive impact to a huge number of Boulder citizens.
♦ Mixed	When I first moved here in 2003, I had a great view of Sanitas - since then a new development went in that has blocked most if my view - now I look into their parking lot which is very noisy as sound just bounces around due to no trees or other vegetation. On the upside, as businesses have moved East along Pearl, my property value has increased, and my access to shopping has increased.
♦ Mixed	When we moved here in 1980, many of our neighbors were blue collar (plumbers, house cleaners, retired coal miners), who had vegetable gardens and orchards in their back yards. It used to be called 'Tuffy Town.' Now, there is no way incoming neighbors could afford to live here due to considerable gentrification of housing stock and housing inflation.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Mixed	While I'd say the neighborhood has improved over the years, the one area that's important to me is around walking/biking in the area with the rise in traffic, particularly the commute traffic along arapaho and through the adjacent roads (55th, cherryvale, 63rd, baseline). Of particular note is how 55th and arapaho is an area that is not walking/biking friendly. This is also a problem around foothills and baseline particularly when going to the meadows shopping area. These are our local 'village' amenities if we're just talking about walking/biking locally.
♦ Mixed	Wonderful remodels; but aging housing stock
♦ Stayed the same	Although a mix of commercial/residential buildings and on street parking issues, my neighborhood has remained pretty safe, with access to shopping, transportation, etc. This is the reason I want to stay in this neighborhood, and I hope the City will include affordable/senior housing in its plan for the purchase of the BCH property on Broadway.
♦ Stayed the same	Basically, had to say stayed the same altho' the roads & sewage system (I have a feeling the city approved an inadequate/not built to code system when the homes were built.) are worse. Also, seems to be more rentals, with a few in disrepair.
♦ Stayed the same	Bought the low-quality condo for reasons of transit access and price, to avoid buying a car. Management has no quality control on yard-watering waste, design has no ADA accomodations, and flooding resulted in no improvements. HOA 'management' is as much of a joke as one would expect.
♦ Stayed the same	concentration of homeless shelters has made walking around lee hill and broadway unpleasant
♦ Stayed the same	Construction has exacerbated ground water problems since we moved here.
♦ Stayed the same	Cooperative neighbors; LONG FAMILY VIBES
♦ Stayed the same	Except for the County Commissioners' refusal to honor their commitment to maintain the roads in our neighborhood, I am happy with our area.
♦ Stayed the same	Except new bike lane on Folsom which causes congestion
♦ Stayed the same	Growth had, so far, been forestalled.
♦ Stayed the same	Have only been here 2 years, so not seen much change. This neighborhood is amazing, it is hard to complain about anything, so I feel extremely fortunate. But my 2 'negatives' relate to: - the only walkable commercial area within 15 minutes is the University Hill area, and it needs some attention, especially if there are to be options for non-student residents. - traffic, parking and congestion on Baseline near Chautauqua is a problem. Sidewalks are minimal and people walk in the road, cross at all locations, clog the residential streets, and do not treat Baseline as the primary access road that it is.
♦ Stayed the same	Horses are leaving which is too bad.
♦ Stayed the same	Houses have been updated but it looks the same
♦ Stayed the same	Housing costs have risen dramatically...but overall, my neighborhood is fantastic. Very well-planned, with a diversity of housing types (rentals to duplexes to million-dollar-plus single family homes) that provides access to trails and open space but preserves the natural environment.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration? What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Stayed the same	Housing prices have gone stupidly high, so much so that the kids of people we like as neighbors can no longer afford this neighborhood. Current neighbors are great, and other amenities remain the same.
◆ Stayed the same	However, our road maintenance is horrible
◆ Stayed the same	I am fortunate that I can afford to live in my neighborhood
◆ Stayed the same	I am moving to Superior because I wanted a low maintenance patio style home. There are none in Boulder.
◆ Stayed the same	I don't know a lot of neighbors.
◆ Stayed the same	I grew up in South Boulder, so it has changed since I was a child. There have been many changes since I was a child, but since living here the past 5 years, it really hasn't changed much here, due to nothing really being built. I am very happy that Table Mesa got repaved, it was long overdue. I am glad to see that the shopping center around Kings Soopers has been revived. I would like to see some of that revamping in the shopping center where Bixby is/where I live. It could use some stores, maybe a little grocery store, or a brewery.
◆ Stayed the same	I have lived here for 15 years and like the fact the neighborhood looks the same - stable, clean, quiet, safe.
◆ Stayed the same	I have lived here less than 5 years.
◆ Stayed the same	I have only been here for three years. There hasn't been significant change.
◆ Stayed the same	I have only lived here for 9 months (since Jan 1, 2015), so things have stayed the same.
◆ Stayed the same	I haven't seen much change since I've lived in this neighborhood. At first I hated the changes to Folsom (making it one lane instead of two), but now that it has been changed back to two lanes on the busiest parts of the road (about Pine to Canyon), it is much better. I think it's important to have a wide bike path to increase bicyclist safety. I think a new development project has been approved for unused buildings on the other side of the multi-use path from my apartment building, and while I know some of my neighbors opposed that because of the construction noise, I heard that part of the project is a food truck space, which I think would be awesome! It would be great to have more food options so close to home.
◆ Stayed the same	I live by students and sometimes they are loud but it was like that for the past 5 years. Some are respectful and some aren't.
◆ Stayed the same	I live in a well designed, medium density 'Planned Unit Development'. A stable core of owner occupied small dwellings and apartments allows a diverse flow of renters to integrate and enjoy the amenities.
◆ Stayed the same	I love where I live and that I can walk anywhere from my house. However the cost is unsustainable. We pay \$1650/month for a crappy student-grade rental, even though both my wife and I have professional jobs. There is no community feel. The only neighbors that seem to interact with each other are wealthy homeowners. Renters seem to be second-class citizens in Boulder.
◆ Stayed the same	Increase in rental units is balanced by development of Valmont Park.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Stayed the same	it has not changed much, I suppose, except for the choices in restaurant and bars in the table mesa area. Nice improvements there, except for losing Savers. Lucky's maret will be nice in its place, I suppose.
◆ Stayed the same	It's a mobile home community, so diversity of housing isn't great, it's crowded
◆ Stayed the same	It's a wonderful location, housing (including affordable rentals) on my block generally well maintained
◆ Stayed the same	I've been living here for 20+ years. It's remained the same except for some improvements at Pineview Park (mixed reviews).
◆ Stayed the same	I've only been in South Boulder for two years, so I haven't seen significant change.
◆ Stayed the same	Land is fully developed with little room for change. Landmark Board unduly inhibits change. Turnover of properties is very slow.
◆ Stayed the same	Lots of long-term residents is a plus for a congenial neighborhood
◆ Stayed the same	Martin Acres is one of the most affordable areas of town. There is a good mix of owner occupied and rental units. But the area is so large that it's hard to really call it a neighborhood. I relate to Broadway, others in Martin Acres relate to Moorhead or Table Mesa Drive. Others are focused on the schools.
◆ Stayed the same	More mountain bike trails nearby
◆ Stayed the same	Mostly been good, but the Hogan/Pancost development threat is a nightmare every few years.
◆ Stayed the same	My small neighborhood really can't change.
◆ Stayed the same	New houses being built, but that doesn't bother me
◆ Stayed the same	No major changes in the neighborhood. Perhaps a little more construction now.
◆ Stayed the same	No one seems to have yet discovered all the advantages to my neighborhood and I like that. It's still among the least desirable in town.
◆ Stayed the same	No significant changes.
◆ Stayed the same	noise from Foothills Pkwy has increased a new high-density development area proposed near us was cancelled
◆ Stayed the same	Not all residences well maintained
◆ Stayed the same	Not much change other than regular rent increases
◆ Stayed the same	Not too much turnover. Not too many student rentals. Sorry to see the older owners dying or moving into retirement homes, but now there are more young families with children: when we moved here in 1983 few children came trick-or-treating on Hallowe'en. Now they arrive in droves and we love them! But the ever-rising housing prices are making it harder for them financially.
◆ Stayed the same	Nothing has changed. Poor alley maintenance.
◆ Stayed the same	Only lived her 1.5 years
◆ Stayed the same	Our neighborhood has been fairly stable.
◆ Stayed the same	Our neighborhood has limited public and park space (aside from OSMP) and the local retail (Basemar, Broadway near NOAA) is in need if revitalization.
◆ Stayed the same	Our neighborhood is all residential with no new mixed use or commercial zoning.
◆ Stayed the same	People are upgrading their homes, but basically it is all 'interior' - not many 'pop-ups'.
◆ Stayed the same	Rentals stay messy, but I'm glad there's no HOA

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Stayed the same	Road maintenance is poor
◆ Stayed the same	Roads, pathways, parks, building around me
◆ Stayed the same	Safety, cleanliness, appearance
◆ Stayed the same	Safety, street traffic limited, well maintained properties
◆ Stayed the same	San Juan Del Centro received much-needed remodeling which is a plus for the neighborhood, however the development of the Sutherland's property has been generally low quality and disappointing. Allowing a daycare center with up to 80 children and less than 20 parking slots, accessed through a residential driveway is an example of irresponsible planning. Considering the level of traffic emanating from San Juan and the UCAR daycare center a traffic light should have been added at 34th Street and Valmont long ago. I understand the SPARC development will solve many of these problems and I am a supporter of the latest incarnation of that plan (even though I was opposed to the original plan that called for maximum height buildings and an unnecessary hotel). SPARC will, however, add significantly to congestion and noise in an already congested and noisy neighborhood. I'm hoping city planners and developers will work diligently to mitigate such impacts in areas that are expected to receive major redevelopment in the future.
◆ Stayed the same	Shopping is limited in South Boulder. Parks and open space access is great. Rec Center is close.
◆ Stayed the same	Some owner occupied homes have turned and been improved. But many have become investor owned rentals which kills the neighborhood character. More density should be allowed in the core of the student part of the Hill - Bway to 9th, College to University. This would increase inventory of student housing in the Hill area while relieving pressure on the mixed and owner occupied portions of the greater Hill area.
◆ Stayed the same	Stayed residential. Parks improved.
◆ Stayed the same	Staying the same is a good thing, it's pretty awesome. Hard to improve from there!
◆ Stayed the same	student impact - loud noise, pot smoke
◆ Stayed the same	Table Mesa fosters close-knit communities and maintains safe and equitable access to natural areas, parks, and community centers. I feel so lucky to live here, and I would hate to see changes.
◆ Stayed the same	The area is beautiful...but people drive SO fast on Lee Hill. I've never seen speed reduction measures taken.
◆ Stayed the same	The neighborhood was already built when we moved in and has stayed the same.
◆ Stayed the same	There are a lot of single family homes that end up being rented to groups of young people who do not take responsibility for the care or maintenance of the property or its external appearance, especially landscaping.
◆ Stayed the same	There has not been much change in my neighborhood since moving here 1.5 years ago.
◆ Stayed the same	There have been no significant changes and no zoning changes
◆ Stayed the same	There have been problems in the area at night with the people that hang around Lolita's very late. Wish it could close at 11:00 and open at 6:00.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
◆ Stayed the same	There seems to be no closure ever on Hogan-Pancoast. All the neighborhoods in this part of the city have been fighting this development (whatever it is at the moment) for over 25 years. Enough!
◆ Stayed the same	Thinking overall the neighborhood has stayed the same.
◆ Stayed the same	This has been a great place to live and continues to be. My only concern is the eventuality of being pushed out due to development in the neighborhood and the influx of exceptionally well off individuals driving rents and the purchase price of homes out of reach.
◆ Stayed the same	Too many transients and that has been increasing. Would like enforcement of smoking bans as well as other rules (especially on Pearl street mall).
◆ Stayed the same	Traffic after the fires has gotten worse. Traffic is the biggest issue.
◆ Stayed the same	Traffic noise from Broadway/highway93 (jake-breaking trucks and loud/fast motorcycles). Increased speeding on same road. Lack of plowing after snow events. but Many have improved their home/landscaping during this time.
◆ Stayed the same	Until recently, there was little changes in the neighbourhood. With the extreme development in Gunbarrel center and the lack of infrastructure, unexpected changes may come.
◆ Stayed the same	Very little interaction with neighbors. They seem to turn over very quickly, so we have gotten to know very few.
◆ Stayed the same	Very little is happening in this part of Boulder...just a place to live. Flatirons improvements helped and Meadows Shopping area improved.
◆ Stayed the same	We have been here 3 years and have been very happy with the area and surrounding communities.
◆ Stayed the same	We have not lived here long, and there hasn't been much change in the area
◆ Stayed the same	We have only lived here a year. We moved from Maryland in June of 2014.
◆ Stayed the same	We have only lived in our neighborhood a year.
◆ Stayed the same	We have too mansions that were built by the open space and affordable housing rentals built by the industrial area, which is unfair. There needs to be a transition zone for both. Also, the affordable housing rentals tend to degrade the neighborhood, because they don't stay long and don't care for the properties. It would be great to see an initially affordable program for school teachers, and police officers, etc... in which they could buy at initially affordable prices and sell at market. That way they can have a long term investment and also we have public servants living in the community in which they serve.
◆ Stayed the same	We live in the county between Boulder city and Louisville.. So our neighborhood doesn't change - housing and traffic are the same as it was many years ago..
◆ Stayed the same	well-maintained little change in neighborhood
◆ Stayed the same	We've gotten to know our neighbors better, and rental residents have been neighborly -- we feel fortunate to live here.
◆ Stayed the same	What I see around me

