

Attachment A –

April 27, 2016 Canyon Blvd Complete Streets Study Open House Meeting

Summary of Feedback

More than 35 people attended the open house meeting and feedback was gained in a variety of ways including:

- Oral feedback to project representatives
- Sticky-notes/comments directly on the presentation boards
- Official public feedback boards regarding the vision, goals and objectives as well as the type of bicycle facility and where to focus the space and improvements on
 - Feedback on these topics listed above was provided through a dots preference activity where participants indicated their choice with a dot. The total is indicated as a number in parentheses below.

1. Important objectives

From the *dots preference activity board at the meeting*, the most important objective was:

- Maintain Canyon Blvd.'s function as a cross-connector for vehicular through-traffic (4 dots were placed at this objective) followed by
- Improve walking and bicycling experience along the corridor and at crossings (3 dots), Reducing Canyon Blvd. as a barrier through urban design (3) and Use landscaping and street trees to help define the edges to Civic Area park & reduce effects of vehicular street noise to pedestrians, bicyclists and park users (3)

From *the comment forms completed at the meeting*, the most important objective was

- Increase safety for people traveling in the corridor (5) followed by Improve the walking and bicycling experience along the corridor and at crossings (4).
- Protect and enhance historic resources... (3) and Use landscaping and Street trees.... (3).

2. Features to focus space on Canyon Blvd.

Another *dots preference exercise activity at the meeting* requested feedback on preferences for which features to focus the space on (wider pedestrian facilities, wider bicycle facilities, enhance transit facilities, tree-lined median, public gathering spaces, amenity zone enhancements and/or other). Attendees were asked to indicate a first and second choice and the Wider pedestrian and wider bicycle facilities received an equal number of first choices (6 each). The Tree-lined median received the most second choice preference (8).

From the *comment forms completed at the meeting*, the feedback on preferences for first choice was Wider bicycle facilities (2). Meeting attendees selected Wider pedestrian facilities (3) as their second choice for features to focus on.

3. Bicycle Facility type

The *dots exercise board at the meeting* on bicycle facility type showed a preference for one-way protected bike lanes on both sides of the street (9).

The *meeting comment forms* on bicycle facility type preference showed an equal preference for one-way protected bike lane on both sides of street and one-way buffered bike lanes, both sides. (2 each)

4. Written comments related to Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study – Please note that the number in parentheses reflects the number of times a comment was written.

- There is a lack of service/delivery loading zones for residential and commercial (2)
- Recognize the residential access
- Consider a name that doesn't include "Complete" - Enhanced?
- Narrow the road (3)
- Separation of bicyclists from pedestrians (2)
- Roundabout at Canyon Blvd and 9th Street to slow down speeding vehicles and provide opportunities for gateway features
- Enhance safety and experience of pedestrians crossing with raised crossings, landscaped medians
- Reduce speed of cars along Canyon by varying width of street and make it less linear/curving into north and south edges intermittently (2)
- 2 way protected bike lanes on north or south sides are dangerous (3)
- Option 6 – the mixing area of pedestrians and bicyclists adjacent to the Glen Huntington Band Shell is unsafe for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- More accommodations for buses at peak times
- Concerned about safety on turns with a lot of bikes and trees on Canyon
- Use a variety of tree species that leaf and color at different times. May also help to soften the linear wall that is developing along the north side of Canyon Blvd.

- Keep the Glen Huntington Band Shell in current location (2)
- Show what happens at transitions at 9th and 17th streets
- Prefer fewer trees in median for less maintenance needs (2) from tree damage from heavy snows.
- Do not impact ability to clean storm drains. We always have standing water at intersections with Canyon and several north side streets
- Do not do anything to increase water run off
- Don't do social engineering on our streets any more. It is preferred by a minority of people. Remember the "silent majority" really does exist.
- Don't slow traffic – it will increase our polluted air even more.
- Bicycle lanes separate from road can't be seen by cars so less safe and not as useful for their direct travel needs.
- Pedestrian overpass taking people over traffic and bike flow instead of crossing through traffic
- Important to keep historic elements as they add diversity
- Canyon needs landscaping to buffer street

