

# Report for Folsom Street Living Lab Feedback

1. Today, Folsom Street has protected bike lanes from Valmont to Spruce. BEFORE: Four travel lanes and conventional bike lanes TODAY: Two travel lanes, center turn lane and protected bikes lanes Based on your experience with the current treatment, what do you recommend? - comments

Count	Response
2	Thank you so much for keeping these bike lanes. I would not feel comfortable or safe biking on Folsom otherwise. I much appreciate the protected bike lanes from last summer and was very sad when they were taken out or reduced. The sections of Folsom bike lanes that were reduced are much less safe now.
1	Could start more north than spruce
1	I think the current arrangement is really good
1	A separate bike lane on the west side of Folsom next to the sidewalk would be far better than the current setup. Trying to mix cars and bikes on the same roadway does not seem optimal.
1	Actually I don't know much about this section of Folsom and don't have a strong opinion.
1	Add back in the protected bike lane on south Folsom please.
1	Add bollards to the entire section.
1	Additional safety is worth fewer travel lanes. I have not experienced delays by car.
1	Additionally, please do not use this tactic in other areas.
1	After they fixed it, I think it's fine. Sadly our streets just weren't originally made for bikes in some areas.
1	Allows more vehicular traffic at all times.
1	An actual curb or planter barrier would feel even safer for cyclists and look nicer.
1	And continue expanding. I love them, feel safe and valued more equally as a car on the road.
1	And extend. Iris to creek path. Bikes need COMPLETE, DIRECT, SAFE routes. A N/S connector in Boulder is completely lacking. Without COMPLETE routes, most people will not consider riding. Bits of protected bike lane here and there do not persuade them.
1	As a bicyclist, I find these lanes silly and the bollards very ugly. I think we should spend the money and use the space for an off street bikepath, separated from the road and the sidewalk!
1	As a cyclist, I personally felt safe enough on the previous lane and as long as car traffic can be handled with just the one car lane then keep it this way

## Count Response

- | Count | Response   |
|-------|--|
| 1     | As a cyclist, the protected bike lane is fantastic, especially in contrast to the section of Folsom just south where it feels like I'm cheating death.   |
| 1     | As a driver, the sudden appearance and disappearance of these lanes is stressful and potentially dangerous. I wonder how out of town drivers know what to do, especially those with visual impairments, or at night or in bad weather. As a cyclist, wobbly bollards don't really make a difference - how much protection do they provide? Nothing. A concrete wall is a different story. The pavement on the bike lanes is rough and unpleasant to ride on. The markings are not universally understood and too difficult to interpret while driving or cycling. I think this whole idea is misguided. I just don't see that this makes much difference from the former bike lanes. The protected lanes on Baseline seem different, however, I'm not sure why but those are very nice and feel much safer than a regular bike lane. |
| 1     | As a neighbor, we particularly value the middle turn lane. It has made turning much less dangerous for cars.   |
| 1     | As someone who lives right off this corridor (indeed, it's a large part of the reason why I purchased the home I did), the original change was horrifically bad. The current compromise is not terrible, but I am not terribly happy with it, either. At the very least the it should be four lanes through all of the lights (Mapleton side of Pine not Spruce).  |
| 1     | At least you removed the one car lane from Spruce to Canyon. That was absolutely terrible.   |
| 1     | Auto traffic was far too fast before this treatment. Please keep it!   |
| 1     | Backups, visual clutter  |
| 1     | Barrier space (not the bike lane) between bikes and cars seems almost too wide in some spots. As I driver, I felt pinched, and as a cyclist, I found it unnecessary  |
| 1     | Better protection for cyclists and pedestrians. Too many accidents, with one fatality two weeks ago. Please make Folsom safer for foot and two wheel traffic!  |
| 1     | Bike lanes are often blocked by trash cans, or are dirty, or too narrow. On the south end, the lane is in the gutter. The lanes should extend to Arapahoe and be widened/shifted out of the gutter.  |
| 1     | Bike lanes before the change were fine for safe bicycle travel   |
| 1     | Bikers do not follow, respect or even know our basic rules of the road. These "enhancements" only encourage reckless and irresponsible behavior by the bikers. More emphasis (ex: licensing bikers) needs to be put on biker cooperation...not driving restrictions on using the roads designed for drivers.   |
| 1     | Bollards should be more attractive, and protected bike lanes should continue south to CU, not just stop at Spruce.   |
| 1     | Bollards. They give a false sense of security, and complicate peripheral input.  |
| 1     | Boulder is growing too much to take away driving lanes. People are gonna drive. Even bicyclists. Try commuting to Denver everyday or grocery shopping on a bike. I love near Folsom and it's become a pain in the ass, but not enough that I'm going to start riding a bike. It seems like a passive aggressive way to get more people to bike. As far as emissions pollution goes, people idling in their cars for the 10 more minutes it takes them to get from A to B because they're sitting in traffic creates more pollution. It's a dumb and not well thought out idea. It may work in Mayberry, but Boulder's growing faster than Mayberry. Did you happen to notice they built another lane on 36. Gee I wonder why? Maybe to help relieve traffic? Duh.  |

## Count Response

---

- 1 Bring back the entire protected bike lane.
- 1 Build two tunnels underneath the entire length of Folsom. Streets like Folsom were built for motorized vehicles. Let's keep them safe from other forms of transportation. If it weren't for motorized vehicles, we would only have paths to be used by pedestrians, bikes, etc. To mix the two modes of transportation is dangerous be dangerous to both.
- 1 Car travel is getting denser and denser as City population becomes denser. The bike paths are awesome and I use them often but we need more protected lanes on or along streets which bike paths don't serve.
- 1 Cars are far less likely to drift into the bike lane. I've had close (and continue to have close) encounters wherever there aren't protected bike lanes. A lot of it is distracted driving with folks on their phones. Better police enforcement would REALLY help. I so rarely see traffic stops in Boulder
- 1 Cars need more space and the congestion on Folsom from losing an entire lane is rough and made commuting even longer for some.
- 1 Center turn lane is good, but the "protective poles" are difficult to maneuver.
- 1 Change between spruce and pine
- 1 Contrary to the vocal bicycling community, we the drivers of Boulder would prefer to see the original arrangement returned so that we can all have hassle free access to the entire length of Folsom (south of Valmont to the university).
- 1 Distracting to both drivers and riders. Annoying to residents.
- 1 Driving along this section is much better. Four lanes was too tight for this section. I was always afraid of getting side-swiped by the vehicle next to me. Now I have fewer things to worry about, and I don't have to worry about a bicyclist swerving out because their lane is too narrow.
- 1 Due to limited lighting of street lights, this section can be rather dark at night. The reflective posts between the car lane and bike lane is therefore an excellent safety feature. I notice it more as a driver, and it makes me feel more comfortable when I'm biking or driving.
- 1 During high traffic times when I have to cross Folsom to reach my work in South Boulder, it can take 5 minutes to get across Folsom with only one lane in each direction. Causes me to run late.
- 1 Enable bicycle riders as much as possible without impacting automobile traffic.
- 1 Even though I am a cyclist primarily, I think the posts are dangerous to drivers and cyclists. I like the "protective strip" on outside of the bike lanes. As a driver, trying to turn right at Canyon and especially Valmont (northbound) is extremely complicated. As a cyclist, those intersections/right turn lanes are DANGEROUS! Get rid of the posts and weird right turns.
- 1 Expand further south to CU campus. More barriers.
- 1 Expand it and resurface the street.
- 1 Extend two travel lanes with protected bike lanes to the north, as it was in the original test
- 1 Far safer for bikes! I have almost been hit too many times on my bike in Boulder!