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ Stayed the same	While amenities and character have stayed the same, housing values have shot through the roof. Good if you plan to sell, but not good for our children. There is no way that most of the middle class families who bought up here when it was more affordable can have their children who are now grown ever hope to buy a house or townhome in this area or in Boulder.
♦ Stayed the same	While I believe Boulder generally seems more crowded, the neighborhood west of 9th up near Chatauqua has stayed generally the same.
♦ Stayed the same	Years ago when we moved into this neighborhood, we looked over many parts of the city, and decided on our present location based on schools, security, safe area to raise children, stable neighborhood, etc., and do not want to see it radically changed in order to jam more people into it.
♦ Stayed the same	zero amounts of actual 'mixed' USES were afforded our area, because of horrific mistakes in your 'comprehensive' plan... including ... surprise more homeless and 'affordable' 'housing' to increase traffic, if you build it, they will come, Boulder could have become home to the state prison, if you build it they would have come, instead it become the place for the University... if you build it, they will come... which has done more than any 'plan' you can do to make a pleasant place to live... yet now if you want to 'build' a business or University it would be impossible because of the roadblocks... instead you build ever increasing 'homeless' shelters... if you build a 20,000 bed homeless shelter, they will come, and then have to be turned away because it if filled. yet that is exactly what you are doing... providing such a nice 'homeless' shelter city that people from Hawaii come just for your services... a person from Wyoming came, and pepper sprayed a woman tried to car jack her and rape her, why was he here? because you built it, and they did come.... you've reached the critical limit.. now you have to decide if you want to be like any other city in the world that has gotten too large... and try to bandaid it with 'right sizing' streets.
♦	I've live here almost 30 years and it's not the same
♦ DK / no opinion	Again, new to the neighborhood. I love to be outside and I hate to drive.
♦ DK / no opinion	Comfort in my home. Accessibility. Aesthetics.
♦ DK / no opinion	Have lived here only 1.5 years.
♦ DK / no opinion	I have lived here only for 2 years. Prior I lived in Martin Acres.
♦ DK / no opinion	I have only lived in Boulder for 3 years.
♦ DK / no opinion	I only moved to this neighborhood from South Boulder a couple months ago; it's nice to see a mix of slightly older college students and families cohabitating. Also, the house I live in is zoned for 4 unrelated parties and my brother lives with me, which makes our rent affordable.
♦ DK / no opinion	I'm not sure about improvement/gotten worse because I haven't lived here very long.
♦ DK / no opinion	I've only been here for a year. I lived near campus for many years before this.
♦ DK / no opinion	I've only lived here 1 year.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.20: Over the past five to ten years (or since you have lived there), has your neighborhood (or the area where you live) improved, gotten worse, or stated the same as a place to live, taking all things into consideration?

What factors influence your response?

Answer	Comment
♦ DK / no opinion	I've only lived in my neighborhood (MA) a few years so I don't know what may have changed. I hear there is petty crime near Broadway and that CU students drive into the area to park and then walk or bus the rest of the way. This may or may not be new.
♦ DK / no opinion	Just moved here
♦ DK / no opinion	just moved in about one year ago
♦ DK / no opinion	New to Boulder. Have been in North Boulder for 6 months.
♦ DK / no opinion	Only lived here 18 months
♦ DK / no opinion	Only lived here six months
♦ DK / no opinion	The main reason I do not love the place that I live now is the hispanic community party that is ALWAYS going on - day or night. It is directly across the 'ally' from my apartment. It is loud and obnoxious.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.21: The city is revitalizing its neighborhood outreach and programs with the new role of a neighborhood liaison. What neighborhood programs, improvements, or outreach services would you like to see emphasized by the city? (OTHER)

- ◆ 'land use planning at local level' to me means early collaborative participation with the city and developer, not leaving it entirely up to neighborhoods
- ◆ Access to mountain bike trails
- ◆ allowing dog owners to use the school yard after hours
- ◆ Art!
- ◆ better telecommunications infrastructure
- ◆ Bring back traffic mitigation program
- ◆ BUILD A SOUND BARRIER WALL BETWEEN 36 & MARTIN ACRES!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- ◆ City promote putting electric utilities underground and fibre optic network
- ◆ City should not be spending my money on throwing a block party
- ◆ Clean up trash, litter, weeds in Uni Hill
- ◆ Control overdevelopment, zoning achanges and therefore overpopulation, noise and light pollution
- ◆ Crime watch
- ◆ eco pass program is wonderful
- ◆ EcoPasses for neighborhoods?
- ◆ Elect council by district
- ◆ Enforcement of occupancy limit and cracking down on unlicensed rentals.
- ◆ expand ecopass availability
- ◆ Fix our roads and reduce the sign pollution on the roads!
- ◆ fix the potholes.
- ◆ Flood control berm
- ◆ Flood mitigation
- ◆ for the city to stop being so please about replacing a safeway with yet more housing units... increasing all of the problems you pretend to want prevent.
- ◆ Free RTD EcoPass for everyone
- ◆ High speed internet
- ◆ I appreciate that Boulder involves residents in city-wide and regional planning. I am not sure neighborhood-level officials would help us think broadly and equitably about challenges. I would support any additional programming for disaster preparedness, however.
- ◆ I don't know how but something needs to change with our homeless population.
- ◆ I use a car to get around and traffic has gotten worse in Boulder over the last 8 years.
- ◆ I'm not convinced that dividing the city into neighborhoods is useful, but if you have to do it, the two I checked might be OK.
- ◆ identifying where to build more parks or community gathering places in neighborhood
- ◆ If the city had a more representative type of gov't this position would not be needed. How about having a council person elected from each area!
- ◆ improve parks nearby
- ◆ In case of severe flood, there is no exit. Climbing to the roof is more difficult the older we get.
- ◆ Incentives and workshops for healthy (organic, nontoxic), xeric and native gardens and lawns, similar to the National Yard Care program in King County, WA. Can build on existing grassroots Bee Friendly Neighborhoods.
- ◆ Interaction with Uniprop to maintain reasonable lot rent & utility charges
- ◆ Just enforce ordinances!
- ◆ just provide normal city services

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.21: The city is revitalizing its neighborhood outreach and programs with the new role of a neighborhood liaison. What neighborhood programs, improvements, or outreach services would you like to see emphasized by the city? (OTHER)

- ◆ Listen to the residents instead of trying to "educate" them. Many have lived here longer than the "experts" advising the city.
- ◆ Maintain existing and add improved projects for flood mitigation.
- ◆ Mandatory contact/address for people who own property next to these out of town rental property owners. If I cannot contact them, how can I resolve problems?
- ◆ more progressive housing, strong environmentalism
- ◆ More speeding enforcement
- ◆ Move away from toxic building materials to 'green' ones, for instance, in the water pipe infrastructure.
- ◆ Neighborhood cultural activity and art support
- ◆ outside of city
- ◆ Please use Common Sense and not be swayed by just a small group of very vocal people.
- ◆ Plow the streets and fix the potholes.
- ◆ Relationship with city staff with neighbors. We get all our info from HOA which isn't representative of city.

- ◆ Remove all of the outreach and liaison personnel
- ◆ Resource sharing, i.e., skills and tools
- ◆ Return taxes to neighborhoods by way of renewed infrastructure
- ◆ Review permit system, see what is necessary to preserve safety and health and overall experience and what is not
- ◆ road maintenance
- ◆ road maintenance
- ◆ road maintenance
- ◆ Safer pedestrian access with better traffic management
- ◆ should be two way communication, not someone who tells us what the city has already decided
- ◆ street maintenance
- ◆ Support neighborhoods' right to vote regarding proposed changes from the city
- ◆ take over park as affordable housing
- ◆ the rental bikes downtown are very nice and I have used them--I would like to see small car (prius or leaf type) in neighborhoods for rental via credit card--hoarding could be prevented by charging for both time and travel. this would also help with parking needs as fewer cars would be parked in the city.
- ◆ These programs are inappropriate in unincorporated Boulder County
- ◆ This is a total waste of money. If the city government was working correctly this position would not be needed!
- ◆ We are not in the City but appreciate outreach anyway
- ◆ We need good urban planning: big picture, long term urban planning.
- ◆ Wonderland Creek Drainage Improvement underpass under 28th St. Get it done, stop delaying/diverting funds to other less important things!

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ 'Boulder is a beautiful and wonderful community, and to get to this point has benefited from meaningful planning. I believe some of the critical issues facing Boulder going forward really should be vetted to a greater degree than what I have observed. There should not be a rush. All voices should be heard. Referendums should be used.
- ◆ (not sure how far BV extends up into the foothills, but...) There does seem to me a disconnect in some of the BV people's attitudes: We all want to be good environmental stewards, and yet lots of us live up in the mountains and hence require infrastructure to be brought and maintained up there, not to mention all the daily car trips up and down. Do we have any community conversation going on the wisdom and impact of living up there?
- ◆ 1. STOP WASTING MONEY on trying to take over Xcel. You will never meet your financial predictions. You already have Xcel changing their ways. And, you will never be able to provide the service Xcel can provide. The money should have been spent on solar panels. And, who in their right mind wants of be involved in a lawsuit. The City and Xcel are so far apart on value.
- ◆ A focus on increasing inclusivity and welcomeness for people of color. We lost so much having such a dominance of white culture. Although there are people of color living in Boulder Valley, they are marginalized and experience significant harassment and discrimination.
- ◆ A number of the questions were about the neighborhood and what things we'd like to see in those. I think this is a good approach. In the past (thinking 20 years ago), Boulder and surroundings were pretty empty, so the 'town center' was downtown Boulder, and you chose how far to be from that. Today, we now have a much denser front range and surrounding municipalities, inflows of commuters to jobs, and more density in the valley. I think a move toward looking at centers for groups of neighborhoods is really needed to help provide for local use and alternatives as a solution to help minimize local traffic issues. One area that didn't get any questions in the survey is what could be done to help mitigate the issues of in-commuting. We see this around us with the morning and evening traffic issues on arapaho, 55th, cherryvale, and baseline, but other parts of the city see similar I'm sure. It would seem getting more transportation alternatives would help, for example, park'n'rides on the edge of the city for in commuters (e.g. at 75th/arapaho with a regular shuttle in). I've seen this approach in some european cities where large park'n'rides are set up on the edge tied with regular buses to get people into the city. This approach may work OK on the east side of Boulder where there's more people living in the rural areas and nearby towns, but they're too distributed to really have an impact of having park'n'rides further out for boulder specifically.
- ◆ Affordability and regulation as Boulder Valley issues are juxtaposed (so if we want better affordability then we may need to loosen or restrict further regulation). I'd also argue that higher taxes to create affordable housing is a self-defeating method of improving affordability since the taxes make the Valley less affordable. So we should be mindful of further regulation for climate action, for example, since that is likely to reduce Boulder Valley affordability.
- ◆ Affordable housing
- ◆ Affordable housing is probably the greatest need in Boulder. Creative people can't afford to live here anymore and the only people that can are out of town trust funders and start up people with tons of cash.
- ◆ Again, thank you for all the work you do on the comp plan! I know everyone has the best for Boulder at heart, whatever that means to them :)
- ◆ ALL new development needs to pay the total cost for any needed new services to be provided by the city which are the result of this new development. NO exceptions
- ◆ Already identified in the values, but strong collaboration with neighboring communities and the County will be required to ensure success.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ As the floods of 2013 showed us, Boulder Valley must confront problems as a region. As with natural disasters, no single city can solve the regional problems of housing affordability or transportation. The Comprehensive Plan is a vital tool to honor the unique environment and amazing people who call this our home. Please use wisdom and patience in crafting it.
- ♦ Automobile traffic is an increasing problem and is my number one complaint about Boulder. Traffic signal timing seems intentionally bad. No realistic plan exists to address traffic problems, alternative transportation can't fix everything. In fact, buses make the Broadway commute much worse during rush hour. Traffic from Pearl through campus can be backed up for many many blocks during rush hour. There need to be pullouts for ALL bus stops. Make pedestrians wait for lights just like cars do. Convert all flashing light pedestrian crossings to timed stop lights. If you want more bike commuters, make more OFF street bike paths and trails. Discontinue the terrible right-sizing plans.
- ♦ Be careful with what rules you make AND once the rules are in place, follow them, NO exceptions (or very few)!
- ♦ Be clear and specific about development requirements so that developers are not faced with uncertainty and economic risk.
- ♦ Boulder City Council needs to disseminate more information to residents regarding decisions that impact our daily lives BEFORE they happen.
- ♦ Boulder has an image of the diverse, nonsmoking, biking, environmentally friendly health conscious person. This has slowly changed with the influx of new residents. Therefore, most likely the values are changing faster than the comprehensive plan can keep up. For instance this survey is written to cause the reader to accept overdevelopment and sprawl. While going thru choices with/on development. In the same way i was trained to give developmentally disabled a choice in a group home. Do you want to go up the right side of the steps or the left? Regardless you are going up the steps like it or not.
- ♦ Boulder has great hiking trails, but no good way to bike on rails from south to north - need to open some mountain trails to bikes
- ♦ Boulder has to be honest with itself and its citizens. It's a bounded, beautiful area, making it highly desirable, and thus very, very expensive. This makes it insufferably exclusive without any oversight. Some action items can monitor this exclusivity, but its fundamental character is fortunately or unfortunately unique and privileged. The BVCP seeks to maintain Boulder's unique heritage while overseeing the changing interests of its community.
- ♦ Boulder is a magical and unique place because of its natural beauty and the free-spirited attitude of many of its residents. Above all else, we must encourage policies that preserve these traits. If economic growth must be sacrificed to 'keep Boulder weird', then so be it. The entrepreneurial spirit of its citizens will keep the city afloat, as long as it is nurtured. Kill either the beauty or the freedom, and the entrepreneurial spirit will die.
- ♦ Boulder is a wonderful place to be, it just needs to be more inclusive of Colorado's changing demographics. Gone are the days where Boulder can be considered a small, compact community, but the values and culture of Boulder can survive and carry the city into the 21st century as a bigger, stronger and more inclusive community that can serve as a model for the rest of the nation.
- ♦ Boulder is a wonderful place to live. We are going through growing pains and a maturation. This calls for improved, frequent and effective communication of how we are responding to the challenges this brings.
- ♦ Boulder is an amazing city, but it did not become one of the most desirable places to live because of urban development. High rises and expensive condos are not part of this city's true heart and character. Instead, they are a careless, money making scheme that only benefits developers and needs to be stopped.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Build attractive 2 BR homes
- ◆ Buses already coming out of the RTD station by the new Hyatt Place are not stopping, just turning into traffic on Junction Place. Have benches at all bus stops in town, make sure RTD apps work (they don't), and that buses run on schedule (they don't!)
- ◆ Change this trajectory to an 'employment center' to a 'real community' with a diversity of wealth, race and culture. Never say never, but every year we put off a decision on this the harder it will be to change course, and some day it will certainly be too late.
- ◆ City council members should represent neighborhoods, not be elected at large. This would give residents a much more effective voice in planning for development. Current council sets unrealistic goals and is out of touch with the city's permanent residents and taxpayers.
- ◆ City should continue to find creative ways to convert existing mobile home parks into affordable housing. City should consider traffic flow improvement with consideration of the future use of electric and hybrid vehicles. Small, light weight, electric vehicles can coexist with bicycle traffic on non main corridors. Main corridors should be improved to handle large vehicles and high traffic volume.
- ◆ City should stay out of rural character of unincorporated county. No power utility, no high density housing. Gunbarrel Center is a disaster, stop sending city crap out to us.
- ◆ Citywide high speed Internet. Couple high occupancy buildings owned by city for gov employees low wage/low rent. Requirement for food industry recycling.
- ◆ Complete all the flood mitigation required for the neighborhood including Bear Creek, flooding of Baseline and Thunderbird Drive. Bring pressure on the State of Colorado and CU to responsibly participate and fund flood mitigation on CU/State property. Develop a realistic forest fire plan for the City of Boulder. Boulder Fire Department resources are completely inadequate for a fire moving from the foothills towards the City.