Attachment B –

Online Community Feedback provided through Survey Gizmo Comment Forms

Summary

41 persons provided input via the online comment form, which focused on:

1. what were the most important objectives for the Canyon Boulevard Complete Streets Study
2. first and second choices for where to focus the space and improvements on
3. their preference for bicycle facility type
4. other ideas related to Canyon Boulevard Complete Streets Study

1. Important Objectives

From the *online comment form*, the preferences on most important objectives were indicated within the goal area. Respondents were not limited as to the number of important objectives to indicate a preference for; the percentage of responses indicating a preference for that objective is in parentheses’.

- Within the Complete Streets Goal area, “Improve the walking and bicycling experience along the corridor and at crossings” was the most important objective (73%).
- Within the Design Excellence Goal area, “Reducing Canyon Boulevard as a barrier through urban design” was the most important objective (65%)
- Within the Preserve Heritage Goal area, “Protect and enhance historic resources through careful treatment of designated sites, ensuring work is consistent with the Historic Preservation ordinance” was the most important objective (59%)
- With Nature Goal area, “Promote a shift in travel preferences from single occupancy vehicles to reduce greenhouse gas emissions” was the most important objective in the (77%).

2. Features to focus space on

- From the *online comment form*, 75% of the preferred first choices was for Wider bicycle facilities and 76% of the preferred second choices was Enhanced transit facilities

3. Bicycle Facility Type

- The *online comment form* results showed a preference for protected bike lanes (20 of the 41 respondents).

4. Additional comments submitted with the online form related to Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study. The number in parentheses reflects the number of times a comment was written.

Encourage people to walk/bike/bus instead of driving (3)

Under/Over passes for bikes & pedestrians to cross Canyon

Improve visibility - trees/bushes block pedestrians from view.

Require cyclist to stop at crosswalks

Canyon is a major thoroughfare for vehicle traffic and needs to remain so (2).

Make Canyon a 3-lane boulevard so that it is not a barrier (2).

Please no more stop lights!

I do not see Canyon Boulevard as worthy of the term heritage - it is a road that serves a function. Let's improve that functionality.

its current state is not heritage?

I don't see much heritage on Canyon. The 4-lane street already destroyed it.

Canyon is a barrier to cycling throughout Boulder. Let's change that. And the downtown bus station and transit gets hung up due to the Broadway/Canyon mess. Let's improve that.

In the town center, pedestrians MUST be the design imperative. Bicycling must be allowed on the town center sections of Canyon.

We need more bike infrastructure in Boulder, and this is a good example of a street that has none. All other reasons for widening the streets put safety as a lesser priority. Preferably, a protected bike lane would go all the way from the end of the canyon to 28th street.

Enhancing cycling options and safety can only benefit the health of our city.

In the tight and busy area of Canyon, high speed vehicles are dangerous, and things like street furniture in the right of way create congestion. Ideally pedestrians should be able to move efficiently and personal, gas-powered transportation should be discouraged.

Walnut is a key bike corridor and improvements have been made to Arapahoe for biking. Pedestrian and transit improvements should come first on Canyon.

Keep it as shared-lane bicycle route.

Keep bike traffic on the Boulder bike path and off the street.

Tree lined median will impede driver site lines for turns.

Having pleasant spaces for people to congregate is also important if we want them to linger instead of pass through.

Dedicated right-of-way for small electric vehicles, skate boards, senior carts, bicycles, etc.

Protected intersection with no permissive left turns for turning cars.

Attachment C

May 18, 2016 Joint Boards and Commissions Meeting

Summary

A total of 19 members representing eight city boards and commissions attended this meeting to provide feedback on the vision, goals and objectives and the range of conceptual design options. The Boards and Commissions included the Transportation Advisory Board, Planning Board, Landmarks Board, Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, Design Advisory Board, Downtown Management Commission, Library Commission, and Boulder Arts Commission.