## Count Response

- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Feels like more car traffic, but my trips aren't noticeable longer in a car. Biking feels much safer.   |
| 1 | Feels safer and easier to get to downtown on my bike.   |
| 1 | Feels safer to ride. I ride with my kid in a trailer. I feel safe riding with him in this setup, but not in the traditional bike setup.   |
| 1 | Find the plastic bollards visually annoying Painted lines might be totally adequate   |
| 1 | Folsom is a busy through street. Play around with streets that are not used that often.   |
| 1 | Folsom is a dangerous road for bikes from Arapahoe to Pearl. Four lanes is more dangerous than 2. An unprotected bike lane is more dangerous than a protected bike lane.  |
| 1 | For medical reasons, I need to ride a tricycle, which is much wider than a bicycle. The current treatment provides me with the space I need while allowing bicyclists to pass me, since I am slower than most.  |
| 1 | For roughly a few blocks, a wider bike lane is provided - which, in and of itself, would not induce anyone to ride a bike on this route. So why slow vehicular traffic for a dubious benefit?   |
| 1 | For safety, bicyclists should be allowed to use sidewalks.  |
| 1 | From Spruce north, there isn't as much traffic as south of Spruce, so losing a car lane there isn't as much of a problem for traffic. I can't remember what you did at the intersection of Valmont and Folsom when going north, but I do think there needs to be a separate turn lane than straight lane like it was before. If that isn't in place, that is a place for refinement. I also never liked the weird intersection at Spruce and Folsom going south when you have to make the left onto Spruce. It is still clumsy to me. |
| 1 | From a bikers prospective, the protected bike lane is not necessary. I felt safe with just the regular bike lane. All bikers should be on the defense and aware of cars around them when biking in bike lanes when cars are around. Folsom has become a main corridor in Boulder and cannot support the traffic it handles with less car lanes. The one positive I do see is the turning lane, this is safe for drivers and keeps traffic moving.   |
| 1 | Get rid of the obstacles to vehicle traffic. It's a terrible idea, speciously implemented, and has only served to divert traffic onto other north-south arteries.   |
| 1 | Given the curve and elevation change of this stretch of Folsom, the striped bike lane wasn't sufficient to provide safe travel. Cars routinely drive over the speed limit, and many would wander into the bike lane going around the curves and over the small rise in the road.  |
| 1 | Glad busier section of Folsom (south of Spruce) went back to 4 lanes to accommodate automobile traffic.   |
| 1 | Go back to original configuration, before any changes were made   |
| 1 | Go back to the BEFORE way: Four travel lanes and conventional bike lanes. I have been looking, but I have rarely seen anyone riding a bicycle on Folsom in the area in question before or after the "wrong-sizing." This seems to be yet another foolhardy "solution" in search of a problem.   |
| 1 | Go back to what it was.   |
| 1 | Having the "curvy" section of Folsom with an extra wide bicycle lane is important for safety reasons. The sticks are not needed and are unsightly.  |

## Count Response

---

- 1 Having two lanes moved more north-south traffic to 28th street making it more congested and more at times at lights. The Only other N-S thorough fares are 30th St, Broadway and Foothills.
- 1 Headed in the South direction, even casual bicycles are almost going the speed of car traffic. There needs to be a protected bike lane to protect cyclist from car users who believe that they can safely go above the speed limit approaching the traffic lights near the Pearl intersection.
- 1 I am a cyclist, and this is more dangerous for cyclists than it was with the conventional bike lanes. It is too tight an area for both cars and bikes with the new "protected" bike lanes. And visibility is not good for when cars are trying to make a right turn and cross the bike lane.
- 1 I am over 65. I do not bike for reasons of physical limitations. Bus service for errands would take days. When you downsized the lanes, you definitely alienated us older folks. We need a better bus system. Too bad we sold short on the rail system to Denver, too.
- 1 I avoid Folsom at all costs. I'll drive out of my way, I don't care.
- 1 I avoid that section of Folsom so I don't have to deal with the protected bike lane
- 1 I believe it is actually more dangerous for cyclists now. In the evenings many cyclists ride in dark clothing without lights. It is difficult for cars wishing to turn right from Folsom onto Valmont to see these riders.
- 1 I can't really comment because I don't ride my bike on this street, and rarely drive it. I don't mind conventional bike lanes, but protected is always better if appropriate.
- 1 I commute daily on this section on my bike. Before the protected lanes, I always felt this section was unsafe, because cars would cut too close to the bike lane. Now it's terrific. I also see very little delay for the cars through this section, so it's a win win for everyone.
- 1 I do not see the wider bike lanes being utilized. Bike riders still disobey traffic laws as they always have. I still see near accidents because the striping and signage is confusing. The green stanchions are an eyesore
- 1 I do not think they improved safety.
- 1 I don't believe all streets should be Multi use. Leave key corridors for autos and put bike lanes on secondary roads or highlight existing bike paths for cyclists. This is the best of both worlds.
- 1 I don't like the bollards at all. Near intersections, cars can't tell me what they are doing by sliding over and have to turn too sharply across my path.
- 1 I don't see any point in having "protected" bike lanes on one road when they aren't (and can't be) on all. And Boulder can't afford to lose traffic lanes to day!
- 1 I don't think it makes any difference for the bikers, but it does keep the speeders from racing ahead until they reach Pearl going south bound and maybe even a bit north bound.
- 1 I don't travel this section of folsom often, but when I do auto traffic doesn't seem to be affected by the modification.
- 1 I drive and bike it almost every day. works well for both.