- ◆ Concerns about the extreme activity occurring in Boulder, and hope the city will manage to keep its character, open space surroundings, and avoid building of commercial suburbs. New buildings should somehow match the environment and have nice outside designs (for instance, not so dark apartments as in Gunbarrel, or an ugly new building without windows) on Pearl St. east of Foothill Pkwy which masks the mountain views, a huge new University building with high chimneys close to Foothill Pkwy). Additional concerns about what the increased morning and late afternoon traffic will eventually bring.
- ◆ Continued increase of E Management, and I've seen less bike lights at night as we promote the new lanes for bikes. Thursday cruiser rides have turned to be a drug fest. Encourage sober events.
- ◆ County building dept needs an overhaul, communication between members in that office is poor, outdated forms provided to residents during remodeling and lack of desire to allow projects to move forward is counter to the progress of redevelopment. Limitations to floor space vs. homes in the area is a govt oversight that needs to stop
- ◆ County-wide Eco Pass would help traffic congestion/safety as well as environmental stewardship. Improve communication with residents BEFORE city staff develops new plans. Require more transparency from staff to avoid ideological propaganda. Collect better data, and use it.
- ◆ Day use for the homeless community
- ◆ Design of buildings esp. mixed use and commercial is poor/badly chosen. The desire to force the public to mass transit or bicycles is unrealistic.
- ◆ Do not allow the City of Boulder to dictate their controversial decisions on Boulder County. Boulder County was lovely at one time. Now Lookout Road and the shopping area is so unsightly. I choose to go to Longmont to shop rather than this area.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Do not give neighborhoods any more power to influence development. They are not stakeholders (with a financial interest) and should have very limited input on new development.
- ◆ Do not like turning public parks into transient and homeless feeding areas. The shuffle board area near the creek and Alfafas has been turned into a homeless/transient camping area. We have walked by human feces on the creek path between the library and Eben fine park.
- ◆ Don't assume that everybody wants what you want. Don't try to push your plans on us.
- ◆ don't cram any more homeless shelters (we now have two giant ones, thanks) or homeless services into far nw boulder. thru zoning shenanigans you have managed to nearly ruin the potential for this area to thrive as family friendly and as a pedestrian-friendly zone. the homeless concentration you have forced on far nw boulder has probably created an environment that has destroyed the future likelihood of vibrant businesses.
- ◆ Don't envision changes in isolation and spring changes on citizens
- ◆ Drop this façade. This is socialism at its worst!
- ◆ eliminate retro-fitted traffic circles and right-sizing for bike/car separation. They are more of a safety hazard than a benefit.
- ◆ Emphasis should be placed on open space preservation. Better cooperation between city and county. Traffic congestion needs to be improved. (Citizens from other communities tell us how bad the traffic is in Boulder)
- ◆ Enforce speed limit on northbound highway 93/Broadway as traffic enters the southern city limits.
- ◆ Enforce the laws already on the books for aggressive panhandling, public intoxication, and camping in public spaces. The aggressive transients and homeless (home free) are approaching a boiling point.
- ◆ Enhance progress on building the berm for flood protection
- ◆ Fight the State. Community rights to control fracking and pollution.
- ◆ Fire the neighborhood liaison person, the city does not need growth - that's why we live here!
- ◆ Fix the damn roads before you waste ~\$300,000 screwing up Folsom Street, then having to unscrew it up!
- ◆ Fix the streets, provide safety and improve transportation and stay out of everything else. Stop trying to micromanage everything. You have no business running an energy company.
- ◆ Focus on basic local services. Avoid trying to be all things to all people. Let normal economic and housing growth occur without bureaucratic interference.
- ◆ For many years I thought PLAN-Boulder was a governmental plan, not a lobby group. Please ask them to change their name. 2) By not fully supporting rail transit, we are forcing commuters to use cars.
- ◆ FREE ECOPASS FOR ALL BOULDER CITIZENS. FREE PARK AND RIDE ACCESS INTO BOULDER FOR ALL BOULDER EMPLOYEES.
- ◆ Get input from people that were born and raised here for generations. "Money" people are destroying a beautiful town! Bikers and the University of Colorado students come and go - help the people that live here by choice! Lower water, flood, taxes - let us live and be happy! Find me a buyer - I'll move! GOD made it beautiful and YOU are killing it.
- ◆ Get more people involved in the planning process (NOT just homeowners!)
- ◆ Get rid of invasive weeds! Especially diffuse knapweed. Discourage lawns. Encourage front yard gardens and bee friendly landscaping.
- ◆ Get rid of the panhandlers! Every block of downtown Boulder has a beggar that harasses people for money. This is my #1 complaint about our city! It is embarrassing to bring guests downtown because of the bums! There are gov. services to support them - get them off our streets and rid the corners of these "professional beggars."

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Give the neighborhoods more weight in what goes on in their areas; stop with the height-restriction exceptions; don't believe everything developers tell you.
- ◆ Google in the middle of the city? What a dumb idea.
- ◆ Government efficiency, government benchmarking, use of contractors instead of employees - all good issues; as a citizen I believe city government is out of control from a size standpoint - Comp Plan could have something about this in it. Don't want a neighborhood liaison - would rather have taxes lowered than more city employees.
- ◆ Great survey. I watch council meetings on Ch. 8, and I SO appreciate the service you provide for this wonderful town. It can't be an easy job!
- ◆ Grow very slowly. Provide low income housing but basic - to encourage moving up ASAP and open the space for someone. Relax regs on occupancy in general, but especially for the elderly. The recession hit them hard and they are losing the ability to adjust to new places.
- ◆ Growth penalizes some neighborhoods more than others. Martin Acres in particular is increasingly impacted by noise from increased traffic on Baseline, Broadway and the turnpike. Why no noise abatement walls? Every developer anywhere in the city should be contributing to pay for walls there.
- ◆ Gunbarrel has been an absolutely fabulous place to live. I can see why so many people want to live here, but with all the recent development of crammed in apartments near Spine and Lookout Rds., huge breweries and lack of planning, it has become very noisy and crowded and difficult to travel on roads that have traffic at a standstill. Not the same neighborhood I moved to. Many of the businesses are not good neighbors. It is also very alarming that the land by Twin Lakes is going to be developed which will increase the traffic situation, horribly potholes that never get fixed permanently. It will also destroy hunting grounds for much of the wildlife which will cause more problems with wild animals encroaching on residents. It's their habitat and we're ruining it. This is also causing pest control companies to euthanize these poor creatures.
- ◆ Gunbarrel is not equipped to support dense housing. Our concerns are the lack of support and the rezoning to increase the population. Building high density housing on the Twin Lakes properties will cause further congestion, noise, and light pollution. In addition, the wildlife in the area would be chased out of their current feeding grounds. An additional concern is the water problems that could arise from the increased population of housing. People in this area have already experienced flooding in the past years and many of these people have to run sump pumps 24/7. If the city of Boulder wishes to build high density housing they should consider staying within the current city boundaries instead of rezoning county property.
- ◆ Gunbarrel needs to be treated with respect and not part of a City/County tug of war. We pay city sales tax and don't deserve the arrogance of the City attitude.
- ◆ Higher taxes for commercial building, non-local business, e.g., corporate chains like Chipotle and Google etc.
- ◆ Hogan-Pancost should be moved to Zone III.
- ◆ Homeless population has become a serious problem - more concern and money spent on the homeless than the tax paying citizens...the main library branch has become somewhat unusable to families with young children as there is more concern for the homeless semi living there than the citizens trying to use it.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ I absolutely love living in Boulder. Whenever all buses are running, I find transportation easy. On the weekends, transportation is hard. That is the one thing i would change. Schools are doing well, there are countless number of trails and opportunities (start ups) and places to eat and see. Maybe trying to get free tuition..... that would be a plus. I wouldn't want too many big buildings because Boulder is known for it's homey feeling, and big buildings wouldn't do that. we aint new york my friends. i love boulder
- ♦ I am a disabled aging woman. All I ask is for a quiet home. The city doesn't care about people. They recently approved a business that will have outdoor eating, music, alcohol and ball games 185 feet from my window. If I sell my condo it will not bring enough to buy another one. I don't know where I will go. Why are our city leaders so cold hearted? I'm sure there are more appropriate locations for businesses such as this.
- ♦ I am blessed to live here... Decisions do need to consider practical impacts as mentioned in the IRIS one lane issue that i defined in my answer. Traffic jams increase carbon footprints... There are lots of ways a bicyclist can get from A to B...less so with cars... Continuing to encourage MASS transportation options is the real answer.
- ♦ I am concerned about the overt involvement of the city in planning in general
- ♦ I am in favor of moderate growth and development of our community in discrete areas, like Downtown and Boulder Junction.
- ♦ I am not in favor of the city annexing any developed part of Boulder County
- ♦ I am pleased that you are doing this. I think the current climate in Boulder Valley is negative which may affect some responses - I know it affects mine. Disenfranchisement is not a popular value. I hope we can come together to preserve one of the most beautiful and community minded communities in our state and nation.
- ♦ I am really distressed at having huge lots of open space purchased by affordable housing in my neighborhood and being annexed by the city. the reason i live here is because it is not in Boulder City, it is more rural, has more open spaces. This construction will totally change the look and feel of the area and me and my neighbors are not happy about it.
- ♦ I am resistant to the Council even having a "plan" that assumes they know what I need to live a better life. Please do not try to force your agenda on the residents. A 51-49 vote to STUDY a municipalization project did not mean it was a MANDATE to make this expensive change. Look at the money that was wasted on "right-sizing" simply because the council thinks we need more bikers. Now, we are to trust them to provide electrical service. NO! We need to change to a more representative government and to actually listen to the voters.
- ♦ I am saddened by the direction development in the city has taken the last few years, as detailed in my previous comments. I am considering moving to Louisville or Lafayette or somewhere else to have that smaller-city feel I used to love in Boulder. The loss of unique mom and pop shops in downtown Boulder and East Pearl, the extreme affluence and lack of diversity in economic status of the individuals, and the addition of the Google campus right in the heart of Central Boulder (why aren't they out in a commercial office park district?), given the knowledge of how Google has affected communities like Venice Beach in CA (where my artist brother has been displaced), make me feel a loss for the city I've loved for over 20 years.
- ♦ I am so not an expert but have loved the emphasis on open space and dog trails and bike trails. I like the downtown being walkable and 29th Street Mall. Arapahoe has been a nightmare for traffic especially for us leaving near. Keep up the good work.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ I am strongly opposed to the affordable housing program as it limits middle income and artificially modifies home prices. Not sure how to fix it, but it's poorly executed.
- ♦ I am very concerned about the situation on US 36 and the FasTracks project. Boulder County has spent \$150 million dollars in FasTracks taxes for nothing. The train that was promised will not be delivered for decades or ever. The Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system is not a BRT by any definition of the term. When is City of Boulder going to start demanding what we have paid for?
- ♦ I am VERY glad that there IS a Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan and thank you for this survey!
- ♦ I am very happy Boulder takes a long view on urban planning, and I am in support of that effort. I wonder how education on how community input to the planning and development boards works: ie. are the only ones who attend the community forums the people who are against given developments? I am pro mixed use and urban density, however, I have not attended any planning board meetings, so my voice is not heard. I feel bad about that. Is there a way for me to get my opinion to the planning boards without attending evening meetings?
- ♦ I appreciate all the effort the City Staff and the City Council put into planning and getting citizen input. I wish the whiners in the letters to the editor would TONE IT DOWN! We need more civilness in the dialogue!!
- ♦ I appreciate that you are asking for the input of residents. I love living in Boulder and it's important to me that the city is a place that supports and provides for all its residents, not just the most wealthy.
- ♦ I appreciate that you put the time into the survey. We are losing diverse populations everyday. Many people from African-American, Latino and Native American populations find Boulder to be a hostile place. Boulder is my home and it is horrifying the level of unwelcomeness that anyone feels. We are very good around GLBTQ issues, which is great, and it is also means we have potential to be great about diverse socioeconomic communities to feel a true part of the community.
- ♦ I appreciate the difficulty of crafting this plan. Please be thoughtfully informed by compassion.
- ♦ I appreciate the historic preservation regulations, but decisions should be speeded up. A summer season has passed while I've waited and still wait for permission to add an awning.
- ♦ I appreciate the opportunity to provide input
- ♦ I believe that the city management is out of touch with the housing availability, costs of rental units and sky rocketing real estate prices due to the constrictive nature of policies. Even recently the city was proposing restricting non-related roommates which is the only way that many people have been able to afford living here.
- ♦ I believe The City should not take over the electric utility. They have demonstrated the inability to economically manage their resources . For example, the City has a large open space program, but cannot control the noxious weeds. Another examples are newly planted trees in street median that are not watered for the first two years. Many die from lack of proper watering.
- ♦ I can picture the foothills of Boulder covered in the twinkling lights of tiny (perhaps *truly* tiny--as in the tiny house movement) homes...similar to the seaside towns of Italy...perhaps a vision for the future but since Gunbarrel resident don't seem happy about developments moving out there, perhaps to consider in the near future. Go team! :)