The group began with a guided vision exercise and participants were asked to imagine walking, biking, drive, taking the bus, spending time on Canyon in the future and to pick and share an image that captures their future vision. Themes that were captured included:

- Trees – People inhabiting space, slow speed
- Natural/man made
- Less vulnerability/unsafeness (than currently)
- Slower speed more space for pedestrians.
- Built/natural coexisting in inspired way
 - Trees/buildings
 - + Safety Visionary
 - + Slowing Street
 - + Harmony
 - = Delight!!!
- Diversity + Equity – Everyone feels entitled to be there
- Natural-non-manufactured
- Fluid – ability to go fast, slow, or stop
- Mode split – more peds + bikes
 - Quieter + cleaner – electric vehicles
 - Encourage non-car mobility
- Aesthetically pleasing
- Safe, inviting
 - Families + seniors have access to parking
- Unique to Boulder – reflective of Boulder’s uniqueness
- Reducing CO₂ emissions
- Beauty/leisure/tree tunnel “enclosure”
 - sunny buffered environment for cycling
- Bells & whistles
 - separate travel options
 - lighting – security/safety
 - transitions into creek area from businesses

- Slow down – removed from traffic
 - place to be...quiet
- French boulevard café's – sitting
 - Euro sophistication, amenity continece
 - Human element dominance
- Downtown → Civic Area; should fit like a puzzle, connectivity local and regional
- Speed of the road – friction of differing users
- Synergy and shared space
- Time – historical connection to mountains
- Ten years from now being pleased with ourselves because of non-motorized transport investment
- Sense of success/victory by using Canyon
- Comfortable, inviting, social, green, inviting to people
 - More activity

The group viewed the project's vision statement and then discussed if they had proposed changes to be considered. Ideas included:

- Add mention of state highway connection to mountains
- Add mention of maintain vehicle level of service
- Change the first paragraph to say, "Canyon Boulevard will become an accessible, safe, and inviting travel experience for pedestrians and bicyclists, while accommodating transit users and cars traveling across and along the corridor."
- In the first paragraph, change "transit" to "transit users"
- In the first paragraph, change "cars" to "motorists"
- In the second paragraph, change the first sentence to say, "Canyon Boulevard serves as a vital and organic connection, a linkage..."
- In the second paragraph, change, "...important destination and a connector" to, "...desirable destination and connector"
- In the second paragraph, emphasize that Canyon should be BOTH a destination and connector

The group was then asked to use their future vision and indicate their preferences for important Study objectives by allocating up to 30 poker chips to any of the objectives. The objective receiving the most poker chips was:

- Improve the walking and bicycling experience along the corridor and at crossings (73 chips)

Followed by

- Use landscaping and street trees to help define the edges to Civic Area park and reduce the effects of vehicular street noise to pedestrians, bicyclists and park users. (61 chips)
- Increase the quality of streetscaping and incorporate art and culture (57)

- Increase safety for people traveling in the corridor (51)

Regarding the range of options the group then discussed if there was anything missing and if there was a full range of options. Ideas given from individual board or commission members included:

- a. No-median option
- b. Reduced vehicle travel lanes
- c. Transit option
 - i. shared bus and bicycle lane in the future
- d. Greater separation of users types

Other comments related to Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study were made and included:

