

Comments received at Public Engagement Events

(Includes open houses, pop-up events and walk/bike audits through June 1, 2015)

RIGHT SIZE PILOT PROJECT APPROACH

- Yes, we need to get more people out of their cars – don't forget about the regional commuters as well!
- Physical separation between cars and bikes is crucial.
- Very supportive of these separated and protected lanes. How about a concrete, landscaped section to show how nice it could look?
- Need more or better explanation of advantage to cars & drivers.
- Yes, physical buffer for bike lanes when possible please.
- Will need to train ops to change their snow plow techniques
- No suicide lanes!!
- When you can, cut out lanes. It's safer for cars & bikes. You only need one lane & turn lanes on 55th for example.
- Have plenty of signs on intersections of multi-use paths like Arapahoe west of Foothills. Intersections are dangerous.
- On multi-use paths like west of Foothills on Arapahoe, retract the crosswalk by 10 feet. Allow one car turning right that space & have peds & bikes cross in back of that car.
- Please wait until the new residential & community developments are completed @ 29th Street and Sutherlands before implementing this pilot program. We'll get a more realistic result when the population increases dramatically in just a few years from now.

Barrier Separation options

- Delineator posts are ugly, especially once battered and parking blocks are doubly ugly.
- Use parking blocks on high speed corridors – plows will not remove when working snow.
- Ideally would love the planters. Can we have an option that is #1 effective and attractive?
- Bollards (temporary) or curbs (permanent) for physical separation are essential to encourage hesitant new riders and families.
- Best bike car separation is the lane on University between 9th and almost Broadway where cars are the buffer. Please no bollards or posts.
- Yay planters and landscaping!
- Biodiverse & edible plants. Bicycle Safari!
- Please consider the visual quality of our neighborhoods when choosing a barrier.
- Mixing terrifies me as a cyclist. I'd prefer bike boxes.
- More people use the right lanes to go forward than you think. Show more data please.
- Concern with using two many techniques, could cause confusion.
- Parked cars as the barrier is the best. Planters is the next best.

Intersection options Right turn treatment options HIGH volume of vehicles turning right

- Buffered transition feels safest.
- Without bollards this treatment is scary (e.g., current N.B. Folsom @ Valmont). With bollards/curbs this is much better!
- Mixing terrifies me as a cyclist. I'd prefer bike boxes.
- More people use the right lanes to go forward than you think. Show more data please.
- Concern with using two many techniques, could cause confusion.

- Not the most comfortable from the handle bar view.
- Buffered transition feels safest.
- Without bollards the mixing zone treatment is scary (e.g., current N.B. Folsom @ Valmont). With bollards/curbs this is much better!

IRIS AVENUE

- Like safer bike lanes, but I already bike one block north of Iris instead. Even safer. Like that the 2-way turn center lane goes from B'way to Folsom – better than mix of 1 lane/2 lane sections. Like turn lane into 22nd from Iris will probably help with the (rare) rear-ending incident. Dislike: I doubt this will help our area – it is likely to make our in/out access worse. Problem is only when we are east bound, between turning in or out across traffic. One lane will reduce our opportunities (= gaps) by stringing traffic in single file. The center turn lane will be problematic due to the complex junction. How much will that turn lane help? Four possible turners, competing for one space. The turn lane conflict exists apart from the Iris through-traffic, which now is bottle-necked (maybe) due to the single lane. We only have a problem at busy times –now it will be worse.
- Turning left out of our neighborhood is currently a significant problem. redesign could be an opportunity to improve upon that problem by having sensors placed at intersections that will signal the lights to turn red + create a time for left turners to get out or timing the lights all along Iris so they provide frequent opportunities for left turners. Relocating the pedestrian crosswalk signal about 50' to the west from Hermosa + the bike path to 22nd & Iris where 37 homes could also activate the signal for crossing. Provide written handouts on how we can give feedback about how this experiment is working for us during the pilot phase, as well as a way to view what feedback has been given on a regular basis; also notification of when the project will be evaluated & the outcome of that evaluation. Educate us about the project in a presentation format with a chance to ask questions after. Today's "Open House" would be more appreciated if presented to us rather than having everyone read 15 or 16 large posters with too much information to digest – no order. Where to start? The posters could have been numbered start to finish to help understand.
- Please schedule a town meeting forum where neighbors can interact and voice their complaints about troublesome and dangerous intersections. Have a Q & A with the professionals present.
- Move bikes one block south to Hawthorne. Most difficult will be connection from west of Broadway to east of Broadway as now there is now lane for bikes on this block. Hawthorne connects east via bike path at Iris Gardens OR north/south via bike paths to (north) 15th/16th – south 13th. Keep 4 lanes of car traffic on Iris, move bikes off of Iris. Yes, I am a bike commuter.
- It will create a lot more stress, for everyone, and will not increase safety but will reduce it. Off of the road multi-use (bike/pedestrian) paths are the only safe options, and there is already a sidewalk on each side of Iris Avenue, that could be expanded to accommodate bike & ped traffic, without changing the street for motor vehicles. This design will be disastrous in the winter. The proposal benefits a small minority of residents and users of the road. This is a major thoroughfare and traffic will spill off onto smaller streets to avoid the traffic jam.
- I'm willing to give it a try, but my impression is this is an anti-car project. There are times when the traffic is so heavy in both directions that it would be almost impossible to turn out of our subdivision. The traffic would double if we cut out a lane on either side. Bus options on Iris are very limited and expensive. Lowering bus fares would help a lot. Our area does not have eco-passes.

- I'm concerned about the high number of commuters from Longmont, Gunbarrel, etc, who are already frustrated with the congestion. There needs to be a right turn lane on Iris @ 28th (to go south on 28th). People try to crowd around the right lane to make a right turn. Get rid of the high shrubs on the island on Folsom just south of Pearl. Can't see people (bikes & peds) when they are crossing and you think the bikes that crossed is the last one. Quit decreasing the visibility with the tall islands so the bikes are visible!!
- Quite interested to see how it goes. If it will improve or worsen the left turn from 22nd Street onto Iris which at certain times of the day are nearly impossible now. Perhaps consider a remote light trigger on 22nd that would turn pedestrian crossing light to the east of 22nd Street red to allow cars turning from 22nd left onto Iris the opportunity to do so. Timing the lights at 19th & 28th so a break in traffic could help. Glad this is a trial for now.
- Difficulty making left turns from 22nd onto Iris going east. Timing of lights should be set on Folsom & 19th Street to allow safer access from 22nd going east on Iris. When school light at crosswalk is red, traffic coming east on Iris stops & backs up at the light not allowing traffic from 22nd going east to enter Iris. My perception based on what I've seen from this discussion, single lanes in each direction will just cause traffic to be more continuous for a longer period of time, thus not mitigating the problem at all.
- Love it! Please continue in your efforts for this project – it will encourage alternative transportation and beautify our streets. We have a home on Iris and this is nice to see this major improvement. We live in Boulder due to its lifestyle and this will further the city and its primary role of healthy living.
- Bus traffic – when they are picking up passengers, where do the cars go? Trash trucks are also present on Iris all week long. 13th Street is impacted by Colorado Employees as well as 14th & 15th street. The side streets are not wide enough for all the traffic & parking.
- Concern for evaluating success: Delays in exiting 22nd onto Iris in the east bound direction. Does the 2 part turn (into turn lane, then onto east bound) work to get residents safely and quickly out on to eastbound Iris? Awesome design! Hope it works!
- It is hard to imagine one lane each direction on Iris. Traffic flow is already difficult. Those who need to turn left onto Iris will face insurmountable difficulties unless there is a light. I wager that if council members lived off of 22nd Street this would never be considered. The push of all vehicular traffic to one lane makes biking even more dangerous, and will not encourage more bikes onto this road. Please do not implement this plan!
- I live on 17th Street, north side of Iris. 17th Street is a dead end street, so you must get out on Iris. Now it can be very hard to make a left or right turn on to Iris as the traffic is already heavy. Making Iris a one lane heading west will make the situation worse, as traffic will block the exit of 17th Street & Iris Court. Iris #2 would be the best for me living on 17th Street.
- Concept is interesting. I would like some help getting attention to left turn from 22nd onto Iris (eastbound), very dangerous turn because of traffic in both directions merge into two lanes of traffic. Maybe center lane is a potential solution.
- Will the traffic westbound on Iris backup at Broadway. When people are delayed what alternate routes will they choose. Are we dumping Iris traffic into neighborhoods not suitable for community traffic? Worse with ice at Broadway. Left lane turns in and out of 22nd Street. How will this improve our safety here?
- The proposed changes to Iris are going to make a difficult situation of turning left/east from 22nd even more difficult than it already is. It is already a significant wait for each of the 2 west bound lanes, & combining all that west bound traffic into one lane will only make getting out of Heritage Meadows

(about 30 homes) going east, even more difficult. Let's not make a difficult situation even worse. Instead, move to pedestrian path right signal to 22nd. The pedestrians can walk 50' west to the relocated light. This will allow the Heritage Meadows people to make an east turn in a reasonable time.