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ I do not believe that many things that are being done area really consistent with what most Boulderites want. The city should focus less on 'right sizing streets' and focus more on putting bike lanes in places like arapahoe, and improving the conditions of the streets so that people actually want to ride their bikes on them. Arapahoe is in terrible disrepair (sorry, no, not going to ride my bike on the sidewalk - unfair to pedestrians, and unsafe with cars that do not look when they pull out of shopping centers onto Arapahoe). 55th is a prime example. The city wanted to 'right size' 55th - yet 55th is one of the worst streets to ride on - the road is choppy and in bad shape, there is a major uneven railroad crossing that is dangerous to cross (because it is not flush with the street - I'm always afraid its going to kill my bike), and the street is constantly littered with garbage, debris, and rocks. I avoid 55th at all costs.
- ♦ I do not believe there is any realistic way of solving either the housing or affordable housing problem in Boulder without drastic changes to density which the community does not want (probably!). Thus it is imperative to dramatically increase public mass transit to bring workers in and out of the city and for much routine commuting within the city. Employers must help solve these problems.
- ♦ I do not feel positive about the planning administration of Boulder. Most of us are bracing for impact of the next change , wondering which one will tip the balance and cause another sale and moving away. I'm not sure what it would take to regain trust of the residents but that would seem to be a priority.
- ♦ I do really love Boulder, it is my hometown. I would just like to see more diversity and affordability. I like that we have access of open space and nice parks. Not every town has that.
- ♦ I don't know enough about the details of "the plan" to make an intelligent comment, good or bad. I just know that our bureaucratic leaders would do us a real favor if they would simply manage what we have and stop trying to control every little detail of our lives with new regulations and ordinances and instead see how they could reduce government and taxes. A little efficiency would help.
- ♦ I don't support the ballot initiative 300: Neighborhood's Right to Vote - I don't think this is a good idea as it can promote "Not in My Neighborhood" that doesn't reflect the greater good of Boulder City/County.
- ♦ I dont feel that the plan goes far enough in preservation of boulder as a city with and in nature. The city itself seems to be asking *where* do you want new development, where do you want the new parking lot etc. Admittedly things are a bit pricey in boulder but that cannot be fixed as long as we keep trying to attract google (as an example) to drop a huge office here. I want boulder to stay boulder, not try to develop our way into something else.
- ♦ I emphasis the need for affordable housing because the cost of living and housing goes up and wages stay stagnate. I'll quote my Mother who has lived in Boulder since 1965, 'I liked it more when it was just cowboys and hippies.' You can never go back, so I hope we move forward in a positive way and preserve and even bring back some of the magic that has made Boulder great.
- ♦ I encourage you to look at the Plan with fresh eyes and see what its intent truly is; this questionnaire frames the discussion to the current City Council. It reminds me of using the "right-sizing" term for the Folsom Street project. Traffic is a huge concern for me and I MUST drive (evil) to do my job.
- ♦ I feel that Boulder is becoming too crowded and congested with buildings and traffic, that is why moved to Gunbarrel which is more rural and peaceful. If there must be high-density development, I feel it should be in the heart of Boulder and not in the rural, residential areas such as Twin Lakes.
- ♦ i feel what is to be emphasized is the intention to improve livability not financial opportunities for the city or business or certain city leaders. that is what the rest of the country does and i believe we can do it differently.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ I grew up in Boulder. Now with my aging knees my hiking is very limited. Bicycling is my main activity and I prefer to mountain bike away from cars and commune with nature on trails. As a mountain biker, I feel like a second class citizen with many prejudice against mountain biking. Create more trails close to the city so I don't have to drive to mountain bike. As an older, disabled person it is not fair!
- ◆ I had to move to Boulder after the 2013 flood to help my mother. Because I could not find affordable housing, I had to move in with her, although she does not require 24/7 care.
- ◆ I have a love/hate relationship with Boulder. I love the natural beauty and the few quirky vestiges of old Boulder that still remain. I can't stand the attitude and arrogance that so many people here seem to have. I find that Boulder's traffic management is at odds with its environmental policies. And I have no expectation of staying when my lease is up because I can't afford to stay.
- ◆ I have lived in Boulder all my life (62 years!). Of course I have seen it change incredibly. I love living here but I do not like many of the changes in the last 5-7 years. Have we lost our sense of design? The new buildings are very disappointing. How can we reverse this? I am here to help.
- ◆ I have lived in several University Towns in the past, but never in one where the University is so intrusive. The town seriously needs to do something to limit the sprawl of CU. The amount of land they are buying up / building is worrisome, and the increased number of students is just making the overpopulation problems worse.
- ◆ I honestly believe that the rule limiting the number of unrelated people living together is unrealistic in today's economy for single people who are getting older and will need care. If seniors and caregivers could live together as an option to expensive all-inclusive elder care places, it would foster care, community, AND cottage industry.
- ◆ I hope it remains intact and not subject to the whims of individual neighborhoods.
- ◆ I hope the Plan takes growing climate concerns very seriously. I find current automobile congestion and rates of building development quite overwhelming and certainly contradictory to Boulder's reputation as an earth friendly community.
- ◆ I hope there can be a good dialogue soon about the values and goals: what do we want Boulder to be? Start with those statements but facilitate people coming together to talk about what the statements mean to them. I don't observe as much dissention as is characterized. Once people inside and outside local government are able to articulate and be excited about this vision we will be better able to work together to achieve it and make trade offs. The City Housing Task Force started right in with solutions which was unfortunate--we can't 'solve' something we don't agree on.
- ◆ I hope you make the right decisions and keep Boulder appealing. It used to be a city where one had a sense of community. I see it now as a city of wealthy people interested in their own well-being. I think this Plan is too little, too late. We can no longer afford to live here and after 40 years are sadly leaving. I grieve for the lost opportunity, but grateful for the time spent here.
- ◆ I hope you read this!
- ◆ I like the idea of this survey, but I'm not confident it will have much weight.
- ◆ I live near the BHP Palo Planning project and believe that this development will have a severely negative impact on our community. Despite strong neighborhood opposition, BHP states it will put 44 (!) permanently affordable rental units on a 3.25 acre parcel with only one street (Palo Pkwy) for ingress/exit. The resulting plan will overwhelm our already dense neighborhood. Why not put some of these projects west of Broadway?