- Center running multi-use path
- On-street parking
- I appreciate the way the city's history was incorporated directly into the sidewalks and bus stops on Broadway from Alpine north as an example of a nice way to get to that goal of "Boulderish." There is so much history around Canyon Blvd--what an exciting opportunity to be really creative.
- "Parkway" vision – drive through the park!
- Concerned about the curbs in median
 - Visual barrier?
- Node + focal points
- Visual interest
- The park should "wash up" into downtown
 - Canyon Boulevard vanishes
- Add enhancements to north/south travel
 - Include diagrams of pedestrian crossings
- Options need variety – as presented they are extensions of a zoning diagram without acknowledgments of nodes
- Consider nodes, focal points, rotary
- Consider curving, sloping of edges
- Pedestrian overpass between 9th and Broadway
- Need to define who the target bicycle user is, tourists and commuters have different needs
- What is the plan for bicycle travel flow at 9th and at 17th
- (Option 4: 2-way, protected bicycle lane on south side) is not desirable for pedestrians that must look both ways and is not desirable for bicyclists.
- Concerned with mixed-use path that has no distinction. Decreased safety for both pedestrians and bicyclists. I don't really see a tourist use, but the mixed-use option does not provide a real alternative for commuters that are using the Boulder Creek path.
- Revised median treatment

- Parking an option
- Center bike median
- Loading zone and separate drop-off zones
- No options missing
- Like separation of modes by speed to reduce conflicts
- Like decent sidewalks on both sides
- Save existing trees?
- Safety concern regarding two-way travel bike facility
- Will the continuous trees block views to the Civic Area?
- Make the corridor unique to Boulder reflective of Boulder's character and create a corridor that will have a lasting, positive impact into the future
- Reduce CO₂ emissions/make sustainable
- Allow the human element to dominate

Attachment D

May 31, 2016 City Council Study Session on Transportation Master Plan (TMP) implementation and focus on Complete Streets

PRESENT:

City Council: Mayor Suzanne Jones, Mayor Pro Tem Mary Young, Council Members Lisa Morzel, Andrew Shoemaker, Aaron Brockett, Matt Appelbaum, Sam Weaver, Jan Burton, and Bob Yates

Staff members: Jane Brautigam, City Manager; Maureen Rait, Executive Director of Public Works; Michael Gardner-Sweeney, Director of Public Works for Transportation; Gerrit Slatter, Principal Transportation Projects Engineer; Carey Sager, Acting Transportation Maintenance Manager; Bill Cowern, Traffic Operations Engineer; Kathleen Bracke, GO Boulder Manager; Noreen Walsh, Senior Transportation Planner; Randall Rutsch, Senior Transportation Planner; Dave Kemp, Senior Transportation Planner; Marni Ratzel, Senior Transportation Planner; Jean Sanson, Senior Transportation Planner; Jenna Pratt, Budget and Financial Analyst

The purpose of the May 31 study session was to provide the City Council with an update on the city's progress implementing the 2014 [*Transportation Master Plan*](#) (TMP) and seek council feedback regarding several key Complete Streets initiatives, including the Canyon Boulevard Complete Streets Study. Specifically City Council was asked if they had questions and feedback regarding the Canyon Boulevard Complete Streets study goals, objectives, evaluation measures and conceptual design options.

The presentation regarding the Canyon Boulevard Complete Streets Study provided background on the study's purpose and scope, timeline and current status of work tasks including, the development of the vision, goals, objectives, and proposed evaluation measures as well as the range of conceptual design options to be evaluated as the study moves forward to selecting a preferred conceptual design option.

General Conclusions for the Canyon Boulevard Complete Streets Study Based on City Council Discussion

Focus on the connections at the western and eastern terminus and entry points are important.

Have options for the community and council to consider prior to selection of a preferred conceptual design option.

Canyon is an important transit corridor and can be an important bike corridor.

Continue to support and inform the Civic Area Plan.

Have a joint City Council and Transportation Advisory Board Study Session.

General Comments from the City Council Discussion

The council's discussion and questions included the following questions, ideas and topics related to Canyon Boulevard. The staff response is shown in *Italics*, following the questions from council.

Consider naming the options with a title that is more identifiable with its features or characteristics.

How does this affect the Chamberlain historic district?

At this time, it is anticipated that changes near the Chamberlain Historic District are within the right-of-way. Changes to private property, including alterations to the existing buildings, are not proposed as part of the project. Any changes within the historic district boundaries would require review and approval through a Landmark Alteration Certificate.

Goals are good but could have more definition such as a goal of safety at a specific location.

Please keep the historic preservation community included in the process.