- I love the ideas of night sizing streets and providing the accommodations at the same time.
- Overall, like the plan. Maintaining all turn lanes at Iris & Broadway. Add dedicated right turns at 19th WB and EB @ 19 & Folsom as planned for traffic flow.
- Right turning bikes get stuck behind right turning cars at Broadway. A wide path would mitigate this concern.
- The linear ideas for bikes are good, but because of the multi lane large intersections as an interested but concerned person I would not ride more.
- Does bus stop in bike lane? Unsafe.
- Change light timing.
- I once had to wait 3 cycles to turn east onto Iris from south bound 19th.
- Ped crossing at 15th and Iris gets little use, has wrong locations, & bad visibility. Should be at 16th, which is entrance to neighborhood.
- 16th has better visibility. Putting crosswalk at same intersection as cars would give cars on 16th more times to get onto Iris.
- How do WB bikes turn left at 15th to go downtown?
- Need pedestrian refuge island at 16th & Iris.
- Reducing Iris to a single lane would cause problems for people living on side streets. Strongly disagree, center turn lane makes left turn into and out of side streets easier.
- Too few arterials in town, this restricts capacity too much.
- I will bike here more with my kids and feel safe.
- Bus stop/bike lane?
- Perhaps extend right turn lane further east.
- Change light timing.
- Yes, this will be great.

IRIS 1 OPTION (two westbound left turn lanes)

- Please do this soon. I bike on Iris frequently and this would be a huge improvement.
- Double lefts are very scary for pedestrians if they are expected to cross while cars may turn left. Dedicated signals & phases fix this issue.
- Yes, more time for pedestrians at this double left. Double left is good.
- I think two left turn lanes will be necessary at Broadway. I think the bike lane is visibly safe as is.
- Like this option. Need left turn volume. Most dangerous for bike is right turn lane crossing bike lane. Both options have this.
- This makes sense. Helps minimize opposite from motorists. Long term can add protected lanes near Broadway by widening row.
- Option 1 is okay. Signal timing preference for Broadway keeps vehicular traffic on Iris at low speed (most vehicles stop for signal).

IRIS 2 OPTION (One westbound left turn lanes at Broadway)

- Travel time for whom? Only cars? And bikes/peds are safer?
- The buffered bikeway is necessary for this road to be safe for cyclists. This option is the winner.

- Please try this first. This is an important intersection because of Foothills elementary commuters.
- If wait times are too high cars will re-route through North Boulder neighborhoods north of Iris.
- Do bikes really feel safer if stopped cars are further away?

IRIS & FOLSOM

- Rightsizing is an idea whose time has come! Rather than present metrics like how much driving time will increase, focus on things like expected in cycling/walking volume, or expected reduction in speeding. We should not treat a reduction in motor vehicle speeds as a downside – it is a benefit to the perm ability & walk ability of the neighborhood. We must envision these physically protected lanes as beautiful additions to the street scape! Don't show pictures with lame flexible bollards – show me pedestrian refuge islands with beautiful plantings or public art – show me large planters spilling over with flowers (like on the 13th street counter flow lanes) – show lots of pedestrians and kids on bikes – these images should be pretty, idealistic, the future we want!
- More signs to let people turning right from side road to main road that there are bikes going in both directions. Put aesthetically pleasing dividers between bike lane & cars. Make cars pay their full costs to use as a price signal to motivate people to switch to bikes for more of their travel. Have fuel efficient busses to compliment bikes.
- Suicide lane of great concern. I thought this was not longer used! Too dangerous. Striping and markings can be confusing for older drivers (even those who are still reasonable good drivers). This will certainly cut down on older drivers. Perhaps that was one of the goals.
- Problems I see: Speeding bikers who refuse to obey traffic signage & lights; confusing stripes on road that would baffle seniors & tourists; the best bike lane is curled (Berlin) but the most costly; the concrete channeling that might be used would block snow plows; snow would cover all striping on road; the people who hate the blinking walk lights will go bonkers when they see this plan.

FOLSOM

- Folsom desperately needs safe bike/ped facilities all the way south to Arapahoe. If we truly want to shift mode share away from motor vehicles, roadway space needs to be reallocated to create a safe environment for non-motorized modes. We need a physically protected bike lane all the way south to Arapahoe, even at the expense of delaying motor vehicle traffic.
- Since older people will drive these corridors less, and will not walk long distances and the buses are not always convenient they may end up more isolated, staying home more.
- Would be interesting to see a traffic flow scenario when there was an accident on any of these streets and how traffic would be diverted.
- The intersection at Folsom & Arapahoe is always the most challenging for cars and bikes, partly because Arapahoe suddenly gets narrower west of the intersection. Suggestion: Make Arapahoe one-way (eastbound only) from 17th to Folsom, eliminating all turning and merging traffic on that side of the intersection. Divert westbound traffic to Canyon.
- Love all of these projects! I strongly support extending the “rightsizing” approach from Valmont all the way to Arapahoe. Any delays for drivers should encourage some of the traffic to shift to 28th Street leaving Folsom safe for cyclists.
- If we want to encourage commuting by bike in Boulder, we need to create well-designed streets such as the ones proposed here. Slower travel times for cars are an acceptable cost, in my opinion. It's worth it to create a beautiful, healthy, city for humans.

- The intersection at Folsom and Valmont is unsafe for cyclists going north, so some mitigation would be great there.

The flashing cross walks on Folsom are dangerous. The one at Valmont often flashes when no one is there, thus making drivers start to ignore it.

The flashing cross walk on Pearl between Target and Whole Foods is good, but there is too much heavy traffic on 30th to make the one at Walgreen's safe.

Keep it all affordable (mostly green painted safe spaces)!

- Critical to improve safety for all and access for bikes on Folsom. The curve is dangerous! The protected bike lane looks great. The merging at Arapahoe & Folsom SB will be interesting. Can we maintain a narrow bike lane there, and at Canyon (NB) all the way to the intersection.
Awesome proposed changes, especially if only one left turn lane from SB Folsom to EB Arapahoe is permitted. This gives proper room for a right-turn & through bike lane. If through traffic on Folsom get congested, they'll go elsewhere – the inverse of “induced demand!” People (drivers) will scream at first.
- I think that the congestion concerns with F1 are valid, but I believe the benefit outweighs the negatives. Benefits for bikers include improved safety for several more blocks of very high-traffic area, additional N-S capacity that currently does not readily exist in that part of Boulder for bikers and a full-scale experiment (rather than F2 & F3) on Folsom bike lanes. Without trying the full length, we will never know if it actually might not be as bad for traffic as is being predicted.
- I love the idea, but think the traffic congestion would be awful. It is already busy and backs up at Broadway from the left turn lane. It can take three or four light changes to get through the light and turn left.
- Center turn lane is better efficiency. It improves safety for turning vehicles. You have my full support.
- Lots of bike connecting from Balsam/Mapleton across Folsom to Goose Creek.
- Improve line of sight along Folsom near Mapleton Avenue.
- Please add bike lanes to Canyon Blvd. next.
- Important bike corridor for us who live north and east. Look forward to these improvements.
- Such a great improvement!
- Why nothing between Pine & Arapahoe, existing bike lanes are dangerous and traffic is heavy?
- Fix potholes in bike lane.
- Cars drive into bike lane along curvy segment of Folsom.
- Consider creating bike corridor on 23rd.
- Why are existing vehicle & bike lanes considered substandard?
- Yes, 23rd Street too. I like 2 and 3.
- Yes, Folsom would be great! Looking forward to feeling more comfortable then.
- Canyon at Folsom is a good candidate for protected intersection.
- Nice proposed buffered right turn design at Canyon. Bikes make a left here to get on path.
- Opening up thru traffic at Walnut/Folsom with a real traffic light would be nice. Traffic red light at Walnut is too much. It's not needed. I bike it every day.
- Many cyclists go between Mapleton/Bluff and Goose Creek. Dangerous crossing or ride the sidewalk south bound addressed. Need protected crossing here. Improve line of sight for crossing also.
- Bollards make it clear that cars are changing lanes, emphasized by the green stripes. I like this design compared to options. Of course, a Salt Lake style protected intersection would rock.
- Center lanes makes left turns much easier. Green paint at Mapleton (Way Folsom) for bike crossing, especially north bound.