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ I lived in Gold Hill for 30 years before moving to Wonderland Hills, there is far more community connections and events in Gold Hill than down in Boulder and I knew that I could always count on my neighbors to help with disasters up there.
- ♦ I love our community. However, plans should go forward when data is provided to support some changes. The Folsom bike lane is an example of a plan without data, poorly communicated to the community, pushed through by special interest, and even poorly implemented. As long as we stay away from that again, I think the BVCP could be great.
- ♦ I love the last questions - what a great outline for all of us to follow.
- ♦ I moved here to get away from the endemic violent crime and air pollution I endured as a child and adolescent living in a violent polluted urban area. I currently have Asthma and PTSD (and a few other things) and am permanently disabled, I do not drive and rely completely on public transportation and walking/biking. I have no interest in living in a city and I will do every thing in my power to prevent Boulder from becoming one.
- ♦ I must mention how much I miss the Boulder I knew 50 years ago. I found it absolutely perfect then, but of course it's unrealistic to think it could have stayed the same. I could afford an apartment of my own on Maxwell when making only \$1.65 an hour! My husband and I could afford a home with irrigation rights on Linden Ave with just one job. Oh well. But all things considered, without Boulder Comprehensive Plan things would definitely be so much worse.
- ♦ I really appreciate this opportunity.
- ♦ I really think that the county and city need to work together to expand the city into the area between North Boulder and Gunbarrel. Really well planned developments coupled with available open space and on a bus route (currently the 205 & Bolt). Some facilities for the homeless, addict, criminal population need to be placed in other towns. The people's clinic should be given a building somewhere in that corridor, and yes, I know that building isn't constructed yet, with easy access for people with low incomes and no cars. We need a better library in North Boulder and the staff need to be trained to pick up the phone and dial 911 when the bums OD or cause trouble rather than worry about how to word a letter banishing someone for two weeks. (You can ask the NOBO staff about that one). There is adequate land for a moderate local library just south of that ugly development on the North side of the creek across from the Violet on Broadway development. I shudder to think of what may be shoved up our backsides with the armory development. I think it should be a park. The park area central to the Holiday neighborhood is too small for the number of kids that use it, although since there isn't much movement, the kids are growing and the neighborhood will ultimately stagnate. Several years ago I spoke with the Holiday HOA people and they had tried to purchase the undeveloped lot owned by Habitat for Humanity across from EFAA but HH wouldn't sell. Too bad, more crammed in houses with no driveways, no garages, no yards, no basements. Sheesh
- ♦ I support allowing more than 3-4 unrelated people to live in community housing together. I support allowing people to have "tiny house" on their property similar to the laws in Portland, OR. I support an increase in the number of co-housing projects in the city.
- ♦ I support increasing building height modestly (one additional story, or two maybe) above 55' in certain areas in exchange for affordable housing and other community benefits. Smart growth, not random market growth. Commercial areas in boulder that are dated strip malls, (ie table mesa, basemar, mohawk) though privately owned could benefit by government policies and incentives (ie financial incentives) to redevelop to encourage mixed use and include affordable housing and other community benefits.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ I support the concept of busing paid for by taxes, either property or sales. It would help reduce the number of cars parking on the streets, reduce the need for parking lots and parking garages, and do a lot to make the city more livable. I would also encourage this planning team to put more emphasis on planning for environmental stress, like too much and too little water. It seems this variability is going to play a greater role in our world, and even locally in our lives.
- ♦ I think Boulder has done a wonderful job of keeping boulder beautiful and safe. I have lived here 30 years and have not ever wanted to move out.
- ♦ I think it is time to plan the city without the requirement to jointly plan with Boulder County. The county should have their own comp plan with all the other municipalities. OK to coordinate but planning with this requirement is a unnecessary burden. Look to other sustainable building codes instead of LEEDS. Look at the German model of "passive house."
- ♦ I think it's important to maintain the small town feel of Boulder, but I do not think we should push away new development. I also think traffic and congestion continues to get worse in Boulder. There are many parts of Boulder that could use some refreshing via development and the city and community should not be so opposed and negative to new development.
- ♦ I think policy makers are more interested in attracting and housing newcomers than preserving the quality of life of its current residents who've made Boulder what it is today. While laudable, the ideal of providing housing to everyone is imposible. Likewise as a job center, reducing traffic is extremely difficult. People are too busy for mass transit or riding their bike. There is poor mass transit from Erie, Frederick or Superior. I live in Gunbarrel and work in Louisville and it would take me 1.5 hr by bus and a 1 mile walk. There also needs to be a unified effort to support the plan not undermine it.
- ♦ I think the BVCP, in action for about four decades, has provided us with some valuable data about the complexity of creating a community in which we want to live. The things that are good with Boulder could be its downfall; but how we choose to handle Boulder's problems today could be what ultimately makes this city shine. The BVCP's best feature might just be its built-in capacity as an evolving, living document. Hopefully one day our 'Boulder Experiment' known as BVCP will be seen as a model that is both workable and adaptable to other communities struggling with the same human issues of capacity, growth, and quality of life. Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinions.
- ♦ I think the Folsom living lab is excellent. People drive way too fast on Folsom and I feel much safer with the new bike lanes now. I bike to work 3 days and drive only 2. I appreciate all the work to make it happen and really hope it stays and that more streets can have separated bike lanes. I don't find there to be any extra drive time at all. And I am on Folsom by car or bike every day.
- ♦ I think we should not be so reactionary to the current economic boom in Boulder. This type of increase in growth will level off in time. We spent several years in a deep recession and much of what is happening now is a response to the economic downturn. Growth will find an equilibrium if we just let it happen organically. Any interference will likely have unintended consequences that will negatively impact our community.
- ♦ I think you are doing a great job - but graffiti on streets and sidewalks look awful and are unnecessary - they say they are washed away over a short period of time but I still have huge large markings from 3 years ago - offensive. I would suggest asking Excel and city utility companies not to use markers on sidewalks that don't wash away. I have 6 feet of bright blue that has been there for 3 years.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ I think you can try as you might to create affordable housing but if you cannot work on some type of centralized or affordable DAYCARE then you will not get families with lower income levels (or middle class for that matter) to live in Boulder and you will NOT get people taking public transportation or biking. I live in Gunbarrel and work in Boulder (30th & Iris) about 5 miles from where I live. I cannot afford any daycares in Boulder (and we make over \$100K/year) or near where I live and end up driving to 17th and Main in Longmont to drop off my children. I would bike or take the bus to work but that is impossible. There is one daycare near my office (Tinyminders North Boulder) but I have been on the wait-list for over 2 years now. That is the only affordable place to take my kids in Boulder. I think Boulder and Gunbarrel should think about having centralized daycares in every neighborhood. I think parents would feel comfortable having their children close to home and where they could walk their children to daycare and then bike or bus to work. A plan like this would encourage more people to use alternative methods to get to work.

- ◆ I understand the need for businesses and housing. However, my parents and grandparents have been residents for over 90 years. As a lifelong resident myself, I tire of people moving here and saying "I love Boulder, now let's change it!"

- ◆ I want middle class families to be able to afford to live in the city both renting and owning. I don't want them, or minorities, or people with disabilities priced out. I want higher density and infilling. I want families to live here more than I want only the rich to live here. I want this community to have opportunity for everyone.

- ◆ I was active in the BVCP years ago, and that plan has generally served us well throughout the entire county. However, the focus has always been on Boulder, and I'd like to see that focus shift to a web model in which the interplay and interactions between all the communities as well as the rural unincorporated areas are fully considered. I lived in the rural county for about 20 years, and often the needs of those who live there were given lip service but no real attention. And the flap about the subdivision paving is just one of those types of issues...we are all in this together, and the sooner/better we think of all of us, the better off we'll all be. I'd also like to see the county abandon use of systemic pesticides...Boulder and the County ag. folks have declared that they'll not use the neonicotinoids, but we also need to get rid of glyphosate (Roundup) and the new glyphosate +2, 4D (ingredient in Agent Orange) that is coming our way. All of the systemics kill insects or plants, they are already found in our water and food chain...and they are dangerous and cumulative in humans. So, perhaps the plan could also say something to encourage the cessation of those pesticides throughout the county --this could go in the environmental protection section(s)

- ◆ I was very fortunate to grow up in Boulder and go to school here. I've seen a lot of development over the years, seemingly way more over the last 5-10 years, and I feel like it's out of control. My wife and I moved to Twin Lakes last year to raise a family away from the congestion, and the traffic and noise that came with it, and now we have a 9 month old son. We are extremely concerned about his safety, especially relating to a huge increase in traffic on Twin Lakes Rd if the parcel at 6655 is developed with a high-density housing unit. We feel like the rural residential quality of the Twin Lakes area should be protected and that 6655 Twin Lakes Rd and the two parcels of land across from it should be considered for use as open space or as a park. If there is any development, we strongly feel it should at least be done without increasing the density of the area but rather within the guidelines of the current zoning as rural residential.

- ◆ I wish I knew enough to offer more concrete suggestions, and I appreciate being asked for my feedback!

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ I would just like to reiterate that if something isn't done quickly, Boulder will be filled with two types of people: the filthy rich, and students. If you'd like to keep us middle class folks around, something must be done about housing affordability.
- ♦ I would like to see better and more geographical representation on the City Council, all City Committees and appointees.
- ♦ I would like to see better options for middle class retirees. Such as low maintenance, detached patio homes.

- ♦ I would like to see Boulder Plan for rebuilding trails and bike infrastructure after flooding events in a more timely manner. The White Rocks trail has not fully recovered from the 2013 flooding events and we have another bridge out on the trail. With Climate change we only have an increase in these types of events so being prepared financially to maintain the infrastructure is important.
- ♦ I would like to see easier ways to get EcoPasses to regular residents of Boulder. If you don't work for a company that provides it or are a student, it is virtually impossible to get. - And, I might add, we still use the bus quite a bit - albeit w/ cash instead of a card.
- ♦ I would like to see RTD service available to all residents of Boulder at a reasonable price. Currently reasonable price access to RTD service is only available to those neighborhoods that have Eco Passes. My neighborhood does not, so I do not take the bus except occasionally due to the price.
- ♦ I would like to see the city support housing first when it comes to the homeless. And look into where the funding for EFAA actually goes because it seems they have enough to house all of the homeless. Yet they don't seem to help anyone which is why a ton of organizations met to try and work without them.
- ♦ I would like to see the property owned by the Lemon's family (east of 55th and south of Baseline) purchased by the City and retained as open space. I would not like to see this land developed in any way. It is great to see large parcels of land in its native state so close to where I live. Thank you.
- ♦ I would like to stay involved.
- ♦ I would like very much to address the issue of police brutality toward homeless people. I witnessed with my children 2 times in the last 2 years how police officers harassed and beat homeless individuals even on Pearl St. That was appalling. My children and myself were shocked. Our community should somehow restrain police harassment and brutality.
- ♦ I would love to have the ability to get an Ecopass. Our neighborhood has a plan, but the rules are so absurd, that we usually can qualify on our block. I think the lack of adequate housing opportunities for the lower and middle classes is the biggest problem facing Boulder. It creates transportation problems, decreases the diversity of our population, and makes Boulder more elitist (in a negative way). Also, good regulations are not enforced, so people ignore them to the detriment of the community overall (for example, not enforcing trash regulations resulting in trash spread all over streets/alleys and attracting bears; and not enforcing bicycle regulations resulting unsafe sidewalks and negative bicycle and car interactions (and I am a cyclist).