## Count Response

1	I drive this street about twice each day. I often seen traffic congestion. I rarely seen a bicyclist. I feel that we've created a problem, not solved one.
1	I feel a lot safer biking on roads that have protected bike lanes. If we want to keep traffic manageable with the trend of long-term population growth, biking needs to be an accessible transportation option. Making roads more accessible to cyclists would reduce the numbers of people who commute by car.
1	I feel much safer on my bike. When I have driven this route, I have not noticed any inconvenience from having one lane of travel instead of two (in my direction).
1	I feel much, much safer with the protected bike lanes.
1	I feel safer on my bike with the protected bike lanes and thus I am more likely to leave my car behind and ride my bike to run errands and get around town.
1	I feel safer ride a bike and I feel safer driving a car.
1	I feel so much safer on my bike.
1	I find it busy on the eyes for me as a driver. And it seems like a huge waste of space for another lane as there is too much traffic.
1	I find that I drive more slowly and safely with the one-lane configuration.
1	I have a problem with bikes coming along side me when I have my blinker on for a right hand turn and I have to stop so that I don't run over them. Who has the right of way in this situation?
1	I have been riding in Boulder since I was a kid in the 1970's and currently work 2 blocks off Folsom. There are some risks with riding in bike lanes but I've never felt unsafe, and I believe the dedicated lane was great but do not see a need for a wider space with lane separators. Personally I wish traffic laws with bicyclists would be enforced. Plus - I don't think people know about the multi-use path between Folsom and 28th, which is awesome! I wish more people would use it.
1	I have continued to monitor the volume of bicycle activity on the section of Folsom that still has the bike lane and it doesn't justify its continuance.
1	I have seen cars turn on to the street into the bike lane multiple times. It is dangerous to bikes by cars turning into the wrong lane
1	I haven't seen very many bikes using the lanes and making turns is a pain
1	I like the buffer space but would like to see a more attractive treatment that adds to the visual quality of the corridor, potentially adds to cyclists safety, and is less distracting to drivers
1	I like the way we have it now.
1	I love the new lanes. This road was borderline un-rideable without the new lanes, and now it's much more comfortable to ride on. I'm sure cars will disagree, but I don't care about their opinion - that's what 28th st or Broadway is for, so they can deal with it.
1	I loved the protected bike lanes--I wasn't pleased when the treatment was scaled back.

**Count    Response**

1        I miss the very temporary southern section of the treatment. that is where I feel most endangered on my bike, and it felt safer with the protection

1        I never liked to ride that section of Folsom. Now I ride it daily...GREAT IMPROVEMENT!

1        I never see bikers on this section of Folsom so I don't think the expanded lanes are needed.

1        I never see many bikes in the bike lanes, at any time of day

1        I primarily use Folsom as a cyclist, and I really dislike the bollards and think they need to be removed. They make it difficult to pass other cyclists safely, which occurs frequently in this area due to people slowed by the hill.

1        I rarely see a bike along the Folsom St corridor. Really the first time I saw bikes there was when bike groups were promoting awareness During the controversy over closure of car lanes. Now that it's been revised, once again it's seldom used. If you compare our transportation system issues against Portland you probably found there seems no comparison. Portland has such an outstanding, all encompassing public transportation network that car traffic is virtually absent within city limits. Therefore bike lanes are easy to incorporate. I don't see how Boulder can use that as a model because RTD can't provide that level of service.

1        I see cars driving over those things all the time, the mailman parked inside them in the bike path, etc. Plus, making Folsom 2 lanes is not good.

1        I see very little bicycle traffic on folsom, if riding my bike i would be more likely use 13th st to walnut to get to the folsom canyon intersection

1        I still ride to the far right, even with the extra room. The "barriers" provide a false sense of security for both vehicles and cyclists, possibly leading to just as many accidents.

1        I think cyclist are extremely rude and often dangerous. There are enough streets thru Boulder that certain east/west and north/south streets should be cyclist only except for local traffic.

1        I think it works very well and drivers seem to have adjusted. I recommend extending it North and to include Iris in the program

1        I think it would be best to remove the extra wide bike lane between Mapleton and Spruce. The road is pretty straight and bikes aren't at risk the same way as through the curves further north.

1        I think its GREAT to promote bike travel and allowing them to feel safer doing it. I saw families / girls w/o helmets / more people who seemed to be casual bikers than ever before riding in those lanes now!

1        I think the block between Pine and Spruce should be put back to 4 lanes. There is still a lot of congestions with the lane merge, the pedestrian crossing and the stop lights at Pearl and Pine.

1        I think the bollards are a hazard when bikers try to pass each other. Bikers often have to pass on the driving side of the bollards, which is more dangerous than not having the bollards.

1        I think the project did not work. It is difficult during many times of the day to turn onto Folsom north of Spruce due to single file traffic backing up. The causes cars attempting to enter Folsom to block the bike lanes. The bike lane traffic and safety north of Spruce was never problematic and I don't see any added safety or bike-use promotion being gained. I think it just is a debacle.

## Count Response

- | Count | Response  |
|-------|---|
| 1     | I think the wider/separated bike lane on the Folsom hill is fine. The area between Pine and Pearl is a mess (especially when someone is crossing at Spruce), there are significant back-ups southbound on the north side of Valmont at least around 8 a.m., and painting the bike lane on the right edge of the right turn lane at Valmont creates confusion for cyclists heading south and drivers turning west.   |
| 1     | I think these lanes reduce safety on folsom st. I hate them, get rid of them now!   |
| 1     | I think you are trying to answer a question being asked by a small group of people over objections of a larger group  |
| 1     | I understand the positive intent behind this project but the expensive experiments last summer were burdensome on taxpayers. The cost of erecting and deploying new controls along with having them removed was extraordinary in cost. The lessons-learned were arguably predictable and failed to really strike a new or effective balance in traffic flow or safety. At the end of the day, I would've preferred that our tax dollars be spent on more pressing and critical road infrastructure improvements. There are many, many roads in and around the City and County of Boulder which are in desperate need of maintenance and I'd like to see the City better balance its obligation in maintaining its existing infrastructure, before spending money on projects like this. |
| 1     | I use folsom during lunch or near 5PM, frankly do n't see that much bicycle traffic to justify the lane.  |
| 1     | I was appreciative of the partial restorative efforts and would love to see complete restoration of how the road was before the experiment.   |
| 1     | I was disgusted by the whining incessant about the treatments. There are lots of car drivers who do not want to share the road with bikes or yield to pedestrians. I also drove that route when the full treatment was in and it was not that bad, a little slower perhaps, but not that much.  |
| 1     | I was happy with the protected lanes that went all the way to Arapahoe, and sorry you removed part of them. But, you kept the most important part. The hill/curve just south of Balsam/Valmont was very dangerous without protection.   |
| 1     | I was in favor of protected lanes all the way to Arapahoe   |
| 1     | I was riding Folsom just about every day of the week at least once per day, sometimes more, until the protected lanes were removed further south. It is nice to have the full protected bike lanes in this section but I would ride the rest of Folsom more often, like I did for a short time, if Pearl to Arapahoe was fully protected.   |
| 1     | I work on Folsom and rode my bike to work until my orthopedic issues prevented it.  |
| 1     | I would at least remove them from Mapleton to Spruce. When I drive in the morning, I see vehicle traffic back up past Bluff from the light at Pine. When I bicycle this area, I do find it safer over the hill, so I think removal from Mapleton to Spruce is a nice compromise.  |
| 1     | I would have said it was good before, but I had 2 close calls last week on the bike. People squeezing into the bike lane to turn into mcguckins. I had no where to go. Just too much traffic in this town.  |
| 1     | I would like the protected bike lane extended north and southward.  |
| 1     | I would like to keep the lanes as currently marked but remove the poles. As a motorist and especially as a bicyclist I find the poles to be distracting and potentially dangerous. The impede my ability to able to pass slower bicyclist and in some cases forcing me to move into the vehicle lane to pass.   |