- Cyclists' threats are at intersections – needs better treatment here! Stripe w/green dashes across intersection of Taft and driveway!
- Why drop buffer? Cars will just use as turn lane.
- Tighten turn, extend buffers = reduced conflict/threat zone.
- This is a great upgrade.
- Signals intervals here (Colorado Ave) are ridiculously long. Everyone just jay walks.

FOLSOM OPTION 1 (Valmont Road to Arapahoe Road)

- Should go from Colorado to Iris at least.
- Buffered bike lanes the full length are the best choice!
- Travel time for whom? Only cars? And we get bike/ped safety?
- Prefer Folsom 1. If too congested, cars will go elsewhere. This would be the only safe bike corridor NS to the east of 13th.
- Strongly support rightsizing for the full corridor. Go all the way from Valmont to Colorado. Traffic can shift to the more car friendly 28th Street.
- Strongly support this option. Need to consider options for stops for the HOP that do not obstruct the bike lane. Why not obstruct the general use lane?
- I think Folsom 1 is best since the people who use the bike lane will continue on their journey no matter if they are there or not. You wouldn't stop painting the car lanes in an arbitrary spot, why stop the full bike lane? It will be used!
- If drivers can't spare 1 minute & 17 seconds of their lives to make the streets safer and more enjoyable, they should move!
- Business driveways? Lots in this block. How will that flow across bike lane? Bad news!
- Bus/bike interaction? Potholes at bus stop. Need cement!
- Need crosswalk at Grove & Folsom like Goss & Folsom. Yes please!
- Yay! Best option! Woo hoo!!!
- There will be bike/car conflicts at right turn/through bike lanes at Canyon & at Arapahoe. Can you establish right-of-way for one mode lane? Or, maintain separation?
- Move RTD stop right before Arapahoe on NB Folsom. It will mess up this turn lane and the HOP is very frequent.
- Go all the way to Arapahoe! Canyon to Arapahoe needs the most help. Don't compromise!!

FOLSOM OPTION 2 (Valmont Road to Canyon Blvd)

- Option 2 –Valmont to Canyon is best. Canyon to Arapahoe is too important and too busy to reduce the traffic lanes. Walnut/Folsom ped activated is problematic.
- Option Folsom 2 is best for me as a cyclist and pedestrian. I often avoid Folsom because people drive so fast and I feel unsafe, even though it's the most direct option for me (I work at CU). These improvements will make me feel more comfortable, especially on Folsom between Pearl & Iris. Thank you!
- But the bike lane south of Canyon is awful – what do cyclists do once they get there?
- This seems like a good approach. Then fix south of Canyon after the pilot project by widening the row for protected bike lanes.

FOLSOM OPTION 3 (Valmont Road to South Street)

- This wouldn't solve the worst problem spot on Folsom.
- I'm happy if you improve bike situation between Valmont and Pine.
- This will make most sense to drivers.
- Preferred.

55TH STREET

- Not good to reduce 4 lanes to 2 lanes because turning traffic & stopping buses impede the progress of vehicles behind.
- Traffic backs up at Pearl because everyone is turning.
- Concern for truck traffic impacts given that there are a lot of industrial uses along 55th Street.
- The S. Boulder Creek path and Boulder Creek path are good alternative routes to get to the Flatirons business park.
- There are no schools of destinations that attract kids or families.
- I wonder if a 10' buffer might allow drivers to think that they can use it as a second lane as for parking. Just something to think about. Love it from a cyclist's perspective.
- Congestion at RR tracks whether a train or not.
- Tanker truck and bus must stop at RR tracks. Also creates congestion and delay.
- Concerns over buses and large trucks that stop on tracks. Will take forever to clear.
- Short-term rush hour congestion is okay if it improves bike/ped safety. Should we compromise residents' safety for the convenience of in-commuters?
- East bound Arapahoe to North bound 55th – Large vehicle semi trucks turning right into Flatiron park is slow & creates vehicle queue back to Arapahoe or left onto Western traffic backed up.
- Left turns from Western Ave are impossible during rush hour. Second north bound lane on 55th offers potential to make this turn.
- Train queue occupied both lanes back to Arapahoe. Congestion will backup 2x a day to Arapahoe and beyond.
- Large trucks can't fit into existing auxiliary lanes and block one lane of thru traffic today – will create long backups into Arapahoe with one lane.
- During icy conditions I have seen bumper-to-bumper traffic at rush hour.
- South bound traffic on 55th often backs up to Western during rush hour. Reducing one lane will aggravate this.
- I am concerned that at rush hour traffic will back up behind this entrance. Vehicles will neck in to 55th and cut off the bike lane.
- North bound capacity at 55th/Arapahoe already constrained. With 1-lane would be impassable with backups for miles.
- Concerned about backups on 55th south of Arapahoe.

63RD STREET

- This bike path is not well maintained and ends abruptly with lots of sand and gravel.
- Is there a way to provide a good transition from Lookout Road?
- What is the volume of cyclists M – F who use this road?

- Paint & separator is okay, works, north and south bound.
- Why not use/improve the existing off street paths, don't duplicate.
- Nautilus needs traffic light. Avery Brew has increased traffic.
- Need a safer option for crossing 63rd Street to get to & from Avery, and the 205 bus stop.
- Need a crosswalk of 63rd at Nautilus. It took me 10 minutes to cross the street at 5 p.m.
- Concerned that congestion along 63rd street will divert vehicular traffic to Twin Lakes Road, which serves a residential neighborhood and has four multi-use path/trail access points. Diverted traffic on Twin Lakes road will increase potential for conflict wPuith lots of pedestrians, dog walkers and bicyclists.
- Concern for loss of dedicated right turn lanes at 63rd Street and Nautilus Road/Gunbarrel Drive

30TH BETWEEN BASELINE & ARAPAHOE

- How/why will 55th Street be addressed before 30th? 30th between Baseline & Arapahoe has sub-par bike lanes and huge bike volume. 55th has good bike lanes and minimal present and potential bike volume. What gives?

Comments received through June 1, 2015 by correspondence

(including e-mails, phone calls and InspireBoulder.com)

55th Brad Sutton 5/15/2015

This email provides my comments regarding the city's plans to reduce 55th street to one lane between Arapahoe and Pearl St. On four separate days last week, I experienced issues with trucks and cars that would have caused traffic problems if 55th street were reduced to one lane (even with turning lanes). First, I was turning North onto 55th from Arapahoe (coming from Resource going to Flatiron Park). There was a large truck heading north but turning right into the business just before the railroad tracks. Because the truck was very long, it was practically stopped while the driver turned. This backed up the right lane all the way to Arapahoe, because many other drivers also needed to be in the right lane to turn right (as I did). Fortunately, the left lane of traffic was still able to proceed (that lane was fairly full of cars.) Second, I was heading north on 55th from Arapahoe in the left lane and there was a long truck turning left onto Western Ave. Even though there is a turn lane on 55th for cars turning left onto Western, the truck could not use it because it was too long, so it was making that turn from the left lane of traffic. Fortunately, the car in front of me was able to merge into the right lane and continue on its way. I was not so fortunate since there was too much traffic in the right lane for me to change lanes. Third, there was a tanker truck heading North on 55th and it stopped at the railroad tracks (apparently it had a flammable load). All the cars behind it had to stop too. Once it started moving, it was going so slowly that traffic backed up nearly to Arapahoe. Fourth, I was traveling South on 55th approaching Central and there was a car moving very slowly in the right lane. I don't know if they were confused, tired or looking for an address, but I needed the left lane to get by them. I do not want to have to drive at the speed of the slowest vehicle on 55th. Please confirm you received my comments, either by replying to my email or calling me. I sent a comment regarding the traffic problems trains cause on 55th but I don't know if you received that. Brad Sutton

55th Brad Sutton 5/15/2015

I attended a gathering May 5 on the proposed changes to 55th street for multimodal. They asked for input. On May 6, I waited for a train on 55th at 8:20am heading north just past Arapahoe. By the time the train passed, traffic had backed up on both lanes of 55th back to Arapahoe (and probably farther but I couldn't see how far past Arapahoe). If 55th were reduced to one lane as proposed, cars would be backed up much farther (certainly far south of Arapahoe) and the impact to traffic would be far greater (because, among other things, it would take longer for all the cars to clear the area after the train passed since most of the cars would have to wait for several light changes at Arapahoe since they would never have made it that far). Trains go by there several times a day. Brad Sutton

55th Brad Sutton 5/21/2015

A month or two ago the city closed one lane of 55th just north of Arapahoe to fix a broken water main. This backed up traffic on both directions of Arapahoe and south of Arapahoe on 55th. Traffic was a nightmare at that intersection until all lanes reopened. This morning, 55th was once again down to two lanes (one each direction) for work on the railroad tracks just north of Arapahoe. At 8AM this morning, northbound traffic on 55th south of Arapahoe was backed up nearly to Baseline (which is one mile) because of the lane closure. I saw drivers doing U-turns on 55th to escape. When I finally got to Arapahoe, I saw cars trying to turn onto 55th northbound from both east and west bound Arapahoe backed up for at least 100 yards. The traffic blocked one lane of Arapahoe in both directions because westbound doesn't have a turn lane and the turn lane for east bound wasn't long enough for the queue. This nightmare will be constant if 55th is reduced from four lanes to two.