- ♦ I would love to see more options for start-up businesses in regards to gatherings. Renting facilities for a start-up is challenging. CoWorking spaces help and gatherings is challenging. Would love to see a grant application to cover some of these expenses so new start-ups are connected more without the huge expense of the Chamber, CoWorking Spaces, restaurants and hotels meeting rooms.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ♦ I would love to see though given to something like car shares sprinkled around Boulder, maybe with each neighborhood having a few. I would gladly give up my car if I knew that I could generally count on the availability of a vehicle when I need to retrieve more than I can comfortably carry on a bike and/or when I'm injured/sick. More frequent runs on some of the bus routes would also be very helpful in cold or bad weather. In general though, I've fallen in love with Boulder, want to be here for the long haul, and am generally pleased with how things are at the moment!
- ♦ I would urge on BVCP the difficult dual goals of maintaining Boulder as a highly livable community while guiding inevitable growth in ways that preserve green places and avoid 'just another building' commercial spaces. Can there be an exemplary middle way between 'Aspenization' and losing our historical character to zealous growth?
- ♦ I'm a Boulder native, and I consider myself a green person and a 'Keep Boulder Weird' person, but I always want more affordability here in whatever way we can manage. It's hard seeing my coworkers making commutes daily into our supposedly green town. Also... These ballot measures this fall make me wonder if we've gone bananas. We need to exist in reality.
- ♦ I'm a cyclist and walker...and bus user. The increasing volume of cars decreases the quality of life and I feel less safe getting around. I encourage enforcement of speed limit laws etc. And I think raising fines, and the cost of parking is a good thing. Single-occupancy-cars is bad for all.
- ♦ I'm a renter wanting to buy. My number one issue is affordability. The city cannot build its way into affordable housing but needs much more new housing in areas like Lafayette and Louisville with very good traffic connectors to help the commute in. Also, added bus/rail. New housing in these areas will put pressure in Boulder housing prices, the connectors are critical.
- ♦ I'm big into sustainable living and while the city has made strides in that direction (dense housing, alternative transportation like right-sizing), little communication about the environmental benefits has been made. Sadly these sorts of goals mean at least some sacrifice in quality of life for many (not having the freedom of driving everywhere, for example), and this loss of quality of life has dominated the conversation with only a nebulous thought given to the benefits. It's not an easy task to ask people to change.
- ♦ I'm not sure where this fits into city planning and development, but where I live there are many cyclists and vehicles that must share roads. It's currently dangerous. The most direct bike route from Gunbarrel into Central Boulder is along Jay Rd. and involves an illegal train crossing. I urge you to give this challenge some thought. I used to bike everywhere when I lived in downtown Boulder. Now, I am more inclined to drive. If there was a multi-use path I could take to get around, including to Gunbarrel Town Center, I would bike more!
- ♦ If Gunbarrel is an example of Boulder City/County planning it is an epic FAIL!
- ♦ If the concept of a head tax is considered, it should be used to make affordable housing - since the increases of commercial demand are part and parcel to the increases in housing prices. The city and county should consider that affordable housing will not be an option unless a revenue source is identified. There should be a commitment to allow people to live where they work!
- ♦ If we (the leaders) keep saying we support additional housing, but then continue to allow the voices of a few to dissuade us from approving any development projects (even if it's just because "we" can't imagine living there), we will continue to exacerbate the problems of in-commuting, classism, and elitist group think. We have a community of elites and some very needed, but the middle class is basically gone. Planning for climate, housing, transportation all needs to be done regionally.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ In general Boulder is a great place but becoming too "California" with the expansion of homes into giant, lot eating mansions. How big does a single family home really need to be?
- ◆ In the fifteen years I've lived here, I feel the Boulder I was drawn to is being diluted and turned into a 'hipster' city. I preferred the small town feel with less congestion of people and cars.
- ◆ Increases in housing density through ADUs being easier to add to owner-occupied housing would benefit Boulder's housing crunch.
- ◆ It appears that local businesses are disappearing - these are important. Infrastructure needs are critical - in Gunbarrel. This seems to not be a priority, when we have uneven roads - potholes growing. Development in Gunbarrel is haphazard - building continues and services lack.
- ◆ It appears to have been created by too many busy-bodies that think they know what is best for the 'unenlightened masses'.
- ◆ It has internal contradictions.
- ◆ It is not rocket science: when you increase housing you increase traffic. Get real! Very few people are walking or using a bike 100%, 75 or 50% of the time no matter how nice the sidewalks/bike paths are. The core arteries of Boulder are almost in gridlock on any given day. There is no great law of the universe that says Boulder needs to provide housing for all of the people that want to live here. Boulder needs a reasonable mix of housing types. I've worked in a county social service agency for 25 years. If everyone on the wait list was magically provided a home on 1 day, you would have an equally long list in 2 weeks. This is a Metro problem. Your notion of "high quality design and materials" is laughable. The latest complex at Boulder Junction is nothing but a box. And what happened to setback regulations that provided room for ample landscaping to provide support for air quality. Recent buildings are right up to the sidewalk.
- ◆ It must be a difficult task to preserve Boulder's legacy while keeping it affordable and taking in all the feedback from a population with diverse and sometimes strong opinions. Thanks for working on this and I will do all that I can to create our legacy and future with the combined core values that we all have in mind.
-Phil
- ◆ It should provide specific goals, metrics and timelines for as many of the elements as possible. Although unrelated to the Comp Plan, I also want to comment that many of the questions in this survey appear biased toward a pro-growth agenda and thus are manipulative.
- ◆ It would be great if the city and county first concentrated on maintaining the infrastructure that they are responsible for. Examples are the railroad crossing at 55th street and the subdivision paving that we county residents pay for but whose funds are not used for the intended purposes. If they can't maintain what we currently have, how can I trust them to do things right in the future? As for new development, the 30th and pearl buildings are again an example of building design that doesn't follow the wording that is presented in the plan. The buildings are ugly and boring, the north side ones are poorly designed with exposed a/c or heating units on patios/balconies. Really, they couldn't hide these units better? If this is the design the city signs off on, I dread the new developments.
- ◆ It's an ambitious plan but hopefully not driven by City staff - the neighborhoods need to be involved at all levels
- ◆ Just in general, I feel there is no easy answers. I am constantly asking, 'where can I move to?' But I still love Boulder due to biking, hiking, dogs, still a little bit of creativity and eclectic feel, but quickly losing a lot of that. We bought last year, some was luck, some was sheer determination. Would I be able to buy again a full market rate condo/house here in future? I highly doubt it. Stuck in condo land forever.
- ◆ Keep Boulder Weird (and moving forward. Weirdly.)!
- ◆ Keep Boulder, 'Boulder'.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Keep listening to the people who live in Boulder. Consider having city staff live in Boulder so they are part of the community in which they make decisions or put forth planning. Consider the need for affordable housing through allowing tiny houses and the sharing economy.
- ◆ Keep talking with a wide cross-section of city dwellers, not just idealists, about priorities and balance. Keep the changing demographics of the city in mind, too. What I prioritized in my 20's and 30's are not necessarily the same things I prioritize now, for example, or that I will prioritize as I age.
- ◆ Keep the character of Boulder intact! We moved here 28 years ago for the quality of life, access to the outdoors, safe environment and opportunities afforded by the proximity to a major research university. Work to preserve these attributes!
- ◆ Keep the green space green and stop conventional soil-wasting monocultures; there are plenty of farmers who want to use a little help for transition to land-landscape scale agroecology instead of failing slowly the way the great majority of their neighbors already did.
- ◆ Keep the middle class in mind. We love living and working in Boulder and would like to stay here.
- ◆ keep xcel - the alternative is stupid
- ◆ Less is more. Because of City requirements, which the owner of this apartment complex must comply with, our rental rates are going up much faster in the past few years. Making it less and less affordable to stay in Boulder. Your policies add expense to those in the middle, and have driven out young families of average income, making Boulder LESS diverse. Also driving out our student renters, adding to the number of commuters.
- ◆ Let's remember the values set forth in the Plan and try to consider these for everyone in Boulder, not just those who own the most property or who have the most commercial interest. This is a highly educated community and our children's future here should be one of the goals of the Plan. Continuing the Bi-Lingual Program in our schools will be vital to helping our Latino population be prepared for higher educational opportunities and jobs. The future of our public schools should be included in the Plan, i.e. with projections of population increases and limited housing, will the current schools become overcrowded? What will be the negative impacts from such a situation?
- ◆ Light rail now!
- ◆ living in boulder county is a pleasure, superb quality of life. I am disturbed by 'peoples' need /desire for huge houses on postage size lots especially in the city of boulder. All the sf houses in these new developments where i worked (as a civil engineer, retired 10 years) were quickly sold however ...indicating demand.
- ◆ Maintain and obtain more open space. Stop new development and breaking ground in new areas. Growth should only come from renovating existing property.
- ◆ Make it more enforceable. Ex: Comp Plan says to distribute affordable housing throughout the city, but it's concentrated in NoBo. Make the development impact fee meaningful. Give neighborhoods a bigger voice in land use regulation. Need more condos, suitable for older people to downsize.
- ◆ make more effort to support walking in transportation planning make more effort to support development of beautiful and pleasing design elements to buildings. Most new development like Boulder Junction is monolithic and ugly providing an extreme lack of interest. Do not let those projects become the face of Boulder tomorrow.
- ◆ Make sure all voices and concerns are heard!
- ◆ More citizen input
- ◆ More emphasis on arts and culture, and NOT just design and tech innovation.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ More focus on access for drivers commuting in and out of the city as well as within the city. Realize that people need to drive and there is nothing to be gained in making that more difficult. Traffic congestion has increased in past years and needs to be addressed.
- ◆ More focus/money on roads! Money towards train crossing at 63rd.
- ◆ Most of what I value about life in Boulder (as a 25-year resident) DOES NOT involve its bizarre politics or require redesign and social engineering, which I increasingly see as an effort to CHANGE the city in ways I oppose, and FORCE people to live differently against their will. This is angering me more and more lately, and I'm going to look for ways to stop it.
- ◆ Move back to California
- ◆ My family and I moved here five years ago from upstate NY. We fell in love with the city because of its surrounding open space, bike paths (which I would like to see further grown throughout and around the city), hiking opportunities, magnificent views north, south, and west, and the open, spacious but lively village-like character of the city, especially, perhaps, resulting from the appeal of the Pearl St. Mall. The open, spacious character of the city itself was particularly compelling. However, the tall, urbanesque new building throughout parts of the city have cast a shadow over our enthusiasm about Boulder. The very character that brought us here and that means so much to so many people is under threat by this new outsized construction and focus on increased density. Job growth and population growth lead to such development and therefore must be carefully limited if the desirable character of Boulder is to be preserved, let alone enhanced. Some growth should and will continue, but it should be at a scale that is faithful to open, quasi-urban aesthetic already established. Finally, I would love to see Boulder's leaders place the highest priority on encouraging the placing of solar 'on every rooftop,' so that our city becomes known nationally and internationally as the one most powered by the sun.
- ◆ My husband feels that the city has egregiously ignored certain neighborhood concerns for a long time; to the point where he wants neighborhoods to elect their own City Council members.
- ◆ My responses were not well studied - sorry, it is a big project. This survey was a good overview of current landscape, but it is questionable that public has control or understanding of a lot of important issues and can review options. I do think it is better to Have a Plan that reflects lessons of recent past and can adapt to change. Thank you!
- ◆ Need to provide standard city services better.
- ◆ Neighborhoods as defined are far too large of geographic areas. Our street has ZERO identity with North Broadway - zero. Plan has living zones. Neighborhood needs more definition and clarity. City cannot expect to unit/unify ZONES which are so vast.
- ◆ next time send out the correct URL so I don't have to search so much to find the survey
- ◆ No
- ◆ No
- ◆ No
- ◆ No
- ◆ No concern in it for Boulder's senior citizens, many of whom who have made important contributions to the community, and who are being squeezed out by soaring property taxes, hurried traffic, and influxes of rude younger people.
- ◆ No more condos/apts/ high density housing! They are ruining the character of Boulder.
- ◆ No more right sizing. Traffic is unbearable all over the city.
- ◆ No representation by anyone one & the city desires to control without our voices being heard. City & County officials seem to be communists in their thinking and ways.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ No, thanks for asking
- ◆ No, thanks.
- ◆ No.
- ◆ No.
- ◆ No. Boulder is a fabulous place to live and thank you for asking our opinion.
- ◆ No. Thank you for the opportunity to participate.
- ◆ none
- ◆ Nope. Good luck!
- ◆ Not about the plan, but some of the side roads are in poor condition with regard to the paving.
- ◆ Not sure I am clear on the specifics or the ranking of the priority ranking of the Comprehensive Plan
- ◆ Not sure if this is the correct forum, however I feel that the liquor laws in Colorado are too strict and make it very inconvenient to purchase alcohol. Is this something that can be changed at least in Boulder? We should have the convenience of purchasing alcohol at our local king soopers, costco, and safeway stores, and not have to make a special trip to an overpriced liquor store.
- ◆ Over the last 50 years residents and leaders have fought to maintain Boulder as a unique and desirable place to live. The preservation of our open space, limits on building height and signage and the continuing development of world-class opportunities for recreation and alternative transportation all are key elements in Boulder's outstanding quality of life. We are now at a crossroads where these values are being threatened by the desire for short-term profit. The comprehensive plan is more important than ever to reinforce these values and chart a course for the future that will allow us to mitigate current and developing interests that seek to rob us of what makes Boulder a special place to live and work. It is my hope that as the plan continues to develop as a living document it's authors will continue to stay true to the plan's core values.
- ◆ Parks and recreational spaces are tops on my list. The Valmont bike/dog park is an outstanding example of success. I'd love to see a public or private tennis facility in Boulder with lighted and/or indoor courts. Most importantly - keep the undeveloped open space around Boulder. Keep the small roads and paths for cycling, don't let us be surrounded by only freeway access.
- ◆ People should be able to do with their properties what they want. They should be able to rely on and use the current regulations without "neighborhood stakeholder activists" keeping them from their rights.
- ◆ Perpetual growth is unsustainable. To maintain quality of life, or improve it, Boulder should focus on how existing older properties can be renovated under a zero growth plan.
- ◆ Planning should be conscious of expansion into designated flood plains - i.e. land should not be developed that would negatively impact existing neighborhoods without extensive study and a comprehensive and effective flood mitigation plan.
- ◆ Plant more trees and Gardens versus development. Keep Boulder's uniqueness and dedensify the housing especially low and middle income housing. Support locals and natives to stay and not be pushed out.
- ◆ Play a minimalist role. DON'T do social engineering. DON'T try to save the planet from so-called climate disaster. Don't do things that are hard to undo (the Folsom street joke can be undone, fortunately)
- ◆ Please advertise the Plan better. Make it accessible to all residents.
- ◆ Please be sure to involve the public, not just the county commissioners and city counsel in these important decisions. They have proven themselves to be untrustworthy and to not be the stewards of the people. Please allow the people to make any decision that may affect them.
- ◆ Please be very cautious about possibly ratifying zoning variances. Development should benefit the immediate neighborhood AND the city as a whole.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Please do not stop purchasing Open Space properties. (I realize voters recently approved doing just that; pity, that.) Please continue the outstanding work with bicycle tunnels and other creative means of improving bicycle access throughout Boulder. More bike paths! Link them with others so we build out an outstanding network of paths/trails throughout all of Boulder County.
- ◆ Please do your best to keep residents informed of developments in the plan.
- ◆ Please don't do anything that will increase traffic along 55th Street south of Arapahoe. Please! It's gotten much worse in the past five years, especially in the past two years since everyone 'discovered' that stretch after traffic was rerouted to 55th with all the construction nearby.
- ◆ please don't let Boulder become too big like the Silicon Valley. I moved here from California years ago to live a simpler life and I don't want us to become too dense and filled with traffic.
- ◆ Please focus on affordable housing like co ops so that many different types of people can live here in beautiful Boulder!
- ◆ please improve the balance of service between in and out of city limits. (ie) road maintenance
- ◆ Please limit growth, especially of tall buildings! I'm very worried that growth is destroying, possibly, the very reason that people want to live and move here.
- ◆ Please oppose occupancy limits. I know many young -- and senior -- adults who can only live in Boulder by sharing homes with colleagues and friends. They are not all rowdy college students! Co-housing should be encouraged, not prohibited. If noise, vandalism, or trash create problems -- send the police to enforce the existing laws on the books. We need to make Boulder more accessible and affordable to lower-income people (of whatever age) or we will lose the vibrancy that makes our community so special. Don't let Boulder turn into an enclave for grumpy rich people.
- ◆ Please over communicate. Living in unincorp. Boulder is wonderful, except when the City makes changes that directly impact us. Having no voice or vote is frustrating.
- ◆ Please plan for the people who live in Boulder now rather than those who might come in the future. We bought a house here because we love the small compact city, mountain views, and irreverent culture. One of my greatest fears is that Boulder will grow and lose it's uniqueness and friendliness. Preserving open space, not building more houses and preserving mountain views are all things I will support.
- ◆ Police presence for safety (on bikes OK). Ticket motorcycles that have high decibel level. The city and CU are linked. Much of current growth problems are caused by expansion of CU. How does the city coordinate with CU? As long as CU has unlimited growth Boulder has to absorb housing and employment impacts. As CU has grown our area bordering it has been negatively affected. It's the 2-edge sword of being a major college town. The recently hired neighborhood liaison should coordinate with CU instead.
- ◆ Provide for single studios; teachers, those who can eventually "move up"
- ◆ Re the quality of in my neighborhood: decreased in the last 5 years because of increase in traffic and number of rentals. There are also now a few what I'm sure are illegal kitchens in single-family dwellings now housing renters.
- ◆ Recently relocated here. It is wonderfully amazing to live in a place that takes a vested interest in fostering community input when it comes to growth and development. Thank you for this opportunity. Also, more can always be done to exceed environmental standards on building: rainwater collection/reuse, solar paneling, solar water heating, composting...
- ◆ Reduce traffic and congestion
- ◆ Reducing our ecological footprints is an important goal to maintain. Rallying around "footprints of delight" that leave places better than before can inspire people. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity is a moral imperative in our rapidly fraying biosphere, and it benefits human health and well being too.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Regarding pedestrian/bike safety. I would like to see pedestrians have a dedicated time slot at traffic lights instead of having to share the pedestrian crossing time with turning traffic.
- ◆ Rentals need to be kept up and parking available. Landlords participate in the values that protect quality of life for owners.
- ◆ Restore Folsom to its original configuration and do not implement 'Right-sizing' on any additional streets in Boulder. We should strive to separate cars, bikes and walkers by increasing bike paths throughout the city and maintaining/expanding roads.
- ◆ See all previous comments and answers
- ◆ Seems to be mostly motherhood and essentially ignored
- ◆ Selling open space land I paid for?! You expect respect from the tax paying public? Taxes in Boulder is OBSCENE from food-property-bag etc. What's next? Perhaps AIR! School funding is a result of building - our schools don't produce kids who can read this survey. The state is facing 200-500 million dollar short falls! GROWTH is NOT the solution. Spread it out throughout the state! Where there is boom there will be bust. Let us use the open space i.e., camping hunting etc. Most people in this country are sick of the failures of govt.! MOSTn
- ◆ Since city gov esp. city council treated our neighborhood very badly during the past spring and summer, I feel very skeptical that the city will aheal (sic) to any promises/plans re existing neighborhood like this one (Valmont/28th). They have shown no concern for well being, noise reduction ect. (sic) And they outright lied to us. We have zero trust in city gov.
- ◆ Slow down with all the planning for growth and density, and reduce the Planning Dept.'s size (not hire more). Let people who live here enjoy their lives, and have priority over those who want to live here.
- ◆ Slow population growth and commercial growth
- ◆ Some large employers like NCAR offer shuttles between locations, and many employees can also work from home. Other Boulder County and City businesses could emulate this.
- ◆ STEP BACK AND LOOK AT WHAT IS HAPPENING TO BOULDER AND THE ORIGINAL IMAGE... -- DO YOU LIKE WHAT YOU SEE?
- ◆ Stop all of the variances. Live within our current set of building requirements and stop trying to jam certain viewpoints down the throats of citizens.
- ◆ Stop the train noise! It's not expensive. It will lower Boulder's carbon footprint allowing people to keep windows open at night. Better health through better sleep!
- ◆ Thank you for a great set of questions and outreach!
- ◆ Thank you for asking for my input.
- ◆ Thank you for conducting the survey. The planning process should prioritize citizen input rather than commercial or developer pressure.
- ◆ Thank you for educating and involving citizens in the big, tough questions facing our community. Outreach programs (such as the Planning 101 program offered in the early 2000s) are critical in helping us become engaged community members able to voice our values while still respecting and adapting to others' needs. I am grateful for my incredible neighbors and all of the thoughtful county and city staff I have ever met.
- ◆ Thank you for engaging in this important process. Hopefully this helps the City and County make decisions based on the whole region, and not piecemeal.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ Thank you for including me. I am not a city planner (obviously). One of the most challenging aspects of completing the survey and providing my feedback are related to a feeling that actions taken with the intent of meeting Core Values are sometimes contradictory. Additional succinct communication prepared for most of us who have no experience in city planning would be greatly appreciated. Though I did not attend any of the community meetings intended to inform the public about the Comprehensive Plan, and the update, I spent about 10 hours sifting through available on line information in an effort to feel as though I had a very basic understanding of the Plan and issues. It would have been helpful to have summary information to more clearly define specific examples of Boulder Valley's interpretation of how the Core Values should be implemented.
- ◆ Thank you for making this City so great!
- ◆ Thank you for providing this survey.
- ◆ Thank you for soliciting input from the public!
- ◆ Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
- ◆ Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and for following up. We have small kids, jobs, etc. and can let these important issues fall to the wayside, but we want to be involved and lend our thoughts to this important process. And thank you for what you are doing for Boulder.
- ◆ Thank you for the survey.
- ◆ Thank you for valuing the input of residents!
- ◆ Thank you for what you are doing.
- ◆ Thank you for your hard work! Boulder is a wonderful place even with the inevitable changes.
- ◆ Thank you for your hard work. All in all there is no better place in the world to live than Boulder (and I have looked!)
- ◆ Thanks again for seeking community input. As a fifth generation Boulderite, I truly care about our wonderful city. Thanks.
- ◆ Thanks for considering my views...
- ◆ Thanks for giving us an opportunity to provide feedback.
- ◆ Thanks for the opportunity to be heard.
- ◆ Thanks for the opportunity to be involved - I love living in Boulder, and am concerned about the rapid development changes that are currently underway. I am especially concerned about rising prices and the likelihood that Boulder will soon become 'unlivable' due to housing and office space costs.
- ◆ Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback and for all of the work you do to keep Boulder a wonderful place :-)
- ◆ Thanks guys, I know you're working hard on it. Hard to keep housing affordable when space is limited and demand is soaring, while being ecologically responsible and providing opportunity for economic growth. I do not envy you your task, but you have my thanks. -J
- ◆ Thanks--
- ◆ The 25-foot rule is a one-size-fits-all attempt to regulate a terrain that pitches and rolls from one square foot to the next. Worse, the Planning Board applies the rule arbitrarily and capriciously. In light of a much larger and denser population, this particular tenant of The (generally laudable) Plan deserves, if not an overhaul, at least some refinement, esp. in light of the diversity of the residential and commercial properties and improvements in this best of all possible cities.
- ◆ The bicycle zealots are out of control. If you want to reduce car usage, provide free bus service that covers ALL of Boulder.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ The biggest problem with Boulder as I see it is lack of affordable housing. In a rush to resolve this, the planning committee seems to have decided that keeping Boulder's character is secondary to building more affordable housing units, without regard for who the city wants to attract. While it will take great effort and compromise, and no shortage of imagination, the planning committee must consider the character of the city and just what the biggest needs are. Additionally, we need to be much more selective in designing attractive units. Even condo/apartment buildings can be imaginatively and attractively designed.
- ◆ The bike test on Folsom was a disaster - I did not protest. But I have two ways I use to drive out of my area, Folsom and Iris. Please, don't continue the right-sizing for north Boulder.
- ◆ The citizen support levels for each major part of the BVCP should be regularly published so that everyone can understand the level of support for each goal within the community. Moreover, the major parts of the BVCP should be regularly voted on during elections (perhaps as a recurring ballot issue). Only in this fashion will citizens feel that they are empowered in a participatory democracy. The recent example of the 'right sizing' of roads by the combination of the City Council and its Staff clearly warns of the danger of not inviting regular, and frequent, citizen communication and voting, on goals advocated by city activists. To this end, the BVCP needs to be viewed as a citizen endorsed plan, not a plan imposed on its citizens by full time staffers or activists.
- ◆ The city is made up of several parts. Any community planning should be coordinated with the University of Colorado, the School District, the County (which has facilities within the city limits), RTD, and the historic preservation advocates. While neighborhoods should be pleasant places to live, we need to remember that Boulder is a complete city, not a mass of amorphous independent states.
- ◆ The city is not able to do everything for everyone. Boulder seems to move on to new projects (Excel) when it does not meet its obligations to residents under rules in effect.
- ◆ The city needs to focus first on local services! 2) Instead of hiring "neighborhood liaison" people for big bucks (or spending \$ on "right-sizing") hire a couple more people to answer the phone in the city's utility billing department. I waited on hold for 8 minutes and then got hung up on - again and again! I repeated this 7 times before a person answered. 3) Elect City Council members from districts, instead of at large!
- ◆ The city needs to increase athletic facilities including considering building a track and cross country course, additional pools, and playing fields.
- ◆ The county refuses to use our property taxes to maintain roads they took responsibility for in the 1960s and 1970s. The roads are starting to fall apart and pothole repair only goes so far. This is an example of poor very poor county governance. I also believe that having an equal representation of city and county residents on the county commissioner board is necessary for improved decision making.
- ◆ The Folsom bike lane is a disaster. Did anyone study the potential impacts before it was built? Traffic congestion is a major problem in the city. Making it worse to encourage bike commuting is frankly stupid. And I am an avid cyclist.
- ◆ The goals look good on paper, but don't seem to really be used as many decisions on growth seems to have ignored these goals. If this plan is supposed to reflect what the community wants, then the city needs to respect the wishes of the residents and not the developers (including the County Housing Authority).
- ◆ The homeless are an ongoing problem. Sure, it isn't politically correct to want them off our streets but it reached a point where I couldn't even take my daughter OR my elderly mother to the downtown library any more because of the homeless camped out there - sleeping in the back stacks with their pants open - bathing and washing filthy clothes in the bathrooms - falling asleep and urinating on the chairs - disgusting!! Library personnel wouldn't do a thing about it when I complained. I used to support the library, but no more. Create a day care center for them way up north or far east.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ The homeless or people asking for money on streets has increased it seems - also, the variety of people asking. I would like education on Boulder services - like many, I look away/feel guilt - I would like to give to the right local orgs who help these people and not give directly as I always fear it doesn't always work well
- ◆ The idea that this city can handle more jobs, more large apartment and condominium buildings is ridiculous. It has reached the point of being impossible to get anywhere between 8-10 AM and 4-6 PM. Imagine needing to get to a hospital during those hours. Stop building apartments and housing! The air was clean for 20+ years. Now we have smog over the city again, from all the traffic.
- ◆ The level of investment in neighborhoods varies dramatically in Boulder. I understand why people supported prop 300/301. I do not feel that my interests are represented in the Boulder. Our parks in South Boulder are not as good. Our roads are a mess. The comprehensive plans need to be comprehensive and not just focused on UniHill, Downtown and North Boulder.
- ◆ The majority of the houses in my neighborhood are vintage 1960's and need to be remodeled as the original owners change (turnover). Most people recognize that houses are expensive in Boulder but they chose to live in an old house in need of updating instead of paying the same amount to live in a brand new 5,000SF house further east and having to commute and not have access to open space, live in a vibrant community, etc. Remodeling of single family houses within these neighborhoods should be ENCOURAGED not discouraged. My 1960's house has minimal insulation, what is wrong with remodeling it and improving its energy consumption needless to say having something that is better to look at that is more aesthetically appealing for the neighborhood? Love the idea of surrounding this beautiful city with open space and the fact that it is recognized that preservation of that open space is a key requirement is fantastic. Infill development and replacement of old dilapidated buildings is a good thing as we move through time. It is a wealthy area and there is no reason the real estate development should not reflect that investment. Not every building is going to look the same or be made with marble floors.
- ◆ The plan generally sounds good on paper, but most of its values seem to be ignored, especially in the last 10 years. We would like to see city or county-wide bus passes. We would like more restrictions on scrape offs and size of new housing.
- ◆ The plan has to speak to the needs of the whole community. Malcolm Cowles talks about the divisiveness of the Livable Boulder initiatives. The City Council has already created divisiveness by emphasizing the interests of the developers and higher-income residents.
- ◆ The planners should recognize and ACKNOWLEDGE that they have opposing requirements. Do not say that you require open space and all new construction must meet higher building requirements than neighboring counties AND that you can achieve low cost housing (comparable to neighboring counties). It can not be done.
- ◆ The property tax rate is too low; allowing more housing will lead to more affordable housing (a good thing); more affordable housing will lead to more diversity (a good thing)
- ◆ The traffic in Boulder is awful. It is the number one reason we are considering a move. I am a professor and my husband is a design and fab shop owner. We are very disappointed in the cheap, ugly condos being built with no public transit (light rail) being considered.
- ◆ The traffic lights at 28th and Arapahoe are not timed properly. There's almost always a backup on 28th northbound and rarely if ever one on Arapahoe in either direction.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ The University is given too much leeway in their impact on our community. They overcrowd the city with cars and have open parking areas that are too expensive for students. The city should stop subsidizing these sorts of activities and require the university to create more accessible/affordable parking. They are, after all, nothing but a giant corporation and should be held to higher standards.
- ◆ There is more concern over tax revenue than quality of life
- ◆ This city is one of the leaders in the nation on sustainable living practices. Lets be the best leader possible so that others in this country, and possibly the world, will do the same.
- ◆ This is a well written and complete survey.
- ◆ This is not a role of government
- ◆ This Plan is extraordinarily and flagrantly biased. Recreation is clearly one of the 5 most important values, modalities, or activities in this community, yet the word or concept is not mentioned nor addressed in this Plan. You should be ashamed of this very unprofessional bias.
- ◆ This Plan is laying our our core values (the reason why we chose to live here). I believe if we want to reach these goals that we have to continue to do what we think is right for our community and environment. We will offend people, we will piss them off, jobs will be sacrificed but for the overall health of the community/environment, I am willing to do my fair share. Continue to do the right thing even if unpopular.
- ◆ This wealthy community has some of the worst roads in the country, needs vast improvement towards longer life road surfaces. Would like to see free bus rides within city core (28th/Iris to 9th/Canyon) to promote less driving and parking problems. Police need to stop hidden speed traps just to raise revenue.
- ◆ Too idealistic; seems little attention given to working families with children.
- ◆ Too much traffic and congestion
- ◆ Traffic is a mess. Eventual development of CU south campus is a concern.
- ◆ Traffic is getting worse - "downsizing" does not help
- ◆ Try having an 'out of the box' approach to the goals instead of the same old tired 1950's development with more cars , more pollution, more noise,...more of all the things that do not add to the quality of life.
- ◆ Try to be conizant about the over all impression visitors have when they see all those street bums. It makes people discusted and frightened to go by these "down and outers." Do not we have "no loitering" laws in place? Please continue to limit how many pot stores you allow in Boulder. Please create stronger fines for people who do not leash their dogs in parks and public spaces.
- ◆ Unless Boulder gets rid of open space (love open space) we have to accept we have limited options concerning available land, water and have air pollution concerns. Few land areas available, increased density not an option.
- ◆ Way too much affordable housing has been put in north Boulder
- ◆ We are doing a great job of providing affordable housing for the rich, and a decent job of providing housing for the poor. The middle-class is being squeezed out! Do more landscaping and tree planting. Keep improving public transportation.
- ◆ We are skeptical and fearful of Comp Plan because of things hidden in previous ones - like subdivision roads. I have read the 1995 plan, and it does not really indicate change. Be open!
- ◆ We can't have everything and a vital economy is the most important feature to a healthy community. Our job growth has outpaced our housing units and we need to adjust. We need to get serious about this. When the growth management plan was adopted traffic flowed the other way. The tables have turned and Boulder needs to revise its plan.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ We don't think the city should be hosting block parties or handing out money to individuals for their personal agendas or pet projects that the individuals failed to fund through the the open market or scientific/philanthropic sources. The City council should be sticking to providing basic city services in an excellent manner.
- ◆ We have a zero growth county with a planning department that seeks to shut down growth. Why do we spend money on their update? The city needs to take responsibility for it footprint regionally and acknowledge it has contributed to tremendous impact. Rezone commercial industrial areas to residential and reerse it residential downsizing done a few years ago.
- ◆ We moved to Boulder because of its unique relaxed atmosphere. I support limited growth and keeping maximum heights of buildings low. We enjoy Boulder's focus on open space, NOT increased population/businesses.
- ◆ We need more diversity. Boulder has a reputation that is deserved of being white and wealthy. It's a common problem with university towns of this sort, but we would do well to try to address this.
- ◆ We need to uphold the fracking ban in Boulder County and strengthen environmental laws to protect our unique town. We need to purchase and preserve MUCH more open space as a buffer to sprawl. We need to put more recycle & compost bins around town and at ALL trailheads. We need to build more hiking and mountain biking trails in the foothills. We need to take better care of the trails we already have (surface upkeep, fixing erosion, trash collection, invasive plant removal etc.) We need to promote and incentive recycling, energy efficiency, carpooling and renewable power in commercial and residential Boulder County. We need stricter building codes to promote green building. We need to make all residential and commercial trash bins in the county bear resistant. We need more incentives for local organic farms. We need to get FasTracks or some other rail line from Fort Collins to Boulder/Longmont to Denver to the airport to Colorado Springs.
- ◆ We really want a biodynamic/organic neighborhood. We feel the US is lagging behind compared to northern and western Europe.
- ◆ We should be thinking about building a North Boulder High school now. Our elementary schools are overcrowded, if we don't provide a high school then they will all need to be driven to Boulder High or Fairview. More traffic and unnecessary driving.
- ◆ We would like a rooftop restaurant or microbrewery in the Table Mesa shopping center, please. We feel that wildfire mitigation and preparedness should be stressed as a priority.
- ◆ What makes Boulder so special is its mountain parks/open space. Preserving that feature should trump most other issues - loss of that will impact quality of life here and desire to be here.
- ◆ what's with CU and their development south of boulder creek and W of foothills parkway? Fo years they say even tiptoeing of the trail brings environmental degradation,, then they rip it all up for giant new buildings. Have we no control?
- ◆ Whatever you do, keep Boulder weird. We have some very unique characteristics in our community -- and the generic modernization of multi-use developments strips us of our personality making us just another LoDo or Austin (which has greatly lost its character).
- ◆ When I moved to Boulder 15 years ago I thought I had found my Utopia: a beautiful, liberal city with a small town feel and plenty of access to the outdoors. Over the last 5 years specifically, I hve noticed a significant change in the friendliness, personal responsibility and generally relaxed lifestyle I fell in love with. I foresee Boulder moving, on its current trajectory, toward a culture of extreme wealth, excessive work hours, and general overall levels of stress, much like San Francisco has become. I still love Boulder, but am hoping this trajectory levels out soon, or even diminishes.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.22: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like to offer regarding the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?