Take a bigger look at having Canyon be more of a transit corridor including central loading, really convenient stops.

Make sure options do not interfere with the good transit service and facilities.

Canyon is an important bike corridor too.

Benches are a wonderful facility for 87 year olds – having them at many points along the corridor would be great and useful for resting and gathering.

Changing the land use/occupation on the north side of Canyon will help activate the area too.

Attachment E

Feedback from the June 3, 2016 Youth Opportunities Advisory Board (YOAB) meeting

Thirteen board members were in attendance as well as the Board liaison.

There was an overview of the project schedule, study scope and purpose and then a guided vision exercise of the future Canyon Boulevard. A discussion with YOAB members about what they would like a future Canyon Boulevard to be resulted with these thoughts and ideas, and the number in parentheses indicates the number of times the comment was communicated:

- Safe and comfortable street, calming not anxiety causing, enjoyable (2)
- Clear – clear in terms of what you’re supposed to do and less anxiety causing
- Comfortable benches, shady spots
- Separation of traffic types – vehicles, bikes, pedestrians, transit riders (2)
- Expedient and safe at same time
- Safe and open
- Clean, clear and easy to access
- Colorful – for example, flowers
- Open – ease congestion for all
- Inviting park use – have more reasons to be there

YOAB members provided their feedback on important objectives, where to focus space on for improvements and preference of bicycle facility type. Feedback on these topics listed was provided through a dots preference activity where participants indicated their choice with a dot. The total is indicated as a number in parentheses’ below.

1. Important objectives

- From the *dots preference activity board at the meeting*, the most important objective was

Increase safety for people traveling in the corridor (11), followed by

- Increase quality of streetscaping and incorporate art and culture (8) and Use landscaping and street trees to help define the edges to Civic Area park, reduce the effects of vehicular street noise to pedestrians, bicyclists and park users (6)

2. Features to focus space on Canyon Boulevard

Another *dots exercise activity board at the meeting* requested feedback on preferences for which features to focus the space on (wider pedestrian facilities, wider bicycle facilities,

enhance transit facilities, tree-lined median, public gathering spaces, amenity zone enhancements and/or other).

Wider bicycle facilities was the top first choice (8) and the top second choice was a tree-lined median (6)

3. Bicycle Facility type

The *dots exercise board at the meeting* on bicycle facility type showed a preference for protected bike lanes with the top preference being the two-way protected bike lane (7)

Additional comments and questions received:

- Consider more Underpass crossings
- Incorporate art in the public gathering spaces and amenity zones for more culture and cultural experiences.
- Will Canyon Boulevard have lane or road closures to construct these improvements?

Attachment F

Additional feedback received on the Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study

- Adding bikes to Canyon is wasteful and dangerous – smacks of Folsom project; bike path along creek is adequate
- Waste of funding
- Put bicyclists at end of study area with no place to go
- Include a No Build option
- Expanding the improvements or study boundary from the city line to Folsom Street to improve the pedestrian travel along and across Canyon
- Prefer 11 foot wide vehicle lanes to accommodate transit vehicles
- Lighting, safety design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities near RTD facility
- Revise vision statement to “Canyon will be accessible, safe, and inviting for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users – not just for cars.” – Canyon is already very good for cars
- 130’ cross sections in all options are too wide and will continue Canyon as a barrier
- Include an option where at least one through lane is removed – possibly coupled with a reversible lane, if necessary
- Lower average car speeds to improve pedestrian experience and safety
- In a town center, use pedestrian and/or bicycle level of service, not vehicular level of service
- Memo should not indicate that parallel bicycle facilities are appropriate to use – they do not provide direct access or facility for the range of users
- Incorporate a design that enhances bus movements on Canyon from Broadway to transit station
- Provide parking in outlying areas with shuttles to the interior or Civic area
- Change from state highway to city street
- Decrease overall width to make it more human scale
- Put more emphasis on pedestrian crossings – do not worsen the “across” movements with the “along” design