55th & 63rd Janice Coen 5/19/2015

Dear Ms. Ratzelm, I'm writing to provide feedback on the proposed "Living Laboratory" plan to reduce the section of 63rd from 2 lanes down to 1 in each direction and add sevenfoot wide bike lanes with 6-foot wide

buffers. The proposal reduces to one lane the section that is accessed by the Boulder Rural Fire Protection District Station on the west side of 63rd. A wide bicycle path already runs alongside on the west of 63rd Street. Considering the commuter traffic from Lookout which can be quite heavy during business hours, the overflow from occasional blockages on the Diagonal Highway, and new traffic loads from the multiple housing complexes under construction around Gun Park, it is difficult to see how this is an overall improvement for any class of commuters and not just a punitive attempt to stop people in Gunbarrel (where, being less density than the actual City of Boulder, destinations are farther apart) from driving their cars. I have similar concerns for the proposed changes to an important and heavily-traveled section of 55th Street between Pearl Street and Arapahoe. It is an important and heavily traveled north-south corridor for those outside the city. The Boulder County Sheriff's department headquarters and a large number of businesses and industries use this section of 55th street and the increased congestion from reducing the volume capacity of this roadway would create unnecessary adversity for users. Here, again, there are wide multi-use paths already available for bikes on both sides of the roadway. Neither of these thoroughfares is comparable to the Phase-I projects listed on the web site. These Phase-I projects are predominantly west-Boulder, where densities and usage patterns (not to say lifestyles) are different from the more suburban, commercial and industrial areas around 63rd and 55th streets. I use these roads almost daily and am opposed to any plan that reduces traffic capacity and increases congestion while providing no benefit above existing conditions to any user type, on these already burdened arteries that serve the economic and safety needs of eastern Boulder and nearby surrounding Boulder County.

55th & 63rd John Michalakes 5/19/2015

Ms. Ratzelm, I'm writing to provide feedback on the proposed "Living Laboratory" plan to reduce the section of 63rd from two lanes down to one in each direction and add seven-foot wide bike lanes with 6-foot wide buffers. The proposal reduces to one lane a busy section that is accessed by the Boulder Rural Fire Protection District Station on the west side of 63rd. A wide bicycle path already runs alongside on the west of 63rd Street. Considering the commuter traffic from Lookout, the overflow from occasional blockages on the Diagonal Highway, and new traffic loads from the projects under construction around Gun Park, it is difficult to see what qualifies as "Right Sizing" in this plan. I have similar concerns for the proposed changes to an important and heavily-traveled section of 55th Street between Pearl Street and Arapahoe. The Boulder County Sheriff's department headquarters and a large number of businesses and industries use this section of 55th street and the increased congestion from reducing the volume capacity of this roadway would create unnecessary delays for users. Here, again, there are multi-use paths already available for bikes on both sides of the roadway. Neither of these thoroughfares is comparable to the Phase-I projects listed on the web site. These Phase-I projects are predominantly west-Boulder, where densities and usage patterns (not to say lifestyles) are different from the more suburban, commercial and industrial areas around 63rd and 55th streets. I and many of my neighbors who live near and are frequent users of these roads, both by car and bus, are opposed to any plan that reduces traffic capacity and increases congestion on these already burdened arteries that serve the day-to-day travel as well as economic and safety needs of eastern Boulder and nearby surrounding Boulder County.

55th & 63rd Matt Samet 5/18/2015

Dear Marni I'm writing to offer some feedback about the proposed "right-sizing" of 63rd Street between Lookout and Gunbarrel roads, as well as the proposal for 55th street between Pearl and Arapahoe. While I realize the City is always working to make the streets more bike-friendly, I believe these proposals will have a significant negative impact on our quality of life (read: traffic flow and pollution) in the eastern part of town. I've been in Gunbarrel since 2007, and have watched as traffic has steadily increased on that section of 63rd, where it can even back up during rush hour. Like 55th Street, 63rd is a major north-south artery through the eastern parts of the city, used by thousands of office workers to access the warehouses, office buildings, and office parks they work in, as well as by heavy (delivery and repair) trucks, in addition to local, residential traffic. Particularly with 63rd, constricting it to one lane will create horrible logjams, especially given the new high-density apartment buildings going up in the Spine/Lookout area that are effectively adding at least 1000 more people to Gunbarrel, not to mention all the traffic from the popular new Avery Brewing building on Nautilus Court. Right now, 63rd has a great bike

path/sidewalk on its western side, one I use every day to walk my dog — it's probably the widest such path in Boulder, and is and will remain more than wide enough to accommodate the volume of bike and pedestrian traffic it sees (I barely ever see anyone on it). So why the need to impede traffic flow on 63rd, in the name of the handful of bikers and pedestrians who already have a good option? It feels baffling, like a solution in search of a problem. As someone who lives west (downwind) of that stretch of road, I also fear the day when traffic backs up along there during the morning rush hour into town and all the car exhaust blows our way. It's better to just keep the traffic flowing, I would think, and get people out of their cars sooner instead of sitting there idling. I'd also put forth some of the same argument for leaving 55th as-is. Thanks for considering our thoughts out here in Gunbarrel. We rarely have a voice in how things play out. I'd also love to know who I could chat with in your office about getting some "Slow" signs or speed humps put in on Twin Lakes Road at Brandon Creek. We have two young children and have had ongoing issues with people speeding past our side street off Twin Lakes, despite a 25 mph limit and a high population density here, between the Twin Lakes Condos and the homes in Brandon Creek, and the trailhead for the LoBo Trail (popular with bird/owl watchers). There are some speed dips south of us, and I'd love to see a similar solution put into place here, if not a crosswalk. All best, Matt Samet

55th & 63rd Miho Shida 5/21/2015

comments: I think this is a pretty bad idea. During rush hour these street gets pretty busy and with all the apt.s being built out here, it will just get even busier. Yes, it would be nice if more people rode their bikes but it just isn't an option for many commuters, families, older people etc. The cars idling will just create more pollution and frustration!

55th & Folsom Bob Jamieson 5/18/2015

I am not able to be at the meeting on May 20. However, I would like to provide input on the proposed Rightsizing projects. I personally ride on Folsom frequently and 55th occasionally between Arapahoe and Valmont. I try to stick to the paths as much as possible to avoid car conflicts, but those two north-south routes are critical bike routes and I strongly support the projects. Riding on those two streets, especially Folsom, is the most dangerous transportation choice that I currently make. Thanks. Bob Jamieson

55th & Folsom Shawn McQuerry 5/18/2015

While I'm a member of two bicycling advocacy groups, I was in utter shock at the concepts that were suggested for Folsom and 55th. This is for two main reasons: 1. As traffic on both 55th and Folsom is a mess on weekends, I imagine that it's a standstill on a typical weekday regardless of the alleged calculations. The concept of removing two functional lanes in some of our only north-south corridors is an absolutely untenable idea for those of us who don't live within the listed 4 miles of downtown 2. As most recently shown by its performance last winter, the city is incapable of maintaining bike lanes and routes in a safe condition, unless they are downtown or a separated bike path, when there is even a trace a snow on the ground. I know that we're lauded for our clearing out bike paths before the roads, but we should remember that you have to get to the paths first. For a further example. consider the slush, black ice, and standing water in the bike lane that personified the Baseline experiment last winter. I know several people who moved their bike commute into the traffic lanes on Table Mesa last winter (another road prone to inhospitable conditions in its bike lanes). If the city can't demonstrate an ability to maintain what it has, why should I trust that it can take care of more? Shawn McQuerry Boulder, CO

55th, 63rd and Iris Joni Skuba 5/20/2015

Marni – What exactly does "Right sizing" mean? In the past, traffic mitigation in Boulder has typically meant installation of impediments to traffic flow. Examples are the numerous tiny traffic circles on Pine, speed bumps on Cherryvale and 55th, and bus stops along many streets all of which intentionally hinder traffic flow. Boulder is an affluent community. Doubtless there are as many cars in Boulder as people. Slowing traffic down does not in any way improve life in and around Boulder. Without radical changes in alternate modes of transportation, cars

are here to stay. So I'm concerned when I hear people in Boulder talking about "Right sizing" streets, especially one near my home. That sounds like another way to impede traffic. Please tell me I'm wrong.