## Count Response

---

1	I would prefer a bike path off street.
1	I would rather have one good car lane with a separate turn lane. The appearance of the bike lane with its utilitarian bollards could be improved.
1	I would start 4 lanes at pine instead of spruce
1	I would take down the bollards as they are rather unattractive.
1	I'm more comfortable both as a driver and a cyclist with the protected bike lane.
1	I'm with the revised structure, but the original bike lanes extending south of Pearl Street were a disaster.
1	I've never felt safer on Folsom!
1	I've ridden this on bicycle and in a car many times before and since the change-- the current configuration is no noticeably safer for both means of travel. The turn lane is a blessing for cars (I live on Bluff off of Folsom for instance, and that intersection is very busy for as residential as it is), and cars will go too fast with 4 lanes and an unprotected bike lane, very often swerving into the bike lane to compensate for their speed. PLEASE PLEASE KEEP THIS PROTECTED LANE!
1	Id like to keep it, but maybe you need 2 lanes each way? Im not sure how congested it gets for auto's during busy times. It may be excessive for the bike lane to take up so much space.
1	If you are going to keep it, expand to further both North and South.
1	If you reduce the lane you must increase congestion. This is bad for residents, businesses and road users. It was a bad idea, get rid of it. In the future remember that you are living in a western city with inadequate public transportation. People will not be getting out of their cars. Check LA.
1	Im not a transport guru, but their have to be new ideas and recommendations to try.
1	In good weather I rode the previous alignment regularly for years in both directions and never found a problem with it. The only exception to this was the awkward transition when north-bound across the right-turn-only lane at Valmont - and that's no better or safer now. Arguably it is less safe since the lane guidance for drivers is non-standard and too "busy" visually, making it confusing for those unfamiliar with the locale.
1	Increase PROTECTED bike lanes so that it extends further than the current circuit.
1	It feels much less scary to bike along Folsom now through this area.
1	It is amazing what a difference the wider bike lanes make. I no longer have close calls with cars veering into the bike lane as they speed up the hill while changing lanes to dodge people hanging out in the left lane waiting to turn. Please keep the wider bike lanes!!
1	It is confusing for both auto and bike traffic. I frequently see bikes going the wrong direction impeding bike traffic.
1	It is dangerous turning south from Valmont onto Folsom because there is a bollard right in front of you when you turn. Remove that first bollard.

## Count Response

---

- 1 It is harder to see bicyclists in the rear view mirror because those green and white posts are visually distracting. At least they are only on the road from Valmont to Pine now.
- 1 It is immeasurably safer to bike and turn onto Bluff St and Mapleton with the bike lanes. The traffic still speeds making it a dangerous stretch of street with the right sizing helping a lot. I live on Folsom. If people don't like that they have to slow down their cars, they should take another street. Those of us who use and live on Folsom with our kids and pets, feel much safer.
- 1 It is imperative to promote alternative transportation and curb green house emissions, we need more of this!
- 1 It is much more comfortable to ride here!
- 1 It is much safer to have a center turning lane on Folsom. There are far fewer accidents and near misses with the center turning lane. Please keep it!
- 1 It is pointless to have it for only two blocks. And having it larger was a complete disaster. Just dump it.
- 1 It makes me sad that the separators near Pearl were removed.
- 1 It may be too early to tell. A year's worth of experience would be useful. I am also concerned about increasing population and its needs. Development within the city seems to be steadily increasing, bringing with it more trips.
- 1 It seems to work well for cyclists and better for motorists now.
- 1 It was not necessary. Conventional bike lanes were fine. Waste of city money. Return to 4 lanes with conventional bike lanes.
- 1 It was unnecessary.. there's not enough bikes before or after to justify the change.
- 1 It's horrible for a car, I go along Folsom to shop at Sprouts, too many groceries for the bike. Now I go to Sprouts in Lafayette, easier than the one in Boulder.
- 1 It's important to encourage bike riding. The added safety is helpful. I would like to see more aesthetically pleasing dividers.
- 1 It's seems OK but don't expand.
- 1 It's very pleasant riding a bicycle on these wider, protected bike lanes.
- 1 Keep and expand south. Perhaps north too. I think i like the separation such as we have on University west of Broadway, where on-street parking is between motor vehicles and bikes.
- 1 Keep and extend.
- 1 Keep bicycles and cars separate, teach drivers how to use the left lane as a passing lane, not a driving lane, teach everyone the laws that apply to bicyclists, do not increase vehicular traffic (ergo, congestion, frustration, pollution, and accidents, etc.) by taking away their space and giving it to bicycles, which are an order of magnitude less in size and then some in numbers.