- ◆ When the Plan is finalized be sure to provide extensive written communication of the revised plan to all members of the community, especially to all property owners. Use mail, not computer for this communication.
- ◆ Whenever I have had a "neighborhood question," it can be very difficult to find the appropriate person or department to answer concerns. EX: it took months and 7-8 calls/meetings with people to get info/help about a problematic non-profit home in our neighborhood.
- ◆ Where is our light rail access to DIA? And, I'd like cheaper access from Table Mesa park/ride to DIA. Costs are prohibitive. It's cheaper and more convenient to drive. We are taxed to create the RTD system; but, the fees makes its use expensive (I realize that RTD is separate in some ways. But, easier bus access seems urgent as a matter of public/civic policy.)
- ◆ While encouraging transportation other than cars is OK, I think Boulder is doing itself a disservice by not planning adequately for cars. Residents still need cars. For example, since Boulder restricts the size of retail stores it is often necessary to go out of town for shopping in larger stores with more selection. Also, older residents (a fast growing segment of the population) cannot walk or bike everywhere. I go downtown very rarely because I can't find a parking space. That means I take my business out of town.
- ◆ While I do like the plan if we don't improve affordable housing Boulder will become even more price prohibitive than it already is, this really needs to be a priority. More neighborhoods like what was done with the mobile home park by 7-11 on Folsom/Balsam and the transportation center. Mobile homes really need to be removed from flood plains and vulnerable areas as those who live in those homes do tend to be fiscally vulnerable as well, and it seems unkind to put them further at risk.
- ◆ Why not a 10 year instead of a 5 year plan. sometimes feel a glossary/thesaurus/dictionary is necessary to fully understand what is being written. for example: repair vs maintenance, and what does the city mean by a 'town center' in the Gunbarrel area?
- ◆ Work closely with the University of Colorado on development of South Campus.
- ◆ Would be nice if someone/anyone paid attention to the inhabitants of unincorporated Boulder county.
- ◆ Would like to see train!
- ◆ Would love to see better transit north of Iris on 28th. Another community-owned (non-RTD) bus serving north Boulder. Community-wide Eco-Pass. A city-owned "general store" on or near the Pearl Street Mall so we don't have to go to 28th Street for practical shopping. ReSource, CHaRM and Art Parts are also terrific. Would love to see movies downtown again, though the Boedecker is terrific too.
- ◆ Yes, your initial list of 9 values was wrong because it left out probably the most important thing on most peoples minds: 'Limiting the size of Boulder so tens of thousands of residents who have their heart and soul to the place don't lose the community they love' You unfortunately front end loaded the survey with too many push questions about housing and welcoming the world to Boulder and not enough Al Bartlett style questions about keeping Boulder at its estimated carrying capacity of 100,000.
- ◆ You are doing a good job on something that is critical to our community! keep up the good work and don't let the desires of the few (and the voices of the few) drag you down or drive the agenda.
- ◆ You can tell how much the city doesn't even think about diversity because it isn't listed as part of questions ["Like" and "Dislike" about neighborhood]
- ◆ You guys are doing a good job
- ◆ Your idea of a "livable" Boulder is crazy - why don't you just be honest and refer to your plan as a way to "survive" Boulder. It's overcrowded now. I try to avoid going into town now - you're probably pleased to hear that's one less car on the streets. Quality of life has plummeted in the last 10 years.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.27: Where do you work? (OTHER)