63rd Frank Aiello 5/20/2015

Marni, I couldn't echo Leslie's comments strong enough!!!! Boulder needs to keep hands off Boulder county with their "bike" craziness and think of ways to keep traffic flowing better and more freely, not clogging up traffic to accommodate bike crazies. 1000% against this stupid idea and will contact as many people as I can to inform them of this stupid and sneaky approach and will use all my energy not only to oppose this idea but any further of its kind! Frank Aiello

63rd Susan Bailhache 5/28/2015

Dear City Officials - As a resident of the Gunbarrel area, I oppose the concept of "Right Sizing" the section of 63rd street from Lookout Road to Gunbarrel Avenue/Nautilus Drive. It appears that this plan would reduce the section of 63rd from two lanes down to one in each direction and add seven-foot wide bike lanes with 6-foot wide buffers. My husband and I object to this plan for the following reasons: - First of all, the proposal reduces to one lane the section that is accessed by the Boulder Rural Fire Protection District Station on the west side of 63rd. Obviously, this could negatively impact the firefighters response time. - Second, a wide bicycle path already runs alongside on the west of 63rd, so it would be difficult to justify the expense of creating a new lane. - Additionally, this section of 63rd street already experiences congestion during commute times due to the traffic from Lookout and also from the overflow of occasional blockages on the Diagonal Highway. - Finally, one should anticipate new traffic loads from the projects under construction around Gun Park. In conclusion, reducing the number of lanes on a road which is already busy just doesn't make sense. Sincerely, Susan & Mark Bailhache

63rd Myrna Besley 5/21/2015

Myrna Besley mysube@aol.com I live in the neighborhood off 63rd street and Twin Lakes Road. I do not think the "right sizing" plan will improve any traffic issues along this transportation corridor. The way it is now seems better than the plan. I hope that you leave it the way it is! Recently our neighborhood has added hundreds of new apartments, adding much congestion to our shopping and eating areas, but this road change will not help in any way. Please leave it alone. Thanks for considering my opinion. Myrna Besley

63rd Paul Boni 5/28/2015

As a resident of Gunbarrel, in the county of Boulder, not the City of Boulder, I am passionately opposed to your plans to screw up traffic in OUR neighborhood. The itemised reasons to oppose your plans were written by a more reasonable neighbor and I would appreciate your consideration on the merits of his well considered points. With that said, know that a lot of us are plain angry and deeply resent your efforts to screw with our community. What right do you think you have to make such changes when we, the people of Gunbarrel, do not have the right to vote in regard to city of Boulder issues, including representation?! 1. They just added additional lanes onto the diagonal due to addition of hotel and other residences. 2. There is already a bike lane immediately to the West of 63rd. If they need more room for bikes, widen that! 3. There are no turn lanes included on any design of the "right sizing" which would cause tremendous congestion. 4. Cars sitting at idle (due to congestion) emit much more greenhouse gasses (and worse gasses since it's NOx) than moving traffic. 5. Gunbarrel has added 100's of new residential apartments since their study (which as far as I could tell, consists of 4 pictures of the road with little to no traffic) 6. It is completely unnecessary to spend funds on a perfectly good road when so many other roads and projects are in disrepair (remember, this is the City and not involved with sub-division paving) 7. This is an industrial corridor - there are multiple semi-truck deliveries daily to companies like Covidien, BI, Qualcomm, GE Medical, just to name a few 8. Boulder wants 30% of all commuters should ride their bikes and claim an average commute for all gunbarrel at 4 miles! I don't think the 100's of workers at Covidien would agree with this 4 mile assessment. 9. This project is ONLY intended to serve bikers. Even Boulder admits that it's a VERY optimistic goal of 30% is not likely. So over 70% of the rest of us are NOT being served by this waste of

funds 10. This would also impact the entry/exit of Boulder Rural Fire that just build a beautiful facility on 63rd. I'm sure, in part, due to its easy access. 11. Not to mention that our entire summer would be dedicated to construction. Who's quality of life is this intended to improve????

63rd Robert Collins 5/28/2015

comments: 1. They just added additional lanes onto the diagonal due to addition of hotel and other residences. 2. There is already a bike lane immediately to the West of 63rd. If they need more room for bikes, widen that! 3. There are no turn lanes included on any design of the "right sizing" which would cause tremendous congestion. 4. Cars sitting at idle (due to congestion) emit much more greenhouse gasses (and worse gasses since it's NOx) than moving traffic. 5. Gunbarrel has added 100's of new residential apartments since their "study" (which as far as I could tell, consists of 4 pictures of the road with little to no traffic) 6. It is completely unnecessary to spend funds on a perfectly good road when so many other roads and projects are in disrepair (remember, this is the City and not involved with sub-division paving) 7. This is an industrial corridor there are multiple semi-truck deliveries daily to companies like Covidien, BI, Qualcomm, GE Medical, just to name a few 8. Boulder wants 30% of all commuters should ride their bikes and claim an average commute for all gunbarrel at 4 miles! I don't think the 1000's of workers at Covidien would agree with this 4 mile assessment. 9. This project is ONLY intended to serve bikers. Even Boulder admits that it's VERY optimistic goal of 30% is not likely. So over 70% of the rest of us are NOT being served by this waste of funds 10. This would also impact the entry/exit of Boulder Rural Fire that just build a beautiful facility on 63rd. I'm sure, in part, due to its easy access. 11. Not to mention that our entire summer would be dedicated to construction. Who's quality of life is this intended to improve????

63rd Tricia Dessel 5/28/2015

comments: I am OPPOSED TO RIGHT SIZING 63RD STREET FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: They just added additional lanes onto the diagonal due to addition of hotel and other residences. 2. There is already a bike lane immediately to the West of 63rd. If they need more room for bikes, widen that! 3. There are no turn lanes included on any design of the "right sizing" which would cause tremendous congestion. 4. Cars sitting at idle (due to congestion) emit much more greenhouse gasses (and worse gasses since it's NOx) than moving traffic. 5. Gunbarrel has added 100's of new residential apartments since their "study" (which as far as I could tell, consists of 4 pictures of the road with little to no traffic) 6. It is completely unnecessary to spend funds on a perfectly good road when so many other roads and projects are in disrepair (remember, this is the City and not involved with sub-division paving) 7. This is an industrial corridor there are multiple semi-truck deliveries daily to companies like Covidien, BI, Qualcomm, GE Medical, just to name a few 8. Boulder wants 30% of all commuters should ride their bikes and claim an average commute for all gunbarrel at 4 miles! I don't think the 1000's of workers at Covidien would agree with this 4 mile assessment. 9. This project is ONLY intended to serve bikers. Even Boulder admits that it's VERY optimistic goal of 30% is not likely. So over 70% of the rest of us are NOT being served by this waste of funds 10. This would also impact the entry/exit of Boulder Rural Fire that just build a beautiful facility on 63rd. I'm sure, in part, due to its easy access. 11. Not to mention that our entire summer would be dedicated to construction. Who's quality of life is this intended to improve????

63rd Kathleen Dye 5/20/2015

To whom it may concern: I don't know who picked the streets to try this on but it would seem that it is someone who hasn't driven 63rd at rush hour. To cut that street to one lane all the way to the diagonal would be a disaster during rush hour. Anyone who is aware of all the apartment building going on out here should know that traffic is going to be increasing dramatically and it will be cars not bikes and pedestrians. There is not enough employment in the area for all of the people who will be residing in the apartments. Please seriously reconsider this idea. The street just was worked on to provide a sidewalk on the east side of 63rd which seemed totally unnecessary as there is a very wide sidewalk on the west side. Anyone who drives this road sees very few people walking on

either side. Again one wonders whose idea that was and why. I think filling potholes with that money would have been a much wiser use of available funds.

63rd Kathleen Dye 5/28/2015

comments: Just a few reason this makes no sense. 1. They just added additional lanes onto the diagonal due to addition of hotel and other residences. 2. There is already a bike lane immediately to the West of 63rd. If they need more room for bikes, widen that! 3. There are no turn lanes included on any design of the right sizing which would cause tremendous congestion. 4. Cars sitting at idle (due to congestion) emit much more greenhouse gasses (and worse gasses since it's NOx) than moving traffic. 5. Gunbarrel has added 100's of new residential apartments since their study (which as far as I could tell, consists of 4 pictures of the road with little to no traffic) 6. It is completely unnecessary to spend funds on a perfectly good road when so many other roads and projects are in disrepair (remember, this is the City and not involved with sub-division paving) 7. This is an industrial corridor there are multiple semi-truck deliveries daily to companies like Covidien, BI, Qualcomm, GE Medical, just to name a few 8. Boulder wants 30% of all commuters should ride their bikes and claim an average commute for all gunbarrel at 4 miles! I don't think the 1000's of workers at Covidien would agree with this 4 mile assessment. 9. This project is ONLY intended to serve bikers. Even Boulder admits that it's VERY optimistic goal of 30% is not likely. So over 70% of the rest of us are NOT being served by this waste of funds 10. This would also impact the entry/exit of Boulder Rural Fire that just build a beautiful facility on 63rd. I'm sure, in part, due to its easy access. 11. Not to mention that our entire summer would be dedicated to construction. Who's quality of life is this intended to improve????