## Count Response

---

- | Count | Response  |
|-------|---|
| 1     | Keep the protected bike lanes! This encourages more cycling, especially in those who would be hesitant to ride on city streets. As our city grows, this will help ensure the health of our population with less road congestion as more people bike, less pollution and more people living an active lifestyle. |
| 1     | Keep the section pictured, but go back to the original plan with one traffic lane and protected bike lanes from Spruce to Arapahoe.   |
| 1     | Keep!   |
| 1     | Keep, but do not extend   |
| 1     | Lanes are not well labelled turning south from Edgewood onto Folsom. Merge lane northbound when two-lane turns into one lane is too short; a right turn lane there might be better. Plowing snow and ice into the shared center lane eliminates protected left turns.   |
| 1     | Like protected bike lanes!  |
| 1     | Love it   |
| 1     | Love it- I feel so much safer as a pedestrian and bicyclist. I prefer it for driving to o as I don't feel like I am crowding cyclists.  |
| 1     | Love the protected bike lanes! They feel so much safer. I'm willing to take my kids on them, which I would not before.  |
| 1     | Love this stretch of road! I choose Folsom over other north-south routes (e.g., 30th street), for commuter biking AND recreational riding in lycra, because the lane is wide, and cars go more slowly, which makes it feel more safe.   |
| 1     | Make a raise bikeway or separate with curbs.  |
| 1     | Make permanent by installing bioswales in the buffer zone, with drainage sloping to this zone from both the bike lane and the general purpose lane. Beautify with landscaping, planters, etc.   |
| 1     | Merge lanes cause too much confusion; bike lanes were sufficient before; not enough cyclists to warrant the protected lanes. Just not necessary   |
| 1     | More protected bike lanes, please...  |
| 1     | My neighborhood is a bit quieter now, and biking a lot more safe and enjoyable.   |
| 1     | Negative impact on vehicle traffic  |
| 1     | New bicycle riders that weren't riding before are still not riding. Auto traffic at northbound Spruce and Folsom is much more congested with large amounts of time idling to get across the single lane of southbound auto traffic.   |

## Count Response

1 None of these options matter at all to me. I travel North-South through the center of town on a daily basis, but avoid this area entirely because there is no way to get safely during rush hour from the Boulder Creek Multi-use Path to where the remaining portion of the Living-Lab separated bike lanes begin. Without a connection further south, none of this matters to me at all as I have no access to it. It seems like it this might be very nice for those living in the north part of town. I would support the refinement of the strategy, but extending it south would allow me to use this. Right now, I never bike on Folsom - if I need to go to this area, I drive.

1 Northbound automobile traffic backs-up approaching Pearl Street. Southbound traffic backs-up approaching Valmont Street.

1 Often to make a left turn to go west on Pine, it is necessary to wait until the light changes and dash across. This is at heavy use times.

1 Only allow such Single file riding And trim the trees in that overhang the lane

1 Or expand them to how it was last summer!

1 PLEASE KEEP the protected bike lanes! We went from never using this part of Folsom to biking it almost every day to school because of the changes!

1 Painted road surfaces are slippery when wet and dangerous. The double lines going over the hill from Valmont to Spruce do give good spacing for the cyclist in that section. The white posts make snow removal problematic. The turn lanes are an improvement for traffic flow. I am not a fan of the right sizing on main Thoroughfares such as Folsom or Iris ave. I am a long time cyclist.

1 Pave the bicycle lane so that the surface is even. Keep the buffered bike lane. Keep the bollards.

1 People always went far faster than the 30 mph on that stretch. And, the narrower lanes meant some unsafe passing. I think traffic is paced more appropriately now. The only glitchy part is the funnel from 2 to 1 lane going Northbound from Pearl.

1 People swerve into the bike lanes all the time.

1 Please consider more permanent separated (planters, grade separated, curb between traffic and lane, continuous bike lane stained concrete)

1 Please extend the protected bike lanes from Valmont all the way south to Arapahoe Avenue. The current unprotected bike lanes are scary around the intersections with pine, pearl and walnut streets

1 Please extend the protected bike lanes to the Boulder Creek Path. The connection from the Goose Creek path to the Boulder Creek path is important.

1 Please make HARD barriers as part of protected bike lanes. There lanes are not actually protected. In addition, if you intend to keep these lanes, please expand them to more of Folsom. You cannot expect compete use if it's only a few blocks.

1 Please please keep. It is so much safer. It makes Folsom available for more than just cars. Thank you.

1 Please please please keep these. I feel SO much safer bike commuting. I also feel safer as a driver with bikes all around.

## Count Response

1	Prior to the expanded bike lanes, it was very common for cars to veer into the bike lanes on the curves on that part of Folsom
1	Protected bike lanes have improved bicycling experience and safety in this area. They have not negatively impacted my experience driving.
1	Protected lanes need to be expanded even to conduct an experiment.
1	Put back in the protected lanes you tore out!
1	Reinstall the bike infrastructure that was removed from Folsom.
1	Remove at least back to Mapleton southbound because traffic still backs up starting at Pine. Unless you really just want to punish those of us who need to use a car.
1	Remove bollards and choose another North, South route for a bicycle lane. As a bicyclist I try to avoid busy streets like Folsom
1	Remove or at least refine. I don't think the removal of the car lane has improved traffic flow for bicycles or their safety. What these zones have done though is turn some of our city streets into ugly permanent cone zones rather than the attractive, pleasant streets you'd want to use with any mode of transportation. The cones create issues for snow removal as well while do nothing to truly make the bike lane safer (they're certainly not going to stop a car). Maybe they do reduce traffic by eliminating the desire for anyone to use those streets. I certainly don't enjoy them and avoid them unless necessary and when I have, I've never seen enough bicycle traffic to warrant the loss of a car lane.
1	Remove parking, then you have plenty of room for bike lanes
1	Remove the bollards, they make it difficult for cyclists to pass other cyclists.
1	Remove the bollards.
1	Remove the bollards. They offer a false sense of security while providing no physical protection. They also impose increased cognitive processing burdens on drivers due to being closer than a cyclist and therefore having a higher angular rate of motion within a driver's field of view. So the driver focuses on them rather than the cyclist.
1	Remove the plastic poles. They make it too difficult to pass slower riders and are unnecessary.
1	Remove the posts, they prevent bikes from passing safely & cause a safety issue when making a left turn on a bike. Return to 4 lanes Spruce to Pine.
1	Replace bollards with hardscape, make it feel permanent
1	Restore protected bike lane on the south part of the project
1	Restore the road to the number of auto lanes that existed before the pilot project.
1	Return Folsom to four lanes and conventional bike lanes.
1	Return to 2 travel lanes AND keep bike lanes protected.