- ◆ Aurora
- ◆ Aurora
- ◆ Aurora
- ◆ brighton
- ◆ California
- ◆ centennial
- ◆ Cheyenne
- ◆ Commerce City
- ◆ entire state of Colorado, but mostly in northern front range
- ◆ Erie
- ◆ Frederick
- ◆ Golden
- ◆ Home and travel
- ◆ In my home
- ◆ Lafayette/DIA/South Denver
- ◆ Local as well as international (consultant)
- ◆ Mobile
- ◆ Nederland
- ◆ One of use works in Broomfield the other out of our home
- ◆ self
- ◆ self employed
- ◆ Sometimes at home instead of my office, sometimes at employer's
- ◆ Travel
- ◆ Travel to clients
- ◆ various
- ◆ Virtual
- ◆ Westminster
- ◆ Westminster
- ◆ Work from home for a company in NC.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.28: Do you ever work at your home? (OTHER)

- ◆ I am self employed and have an office downtown, also work from home
- ◆ I have a work from home option, but usually at work
- ◆ I have an office in Boulder and also work from an office in my home.
- ◆ I rarely work at home, but have the ability to if needed. My husband's business is out of our home.
- ◆ I very rarely work at home. I generally work at my employer's location.
- ◆ My regular job is not at home, but I'm trying to startup my own business from my house.
- ◆ occasionally at home
- ◆ Office at home. Shop is just North of town
- ◆ Primarily at employers location, but occasionally from home.
- ◆ rarely
- ◆ Self employed
- ◆ self-employed
- ◆ Snowdays & as needed from home, but at employers location most of the time.
- ◆ Yes and our business also operates out of rented lab space in north Boulder
- ◆ Yes, but 95% is on the road
- ◆ Yes, but only a little.
- ◆ Yes, I work part time for our home business
- ◆ Yes, office work at home on occasion.
- ◆ Yes, rarely.

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.30: Please check the one box that most closely describes the type of housing unit you live in. (OTHER)

- ◆ 1 BR apt., unattached
- ◆ A mother in law house
- ◆ An apartment connected to a single-family home
- ◆ An apartment in a duplex
- ◆ Apartment-style condos
- ◆ Co op
- ◆ Detached Condo
- ◆ Duplex
- ◆ Single family home with a mother-in-law apt. on the second floor that only a relative or co-owner can live in.
- ◆ triplex

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey

Open-Ended Comments

Q.31: Do you own or rent your residence? (If you own a mobile home but pay a lot fee, then you own your residence) (OTHER)

- ◆ Family owns
- ◆ I own my trailer but must rent my space.
- ◆ Just bought an affordable condo in North Boulder
- ◆ live with relative
- ◆ Own with monthly payments
- ◆ owned by my mom

2015 BVCP Random Sample Survey
Open-Ended Comments

Q.36: Which best describes your race? (OTHER)

- ◆ caucasian
- ◆ I find this question racist--to make it not so, please add the phrase 'or ethnicity.'
- ◆ Latina
- ◆ Latino
- ◆ latino hispanic
- ◆ mixed race
- ◆ My father was a registered Chippewa but I am not a registered member.
- ◆ Native American/ white
- ◆ prefer not to answer
- ◆ should not matter
- ◆ U.S. citizen
- ◆ White is not a race, I'm caucasian