63rd Elaine Erb 6/1/2015

I'm excited to see this change to 63rd Street. At the moment, Gunbarrel is still awkward to ride around. I do ride through the area when I ride between Boulder and Niwot. Currently, I never follow the portion of the LOBO trail signed for Spine Road as I don't like to drive by all those parked cars. Having the option to ride bike lanes on Lookout and 63rd would greatly enhance the experience. This should also be beneficial to families in the area who may wish to ride to the shopping center.

63rd Sue Fattor 5/18/2015

To whomever it may concern, I am a proponent of cycling -- I helped coordinate Walk and Roll Grants for my kids' school (Heatherwood Elementary, in Gunbarrel), to encourage riding, and my husband and I both try to ride when we can to work, etc.; however, I do not think 63rd is a good choice for your "living lab corridor". There has been a construction boom in Gunbarrel, with a large amount of high density housing construction at Lookout and 63rd, and behind the King Soopers on Lookout, etc. As a result, traffic has increased along 63rd, and will continue to increase in the future, and I feel as though by decreasing the lanes available to cars will create a lot more traffic congestion, to an already congested corridor. I would really recommend and encourage you to consider other options. Sincerely, Sue Fattor

63rd James Hudson 5/27/2015

comments: I've lived in Gunbarrel in multiple locations since the mid-90s. I currently live in Powderhorn, and have spent the last two years riding my bike from there to my place of employment, CP+B which is also in Gunbarrel. To get there, I'd take the walking and bike path that already exists along 63rd. It was great and very convenient. In fact, I prefer the paths that are completely separated from the roadway like this one is. In my opinion, there's NO NEED to add more biking lanes to this small but busy stretch of road that ALREADY HAS A SUPERIOR BIKE PATH. Take it from a resident that lives and works here- traffic is going to get NOTHING BUT WORSE when these new developments are filled. Do not make the mistake of thinking that adding bike lanes that take away roadway is the solution- it's not. Please do not make our local traffic situation worse by making this foolish, unnecessary change.

63rd Barbara Pickett 5/20/2015

Re: "right sizing 63rd street" First of all I would like to know why those of us who live in the neighborhoods off 63rd have not been surveyed about our feelings regarding the changes to 63rd. Most of us will be negatively impacted by these changes during and after construction. Getting in and out of our neighborhoods will be more difficult. It will also be harder to exit from Avery Brewery, the Twin Lakes, Boulder Country Day school and the Fire House. Furthermore, the commercial area off 63rd is the only one in Gunbarrel and the majority of shoppers and commuters will continue to use vehicles because they either commute from somewhere else or need a vehicle for shopping. Considering the commuter traffic from Lookout, the overflow from occasional blockages on the Diagonal Highway, and new traffic loads from the projects under construction around Gun Park it seems that you are going to create traffic problems for a population that does not typically use this road for shopping or commuting. And last but not least wide bicycle path already runs alongside on the west of 63rd , why not just build one on the east? Sincerely Barbara Pickett

63rd David Rechberger 5/20/2015

Marni, David I am extremely concerned with even the thought of changing a perfectly good MAJOR Gunbarrel thoroughfare from existing 2 to 1 lanes. The traffic on this street is already dense. The "right sizing" would just make it impassable. I produce environmental equipment for the reduction of emissions from engines. What this "consulting" group is proposing is nothing short of a drastic increase in CO2, CO and NOx gas emissions from vehicles that will spend a vastly greater amount of time idling their vehicles due to extreme traffic congestion. As I'm sure you know, an idling vehicle produces the worst conditions for greenhouse emissions. Boulder, in their extreme wisdom, has added 100's of units to Gunbarrel in just the last few months. Is everyone expected to sit at home on welfare, or actually be able to travel for work? These "rightsizing" plans are VERY outdated for current population density in Gunbarrel. Or maybe great revenue generators for the city like Covidien will just up and move somewhere there employees can actually get to their worksite.

63rd Kurt Schlomberg 5/18/2015

The city of Boulder is considering "Right Sizing" its section of 63rd street from Lookout Road to Gunbarrel Avenue/Nautilus Drive (see <https://bouldercolorado.gov/goboulder/living-lab-candidate-corridor-63rdstreet>). As a resident of Gunbarrel, I wanted to let you know that I support improving the roads in the Gunbarrel area to reduce high volumes and to reduce higher speed travel, while supporting biking and pedestrians. I believe this plan will encourage drivers to slow down while pushing more traffic to the Diagonal Hwy, instead of the through-roads in Gunbarrel, while encouraging walking and biking. Sincerely, Kurt Schlomberg

63rd Kurt Schlomberg 5/28/2015

comments: I have reviewed the drawings of the proposed changes for 63rd Street and support the effort to make this area more pedestrian and bike friendly. With the sharp increase in condos and apartments in the area anything the city can do to reduce traffic impacts on those living in the area, including progressive redesign of streets, will help. Thank you, Kurt Schlomberg 4

63rd Joni Severson 5/20/2015

Hello, I live on Twin Lakes Rd. I received an email about the resizing project for 63rd Str. I think it is a really bad idea!! There is already a lot of traffic on that road. Now with the fire department being relocated, the new hotel, as well as all the new building going in behind King Soopers taking 63rd Str to one lane would be a huge error in judgement. Please add my opinion to those being collected relative this project. Thank you in advance for your time. Joni Severson

63rd Leslie Stinson 5/18/2015

I just have to say NO, NO, NO! What is wrong with all of you! Stay away from Gunbarrel! Leslie Stinson Leslie Stinson

63rd Martin Streim 5/18/2015

I am all for alternative modes of transportation but this is an extremely bad idea given the expansion of housing directly adjacent to 63rd Street in Gunbarrel. This commercial area is the only one in Gunbarrel and the majority of shoppers and commuters will continue to use vehicles because they either commute from somewhere else or need a vehicle for shopping. There are a number of older residents in Gunbarrel that need a vehicle for carrying groceries, etc. I think it would be possible to expand the sidewalk on the west side of 63rd street to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians. I believe this would be cheaper and safer for pedestrians, cyclists, buses, emergency vehicles, and other vehicles. Respectfully, Martin Streim

63rd Renee Von Roenn 5/20/2015

comments: This area (Lookout to Gunbarrel) has recently added more housing leading to more traffic. It is a dangerous corridor. PLEASE make updates for safety to this area. Many families and young children bike and walk in this area.

63rd Les 5/19/2015

Nobody wants this!!! No one is giving up their cars! Why don't you pave our roads first rather than ripping up the same ones over and over!!We don't need any more bad planning in Gunbarrel!Sent from my iPhone

Folsom Ian Huang 5/11/2015

on it has been a scary experience, wrestling with buses and trucks passing with in inches. As a cyclist, my preference is to have a buffered bike lane the entire way to Arapahoe. In addition, if it hasn't been pointed out, cyclists going north are blind to vehicles approaching from the east on Mapleton.

Folsom Matt Roberts 6/1/2015

I love this idea! There are so many bike paths that run east/west, but I find it hard to ride north/south because I don't like riding on the road right next to the traffic. Would you guys ever consider opening up streets comply to pedestrians? Like what they have done in Zurich? Maybe a combo of bus, bike, and walkers, but no cars? I would be cool to see either this current resizing concept or a total opening up of the street adopted in Pearl Street from the end of the bricked over section to Folsom. Or even farther, link up depot junction?!

Folsom Garret Schmidt 5/27/2015

comments: I'm totally biased (live on 23rd/Pearl) but having an installation on Folsom would be incredible. It's super heavily trafficked, but is also a critical road for cyclists to be able to get out, especially when commuting for groceries etc (considering the number of businesses east of this road). Anyway, huge proponent of this work, and hope to see it happen!