## Count Response

---

- | Count | Response  |
|-------|---|
| 1     | Return to the four lane configuration.  |
| 1     | Right turn at Valmont is difficult  |
| 1     | Right-sizing on Folsom has been a disaster! The city should meet the needs of the vast majority of residents who use cars. Folsom is a major artery for car traffic and needs to stay that way. Very few bikers use the bike lanes compared with the huge number of people who use cars.  |
| 1     | STOP WASTING \$\$ ON PROJECTS LIKE THIS   |
| 1     | Safety is not an issue. Only 1/5 or 1/10 bicyclists wear helmets--so safety is not a concern for them. The previous bike lane was as safe as the current "treatment" and far less ugly.   |
| 1     | Seems not to impede traffic so far along this section (Valmont to Spruce, though it is dicey from Pine to Pearl and this just adds to the confusion) -- it was a congested mess, however, when reconfiguration was from Spruce to Arapahoe. Glad the City removed that section. Please be considerate of the fact that not all Boulder residents are able to travel by bicycle. It was elitist to place burdens on those caring for family members and needing vehicles for errands or travel, for those who are elderly, for those who are sick or disabled, for those who don't live and work (both) in Boulder, etc. |
| 1     | Seems to work very well, and the protected bike lanes are where Folsom has less traffic. The center left turn lane makes driving safer avoiding people drifting over the center line.   |
| 1     | Show rules for shared lanes and turning across bike lane (car) and turning across traffic (bike). And dealing w bikes traveling on side walk pretending to be a vehicle and not a pedestrian.   |
| 1     | So much better than before! Before it felt to tally unsafe to bike this stretch. Need to extend it back down to Canyon again.   |
| 1     | So, you only make changes when something is broken. I don't think bikes are safer today than before and you are giving up two traffic lanes for cars, which use this a lot more than bikes.   |
| 1     | Sorry, we are a world of cars.  |
| 1     | Stop protected lane at Bluff, and move south bound bike traffic to 23rd. Make 23rd a major north south bike route and block streets at one end to limit car traffic.  |
| 1     | THIS IS MUCH SAFER THAN BEFORE.   |
| 1     | That bike lane is preposterously huge. It should go back to a 4-lane road.  |
| 1     | The amount of bikers I see in the lane vs. cars seems to me to be greatly unbalanced for the space allocated to the bikers. Furthermore, there is a bike path very close by that can be used or less travelled streets if desired by bikers.  |
| 1     | The amount of use does not warrant the reduction of the vehicle lanes. There are too few streets in Boulder and the present bike lanes and the sidewalks can handle the bike traffic.   |
| 1     | The barriers prevent cars from speeding into the bike lane on the corners. Also keeps cyclists out of the car travel lane,  |

## Count Response

1 The bicycle lanes are great and I like it with the current shorter configuration vs the protected lane all the way through Canyon. The cars turning through the protected lane felt scary and unsafe, especially on the west side of Folsom at Walnut Street. Thank you for removing that area. I think the flow for everyone feels better, safer, and more predictable now. The auto lane markings on North bound Folsom just south of Valmont feel wonky and crooked. They unnecessarily curve to the right for cars continuing straight. Also, the left turn lane on same side of intersection is too short. Please fix, if possible.

1 The bike lane is great. I have changed my route just to use it. This gets bikes off busy street (30th) and on to safe streets. KEEP IT!!!!!!

1 The bike lane is ok but the pylons suck

1 The bike lanes are plenty wide without the bollards. Plus, going north on Folsom, very dangerous/unsafe transition to one lane between Spruce and Pine.

1 The bike lanes were fine before. I never felt in danger riding in the conventional bike lanes. I like the center turn lane, But two lanes is not enough to handle the traffic in that area.

1 The bollards are still upright here, but in the Baseline section, bollards have fallen down and are left lying down near the bike path and sidewalk. The ones on Folsom are newer, but it seems likely that they will follow their Baseline counterparts by becoming random elements of road and path debris as time goes by. Why bother with them?

1 The bollards do make it difficult to pass slower bikes. With more riders, there is greater diversity of cruising speeds.

1 The bollards sticking out of the street are ugly along with dirt and debris that collects between them. Makes the street look unkempt and messy.

1 The center lane and bollards were a disaster. I'm surprised you keep wasting the taxpayers money trying to reinstate such a manipulative and dangerous plan.

1 The center turn lane is a good safety feature along with the greater separation from bikes.

1 The conventional bike lanes were just fine with four travel lanes for cars. This is simply too tight an area for both cars and bikes, particularly when cars are trying to make a right turn. Let me emphasize that I am an avid cyclist and I avoid this area if at all possible.

1 The current configuration is much safer and comfortable for cyclists!

1 The current form actually addresses problems that existed before. The original configuration was a disaster.

1 The experiment was not allowed adequate time to demonstrate its utility on the complete section

1 The extra bike lane space is especially nice going over the hill just south of goose creek path. Previously I avoided that stretch of Folsom St but now it is my daily commute.

1 The first "experiment" on Folsom was a disaster! Please don't try any more single car lanes on our streets. Like it or not, we need roads for cars!

1 The green and white flex hits seem to confuse people. What message are you trying to send by using different colors to do the same thing?

## Count Response

---

- 1 The idea of the lanes is great - but they are bottlenecking traffic and making it very dangerous in some spots for both cars and bikes.
- 1 The inefficiency of this design and the effect on the majority of users for the sake of a few unjustified. Add to that emergency services are unable to use Folsom during peak hours because of hardscaping that is still in place and preventing the promised center turn lane, a defect that was known and ignored in this plan, and you have a recipe for disaster. Bike safety would be vastly more enhanced if the City started issuing tickets to bikers that routinely flaunt the law and act in risky, irresponsible fashion. I would like to see the compiled data regarding the effect of this project on biker injuries, since that was a main selling point. In 50 years of biking in Boulder I've never had a close call because I get along; the current debate about safety ignores the behavior of bikers today, who believe they are entitled to do nearly anything. If you want safety, enforce law.
- 1 The lanes are seldom used. Many bikers use the sidewalk even with the new lanes. Traffic is congested at certain times of the day.
- 1 The loss of the second lane on Folsom has made travel there slower and more stressful. You slow down thousands of vehicles per day to improve the experience of at most a few hundred cyclists per day. This is not a fair tradeoff.
- 1 The merge of the two northbound lanes at Pine Street is not smooth when there's any kind of traffic. Adjusting the timing of the traffic light at Pine Street might help.
- 1 The merging of car traffic from two lanes to one by Spruce St. causes dangerous conditions for cars. The merge is so short and sudden, cars are often at risk of hitting each other.
- 1 The northbound intersection of Folsom and Valmont needs work. The right turn only lane is obstructed by the barriers until far too late. This makes drivers have to turn into that lane very quickly, which endangers bikers more than before. The rest of the project is great, but that part of the intersection is horrible. The bikers and drivers need to be able to merge early and prepare for the intersection. By forcing merging last minute, there are many distractions heading into that intersection that make it much more dangerous.
- 1 The old bike lanes were adequate. The bollards are borderline idiotic!
- 1 The only street I feel safe riding my bike in Boulder
- 1 The posts are very distracting visually. Also, snow removal was a problem. It was plowed to the middle which is fine but a lot of snow was stuck by the posts, making the one lane narrower and more dangerous.
- 1 The protected bike lane alleviates my worry about cars moving into me. Just today I watched my wife get squeezed by a car that wanted to turn right into McGuckin's but didn't want to yield to her even though she was looking through the passenger window. The bollards and extra stripping makes a difference north of Spruce.
- 1 The protected bike lanes are great in the warmer months, however, biking this stretch of Folsom with snow on the ground, I found the bike lanes to be impassable (not plowed) and I ended up riding in the car traffic lanes because they were less snowy/icy.
- 1 The protected bike lanes are great! Definitely the place I feel the safest when riding my bike places.
- 1 The protected bike lanes are much safer for bikers and the turn lane keeps cars moving.
- 1 The protected bike lanes should go all the way to Arapahoe along Folsom.