Folsom Brook Stableford 5/20/2015

Hello Marni. Glad to see you're still rocking with the bike/pedestrian work! I am writing in support of the separated bike lanes on Folsom. The materials I read online look like the plan is a go. Is this the case? Has the structure of stripes and barriers been decided? While I'm not much of a driver, I think the layout on the photo below looks great, assuming studies show that it will be sufficient for making left turns. Coincidentally, I now own 2340-2342 Folsom, which is the only property viewable in the picture, by the person with the red backback by

the parked subaru, so I'm certainly excited for hopefully quieter traffic and enhanced bike options. Also, at some point I'd like to talk about the degrading car culture in town as we seem to become the new So-Cal. I feel less and less safe on my bike, and see cars pulling wackier and more unbelievable moves every day. People are too busy to stop at signals and pay attention. Not that you can wave a wand and fix it all, but it's a big concern of mine as the city seems to be on a track to more faster money. Thanks for your time and attention! Brook

Folsom & Iris Dorie Glover 5/25/2015

comments: I love this idea of complete streets. I would like to bike more, but I am fearful of cars and so I don't bike as much as I could if there were safer ways to bike, away from cars. Introduction of barriers is a good idea, but also why not streets dedicated to biking only? (It may be a pipe dream, but wouldn't it be wonderful?)

Folsom & Iris Zach Swank 5/20/2015

Hello Marni, I wasn't able to make it to any of the open houses but I would like to voice my support for adding bike lanes on Iris and Folsom. As a person who drives and a person who bikes on both roads frequently, I support this endeavor. There are often large trucks that travel up and down Iris and they often pass too close to me in the bike lane. I don't blame them, they can't move over because lanes are too tight and there is generally a car on the other side of them. Still, Iris is probably the most dangerous road I bike on. So much so that I generally take Kalmia instead. While I don't generally travel on 55th or 63rd in a car or bike, I also support adding bike lanes there. As you know, the city is woefully behind schedule on their mode shift goals. Whether bike, bus, or carshare infrastructure, it is truly a case of if you build it they will come. While I bike commute every day year round and have chosen a willful sense of disbelief, the masses won't trade a steering wheel for handlebars unless they feel safe. I salute this bold move and also say, it's about time! Zach Swank Boulder

Iris Bill Belew 5/23/2015

comments: 1) Very disappointed that our entire neighborhood on Linden & Kalmia unaware of public meetings & proposed changes on Iris until 5/21. 2) Proposed changes in Iris will cause massive traffic jams in W/E bound Iris traffic, making it impossible to enter E on Iris from 16th, & bringing frustrated drivers off of Iris & onto Kalmia & Linden neighborhood. Terrible idea. Many options for bikers already exist.

Iris Andrew Churnside 5/27/2015

comments: Going from 2 lanes each direction to 4 would be a huge mistake. Traffic during peak times is already congested on this stretch and taking away passing opportunities can't do anything but make things worse. I'm all for innovative solutions to traffic

Iris Janice Demorest 5/22/2015

Alarmed that the city would consider narrowing Iris Ave by eliminating lanes for cars and adding bike lanes. Though a biker the car traffic flow is already tremendous. I challenge you all to driving it during rush hours. Perhaps a walk light at 16th and Iris would help get folks safely across and suggest further studies be made. What is proposed is dangerous and will lead to a huge traffic congestion at almost any time of day. Thank you. Jan Demorest

Iris Feancaba 5/20/2015

comments: Unbelievable! If you narrow Broadway in vicinity of N.Bldr. Rec. Center to 1 lane it would be a disaster. Let the bike lanes go behind the rec center and the cars go on Bdwy. Traffic already heavy esp. around Iris & Bdwy. Some of us NEED cars & can't ride bikes. You are not facing reality & only interested in Boulder's "image". Even California doesn't try to force everyone to use bikes.

Iris Liora Halperin 5/22/2015

Dear City Council, I'm a resident of the melody-catalpa neighborhood (16th and Kalmia) and have been informed of the proposals to narrow Iris to two lanes (or three, to include a turn lane) and to add bike lanes. This proposal would directly affect me as someone who drives on Iris nearly everyday and I wanted to express my opposition to it. Yes, it is good to add bike lanes where possible, but Boulder still needs its core infrastructure for cars, especially as the population and density of Boulder is expected to increase. Even bikers often own cars and use them for a variety of reasons. Boulder has a small number of arterial roads (Broadway, Folsom, Iris) and we need to keep that limited network free and open (which will then allow the rest of the streets in Boulder to be nice corridors for bikes (13th st is a great corridor for bikes, as is Kalmia--keep Kalmia the main E-W corridor for bikes. Iris flows well right now; with half as many lanes, it will be backed up much more frequently. The addition of left turn lanes seems like a small gain: there just aren't that many people turning left from Iris and I've never experienced that as a frustration. The experience of sitting in traffic is not going to make people bike more often. Many of those people already bike as often as they can, but need their car to transport their young children, pick up supplies or groceries, or commute to places in the area that are less well served by busses. Please abandon this proposal to narrow Iris. Thank you, Liora Halperin

Iris Thomas Hast 5/26/2015

comments: As a resident along this corridor and a property owner on Cloverleaf Dr., I strongly oppose this plan for Iris. Iris is already at capacity with two lanes in both directions during several blocks of time every weekday. Now that you have shortened the left turn arrow time from Iris turning south on Broadway, there is often a substantial backup of two lanes of cars waiting to turn through 2 or even occasionally 3 cycles. I certainly support making it easier to traverse Boulder by bicycle, but there is a limit to how much more difficult that should make car traffic. Experience over the past 40 years has shown that most efforts to get people out of their cars and onto bicycles or public transportation have failed with congestion and parking just getting worse. Some of us need to travel around town by car for work. I feel the same way about Folsom. You can't just throttle down all the north south and east west corridors to Broadway, 28th, 30th and Canyon. Of these projects, obviously Iris is the most important since it is the only open east west corridor in N. Boulder. Thanks.

Iris Paul Hunnicutt 5/27/2015

comments: I live close to 19th and Iris and work at 28th and Iris Avenue. I drive/bike this road every day, multiple times per day. I have lived there since 2007. Changing Iris Avenue between Folsom and Broadway from a 4 lane road to a 2 lane road with a center turning lane is terrible idea and a complete waste of taxpayer money. This is a well travelled road that does not need a reduction in the number of lanes. There are not any intersections with a pressing need to have a center turning lane. There already exists a bike lane and all it needs is perhaps a curb or some of those small round bumps imbedded in the asphalt to alert a car it is drifting into the bike lane. Or create an alternative bike route on Grape Avenue or Kalmia and direct bike traffic there. At rush hour the road is already crowded and losing a lane in each direction will result in increased traffic, lots of cars idling in traffic, and increased traffic on alternate neighborhood routes. It will NOT in any way help reduce carbon emissions, or get people to drive less no matter what any consultant report has told city council. Improving the crosswalk at 15th street (at the baseball fields) would be a very good idea for both cars and pedestrians. The crosswalk is in a dangerous spot as to where it enters 15th street. It would be much better placed mid block instead of on one side of 15th. Cars heading east on Iris turning south onto 15th street cannot see pedestrians coming up to the cross walk heading north. Likewise pedestrians cannot see cars turning and have to cross 15th to the wrong side of the street to use the crosswalk, while avoiding cars turning onto 15th from a "blind" turn. Improving the bike lane by adding some sort of minimal divider between the bike land and traffic is all that is required on Iris Avenue. Please do not implement this change to Iris Avenue! DO NOT change Iris from a 4 lane to 2 lane road.

Iris Drew Levinson 5/26/2015

Hi. I don't know if I'll be able to make these discussions. I live at 1715 Lombardy and my son goes to Foothill Elementary so we are familiar with the area as bikers and pedestrians. And yes, I drive, and of course drive on Iris. I want to type and say I'm in favor of leaving Iris the way it is. 2 lanes each direction. I would make one modification though. At 15th and Iris, there is a median for crossing the street and a sign going eastbound and westbound, alerting drivers to the fact that there is a crosswalk there and it is the law to stop for pedestrians. I propose putting in a 'pedestrian activated button' (flashing light) right there, where all of the hardware already is-this seems like a really inexpensive and smart addition to that area. Seems like an easy addition. "Let's do it", I say! Examples of these are North of Linden at the top of that Broadway Hill, Folsom near Forest, 28th near Iris/Safeway, 28th near Pearl/Whole Foods, you know. Iris is zoned for 35, and those flashing lights would help a lot to warn traffic of a crossing pedestrian, especially on the SW corner of 15th and Iris, where the visibility is actually pretty poor. (worth checking out.) Thanks. Drew

Iris Linda Marntin 5/22/2015

comments: Changing Iris Ave from 4 lanes to 2 lanes with a middle turn lane is a terrible idea! Iris is a continuation of the Diagonal Highway and is the only major East/West corridor north of Canyon. All four lanes are needed to handle the amount of commuter traffic getting across town on the north side as well as the multitude of neighborhood residents that use Iris. All lanes that exist now are needed to handle the daily amount of traffic. Removing two of the lanes in favor of putting in a middle turn lane, for the few cars that turn left (as compared to the the majority of other cars) will turn the road into a parking lot of angry commuters and local residents. These angry commuters who need to use Iris to get anywhere will be forced off of Iris and will turn to neighborhood roads to be able to get anywhere. Neighborhood roads like Linden and Meadow between 19th and 26th, as well as the neighborhoods on the south side of 19th (Grape, Glenwood and Floral) will become thoroughfares. Besides being neighborhood roads where there are children and dogs, those roadways were not designed for high volumes of traffic. Removing the ability for drivers to use the roadways meant for high traffic volume will only cause problems and aggravation. In addition - in the winter when snow plowing happens, the new proposed configuration of the bike lanes will force plows to pile the snow in the middle of the road (as the often do now on Folsom). This would stop traffic on Iris altogether if someone decided to turn left, making Iris unusable on snowy days. If you add in the fact that RTD bus #208 runs up and down Iris (with at least one stop in the proposed area right at 19th), having only one lane of traffic and a blocked off bike lane, will force the bus to stop in the only lane available and again cause traffic tie-ups. This entire proposal is a bad idea.

Iris Amy McCormick 5/22/2015

Hello, I know that there's a lot of changes in store for Iris between Broadway and 28th. I really hope that the crosswalk at 15th and iris will be equipped with a flashing light. Our family lives north of Iris and we use that crosswalk often— we feel that traffic doesn't stop consistently for pedestrians or cyclists. Also, my son will be crossing that crosswalk daily next year when he attends Casey and I'm worried about him and other kids trying to get to school. Please include safety improvements to that crosswalk in your plan. Thank you, Amy McCormick

Iris John Meadows 6/2/2015

I live at 2180 Norwood. I think that this is god awful idea. Lived in Boulder since 1960. In North Boulder since 1965. Have lived on Linden, Balsam and Mapleton. Driving on Iris I think taking two lanes to one lane in each direction will back up traffic between 28th and Broadway. Same with Folsom corridor. It will be an absolute mess and will divert traffic to many other corridors. I think it's a bad idea.

Iris Pete Olesen 5/7/2015

Subject: Proposed plan for Iris avenue I received a living lab postcard in the mail outlining a plan to close two lanes of traffic on Iris Avenue and put a turn lane in the center. My in-laws went to the open house on

Wednesday. No presentation, just people to "answer questions. Not a good sign. I live on 17th and Iris and my in-laws live on 13th and Iris. My wife and I along with my in-laws also own a rental property at 1800 Iris. As a family, we have a lot at stake both personally and financially. If you believe our property tax assessments, collectively we have 2 million dollars in property values at risk. This plan cannot possibly have a good outcome. The volume of traffic is simply way too high to consider closing even one lane, let alone two. We have lived here for 15 years and have seen the traffic volume. If anything, it has increased over the years. You simply cannot cut capacity in half on such a high volume street. If you really want to see what this would be like,, close off two lanes of traffic temporarily for a month. Count up the number of accidents and damage to cars that occur during that week. Study 2 the traffic flow before and after the closure. It will take about 10 minutes to see how disasterous this will be. If you proceed with this plan, we will consider legal options. As a family, we cannot sit by and watch our property values be destroyed. This whole thing stinks to high heaven. The deal is already done and the residents here have not had any input on the design. This makes the boondoggle of Hwy 36 look like nothing. Please call me. Pete Olesen

Iris Linda Olesen 5/24/2015

I have been seeing our neighborhood discussion of this and would like to comment. The idea is lovely, but it seems like there really is a lot of traffic on Iris as one of very few (maybe the only...) street carrying traffic east and west-ish without going through smaller neighborhood streets. So I wonder what the larger plan is, and appreciate the concern that more traffic will likely route through the neighborhood here (Melody Catalpa). Traffic into the ballparks on 16th may create some backlog on Iris with a single lane, and regular traffic does already at times turning on 19th. I am rarely stopped by someone making a left turn on Iris, particularly compared to Broadway. However, I frequently cannot make a left on to Broadway without waiting through several lights - so the idea of decreasing that to one left turn lane really concerns me. If we are concentrating traffic, there will still be as many trying to make a left here. I hope that part of the plan is not implemented immediately until information about where cars go if Iris begins to be frustrating to use. Thanks for your efforts - the intentions are wonderful. Linda

Iris Marcus P 5/16/2015

I was originally a little concerned about trying to pull out of my development on 22nd onto iris with only one lane but I loved the meetings you did where I was able to talk to somebody that explained why it would actually be easier than it is now. Now I'm 100% behind this! Go traffic calming! And I love this Living Lab concept where you come up with ideas, think hard about them and then try them. Nice work! Looking forward to riding over to the foothills with my kids on that bike lane as opposed to now where we avoid iris like the plague.

Iris Nick Robles 5/19/2015

I work for Boulder County and I often ride my bicycle that last mile to North Broadway and Iris campus. I take the BOLT RTD bus from my home in Longmont that leaves me at 28th/Iris. Currently, Iris feels dangerous for me when I am riding my bike. Although there are bike lanes, the car lanes are so narrow that cars/trucks/trailers get very close to bumping into me even when I am in the bike lane, almost forcing me to ride in the gutter instead of the actual road. I support this new concept. Thanks! Nick Robles

Iris Don Ryan 5/24/2015

comments: Safety first: making travel safer on Iris for a few additional bikers will likely push the vehicular traffic to side streets, such as Kalmia, which are very poorly designed for multi-modal traffic. These side streets are likely to become less safe for daily users, residents, and especially children. That is a very poor trade-off. These solutions are not reducing traffic volume. They just hope to do that. Follow the money: Streets aren't equitable because vehicles pay for them in the form of licenses, taxes, and more taxes for fuel. Why not start licensing, taxing and tolling bicycles in the same way to establish equity and pay for these improvements? Separate the

traffic: expanding multi use bikeways along creeks, greenways, and dedicated corridors would be much more successful in increasing bike use by the elderly, women, and families. Boulder already has miles of these trails. Complete Streets sound like a nice idea, and might be the right answer for some corridors, but not Iris!

Iris Caron Schwartz 5/23/2015

comments: I wonder if anyone "experimenting" with changes on Iris Avenue has ever spent time at the intersection of 16th and Iris... I live on Kingwood Place and leave my neighborhood on foot, bike, scooter or car via 16th Street, ending up where it intersects with Iris. Everyone who lives in Melody Heights knows it is nearly impossible to cross south with each of these modes of transportation. I think a crosswalk of some type or even a "sanctuary" in the middle of Iris at 16th would make crossing the street here safer and easier. Yes. I could walk, bike and scoot to the crosswalk at 13th, but that is not convenient when all I'm trying to do is get across the street to head east on Iris. By car, it's damn near impossible to make that left turn. Turning Iris into a two-lane road is asking for serious backups, which will likely make trying to cross the street at 16th even more treacherous.

Iris Joy Spring 5/21/2015

comments: I just learned about this program for Iris and want to register my negative comment for the program on this road. This is the only east-west 4-lane road in this part of town and is heavily used. the traffic congestion would be huge and the benefits limited as few individuals are seen riding this stretch

Iris Peter Stokes 5/23/2015

comments: I am against the proposed changes to Iris Avenue west of Folsom St. My neighborhood (Melody-Catalpa) already receives extra speeding vehicle traffic whenever there's a backup on Iris or Broadway, and it will only get worse if this plan is implemented. The plan has the look of a poorly thought through social engineering experiment that will come at the cost of quality of life in the surrounding area. It's an example of the difference between the goals of certain city officials and the needs of city residents. Iris Avenue works reasonably well the way it is now, so I view the plan as a solution in search of a problem.

Iris Richard W 5/16/2015

I agree, the proposed plan is a big improvement over the current conditions.

Iris Frank 5/20/2015

comments: Top 5 dumbest Boulder ideas. Iris only thru street in N. boulder. Many times both lanes have block long waits at 38th and also at Broadway. There are almost no bikes on Iris.DON'T MAKE THIS CHANGE.

Iris Anonymous 5/26/2015

I have been reading up about the proposed changes for Iris. As a long time resident on Kalmia, I think this is a disaster waiting to happen. Not sure why you would want to change an already congested street into a smaller street with bike lanes. This is a major east-west street. Any reduction of lanes will only drive people into neighborhoods and create delays on Iris. Kalmia already has enough cut-through traffic. We have plenty of bikers that take advantage of a smaller street rather than ride along with lots of traffic on Iris. Bikes cut through neighborhoods to save time and distance. Iris to the west goes nowhere but into Broadway where there are bike lanes on the sidewalks. Why not just continue that concept down Iris and leave the lanes alone?? PLEASE rethink this insanity.