## Count Response

1 The protected bike lanes significantly improved safety along this section. Especially through the curved section where previously vehicles often drifted across the white line into the bike lane. I have also noticed a significant improvement north bound at Valmont. The reduced merge section where the right turn lane crosses the bike lane has almost completely eliminated instances of vehicles "buzzing" me as they make right turns by forcing the vehicles to cross the bike lane more slowly in a shorter distance.

1 The protected lane makes it so much safer to bike.

1 The protected lanes are not any more used or effective than the old lanes. The car turn lane at Folsom to go East on Pine is now a nightmare.

1 The protected lanes are the only part of Folsom I will ride on my bike. It's almost much more pleasant to walk there because cars don't drive so fast compared to the other parts of Folsom.

1 The pylons are unsightly. We had a perfectly good bike lane before and now this entire setup makes traffic worse. More traffic, more congestion, more pollution. Why can't cyclists be encouraged to use a less traveled street like 19th street, Intersection of Folsom and Valmont should be fixed at a minimum. No turn lane right anymore.

1 The removal of auto lane and addition of "protected" bike lanes was pure idiocy.

1 The restricted auto lanes from Valmont to Spruce are fine, and in fact have the very desirable effect of slowing traffic volume and speed coming down the small hill and curve near Bluff St. However, I do think Folsom should have four auto lanes south of Pearl, as the revised scheme now has.

1 The section of Folsom which was reduced to 2 lanes is mostly residential. Prior to the changes cars regularly exceeded the speed limit. The change has been beneficial for more than just bicyclists.

1 The separated bike lanes are great. Yes, they make cycling more pleasant, but more importantly they humanize the auto traffic. The lane configuration seems to control the rampant speeding on this section.

1 The separated bike lanes have been spectacular. I live on Folsom and have seen a dramatic increase in bicycle users. Biking is safer with the separated bike lanes. Traffic noise is down making Folsom a more livable area. I can see in drivers' habits and on their faces that stress is down. Before, drivers had to gun it when pulling onto Folsom because people were driving 11 mph over the limit. Speeds are now calmed. The center turn lane is highly effective as it allows traffic to keep on rolling, like ants in a line. Before it was stressful for drivers when a car had to stop and block the left lane to make a turn. Cars behind the stopped car had to wait and then gun it into the right lane. This no longer happens.

1 The shift from 4 to 2 doesn't work very well where it is.

1 The single car lane leads to pretty long back ups during high travel times such as rush hour. I have also seen cars stray into the bike lane because the flexible bollards are confusing.

1 The sooner this particular project is abandoned, the sooner I'll forget how City Council got bought by special interests. Show some responsibility, because you want to be re-elected. Or, because the vast majority of citizens were inconvenienced by those holier-than-thou few.

1 The temporary treatment is very unattractive.

1 The turn lanes r better than before

## Count Response

---

- 1 The two lanes with center lane and protected bike lane is fine on Folsom towards Valmont. It gets way to congested once you get to pearl up to Arapahoe
- 1 The vertical plastic barrier things are visually cluttered and I don't think they really help.
- 1 There are rarely bikes using it and cars don't have good options for transversing town without traffic backups except Folsom (prior to the bike lane fiasco)
- 1 There has been a negative impact on traffic yet I have not seen any real increase in bicycle use - and virtually no increase in the targeted demographics of older individuals or families. I do not see many commuters - mostly sport riders. I still see bicyclists using the sidewalk instead of the road as well. I would be curious to know how much of the vehicle traffic has moved to adjacent streets.
- 1 There is TOO MUCH VISUAL CLUTTER on this portion of Folsom now, and it's distracting as a driver. Also, the middle "turning lane" isn't being used in its "highest and best usefulness". Traffic could be eased and the road would become safer if we had 4 driving lanes and the old style bike lane
- 1 There is no protection provided. It's as effective as having a bumper sticker that says "be safe."
- 1 There is very little bicycle traffic. The congestion for drivers is not warranted.
- 1 These protected bike lanes should continue south beyond Spruce, please
- 1 They are an eyesore and a complete waste.
- 1 They are awesome. I feel like I am behind a "force field" when riding my bike. So much safer.
- 1 They are unnecessary. The old bike lanes were just fine.
- 1 This has been a huge improvement in usability and safety
- 1 This is absolutely ridiculous that you are spending our tax dollars on this. If bikers want to use our tax dollars and change our lanes, then have them pay into a system where they have their own roads made. Until then, do not mess with roads that were made for cars! Also, have more police watching as they NEVER follow the rules of the road, and make them sign up for insurance and registration so they can be held accountable for their actions.
- 1 This is much safer and makes people ride their bikes. Don't be stupid and take them away! This is the reason why I moved to Boulder in the first place, like so many others.
- 1 This is much safer for all.
- 1 This makes it feel much safer in general on a bicycle, especially climbing the hill northbound.
- 1 This needs to start farther north. The intersection at Spruce has too many things going on and it makes it difficult to safely turn on to Spruce. If I were on bike I would completely avoid it for safety, I now only go when it is my only option (love Hoshi) and it still feels sometimes unsafe.
- 1 This section of the project has been extremely successful. I think the protected bike lanes HAVE improved safety, particularly heading south down the hill in this picture. I also think the center turning lane reduces vehicle traffic congestion.

## Count Response

---

- 1 This was THE WORST WASTE OF \$\$\$ I HAVE EVER SEEN !!!!!
- 1 This was a needless project that wasted my tax dollars. A solution in search of a problem.
- 1 This was the the most stupid idea that I have experienced in 40 years of living in Boulder. I felt unsafe on my bike and in my car.
- 1 This was the worst example of poor city staff work in decades!! Bike paths, Please - put bike traffic somewhere other than streets! IHATE riding on busy streets.
- 1 Those posts look silly and I think they're dangerous.
- 1 To encourage people to bicycle more, safety from motorized vehicles is paramount.
- 1 Today's configuration has led to auto traffic congestion and travel delays. Also, the posts get filthy, look unsightly and do not keep bike riders from riding 2 and 3 abreast into the only lane.
- 1 Too few drive lanes
- 1 Too hard to turn onto spruce
- 1 Traffic backs up too much at the light at Pine and the flashing walkway/pedestrian crossing add to delays for automobile traffic making traffic snarled in the mornings when I am trying to get my daughter to the high school on time.
- 1 Traffic flow is horrible in Boulder (e.g., the lights aren't remotely timed, arrows don't last long enough, etc.), and reducing lanes just makes it worse. I am a mother of small children (your target demographic with this project), and I am not taking my little kids on any road where the cars are going 35 miles an hour no matter how wide the bike lane is. My 90 year old neighbor (the other target) isn't either. Regular bike lanes are perfectly fine. I use them when I don't have my kids, and I will use them more as they get older. Pitting drivers against cyclists has been the result of this experiment, and I think it is backfiring.
- 1 Traffic for cars got so much worse. The original bike lane was plenty safe... Just like everywhere else in Boulder with that type of lane.
- 1 Traffic frequently exceeds speed limit. Bikes need some protection
- 1 Traffic gets backed up from the cars. Bicyclers should be protected but the majority of traffic is from autos.
- 1 Traffic in Boulder has become ridiculous (I've lived here 25 yrs.). Thinking that you can change it by taking away car lanes and adding bike lanes is not what's going to work. Where is the Light Rail system between Boulder and Denver you've been taxing us for, BTW? How about Light Rails from East Pearl and West? Clearly the city council is run by cyclists, a vast minority, and that has informed and skewed your decisions. But I am a senior citizen who will never be a cyclist - you can't change American culture by legislation. Try working with what's true about us and what has worked best in other small cities like Boulder. The bike lane on Folsom is a bad idea, and was never the idea of the majority of Boulder. What happened to democracy here? Why didn't you even ask us?
- 1 Traffic is frequently backed up and very few bicycles use the bike lanes
- 1 Traffic is snarled all over Boulder. It is taking 30 minutes to cross from N to S to get out of town at rush hour. Few bikers are ever in the lane. This is really such a foolish idea for a privileged few people.

## Count Response

1 Traffic is terrible with the new system

1 Traffic on Folsom is more demanding than bicycles. I want published data on bicycle accidents over the past twenty years prior to supporting this initiative. I really do not think there was a problem before this boondoggle.

1 Turning into bike lanes seems a possible danger. Are bikers aware that cars might cut in front of them???

1 Turning onto Folsom from Edgewood is sometimes tricky because of the poles indicating protected bike lane. Can some kind of notification be placed at the turning corner?

1 Unfortunately too many people commute into the city to cut the available car transportation capacity; I've discussed this with city transit employees who claim that because the city only experiences heavy traffic during rush hour it's not a significant burden, but the fact of the matter is that the act of commuting is already stressful on a good day, to say nothing of the madness that happens when lanes are closed because of construction or whatever.

1 Useless idea.

1 Valmont to Spruce was a narrow curving short line of sight stretch before the Folsom Street project and deserved attention for biker safety, so it should stay as is. Spruce to Arapaho had more than ample biking room before the initial Folsom street project, so should never have been experimented with. And even though I never bike Folsom, I am an active biker so can make these judgements without actually biking the route.

1 Very dangerous section of roadway, with documented cyclist carnage. Protected lane is crucial to cyclist safety!

1 Visually the poles are confusing. During winter the snow was piled up in the center turn lane. I don't think you have changed many drivers behavior since I don't see many cyclists.

1 We have lived just east of Folsom for 22 years. Before that, we lived in the foothills Pinebrook Hills for 11 years after our family was brought here from Chicago by Coors. Our family and circle of friends have gotten to the point of just shaking our heads at the actions of the City of Boulder micromanaging nearly every aspect of our daily lives. As time has gone by these "projects" to improve safety and other areas that our City government thinks are in our best interest just give us and our fellow citizens another topic for jokes and ridicule. We'd like Folsom restored to its former self - and that's what we've been telling the businesses along our street - those businesses which have lost our patronage as well as the support of many of our neighbors!

1 What a colossal waste of time and money!

1 What a mess! Remove it. There's a great bike path on 19th St. that is convenient for 99% of N-S bike commuters.

1 What a mistake this is!

1 When automobile drivers complain, that means you're doing something right. The rest of the country is devastated by a car-centered plan, and I love how Boulder leads in supporting bicycle commuting.

1 When looking at the ratio of traffic to bikes, you need to bring back 4-lanes. This can be done without providing more danger to the bicyclists. Go back to old version but put the vertical pylons.

1 Whereas the best, and safest, part of the commute used to be north of Valmont, it's now south of Valmont to Spruce. KEEP IT.

## Count Response

- | Count | Response  |
|-------|---|
| 1     | Why not keep the 4 lanes of traffic, move the curb out to the existing edge of the bike lane and provide a paved area wide enough to accommodate both bikes and peds that is raised from the street's surface.  |
| 1     | Why not make a multi use sidewalk, there is access to the bike path at Valmont  |
| 1     | Why not move the project to a less busy street like 20th? Why keep trying to mix bikes with busy streets? I don't like the feeling of hostility from the drivers when I'm on my bike. I don't want to be part of a political issue, I just want to get from A to B safely.  |
| 1     | Widen the street and make it 4 lanes for cars. You are causing issues for snow removal, and jamming up the lanes. Also, some bicyclists simply ignore the lanes.  |
| 1     | Will not ride bicycle if removed  |
| 1     | With all of the space we have we should have bike lanes separated from traffic. Do as the Dutch do. If speed limit is greater than 30kph=separate from cars completely.   |
| 1     | With longer availability, this will become a major cycling thoroughfare with reasonable safety for all ages.  |
| 1     | Without question, restore to 4 lanes  |
| 1     | Would prefer a wider bike lane to allow bikes of varying speeds to pass safely.   |
| 1     | You are a bunch of money wasting idiots. Return all of Folsom to it's original configuration. Zane Selvans and Dom Nozzi were elected by no one and should have no input on how the city is run.  |
| 1     | You don't even show the same section of road! No wonder it was a disaster.  |
| 1     | You have already seen the problems with cutting back a lane each way on Folsom from Pearl to Canyon and giving more room to bikes. Bumper to bumper traffic on folsom. More traffic diverted to 28th street. Upset/fighting drivers. Dangerous conditions for people riding bikes. Do not go back to this awful plan.   |
| 1     | boulder is too crowded for 2 lane streets. nowhere to drive and 28th is way too crowded.  |
| 1     | bunching cars into 2 lanes causes more congestion and confusion to drivers which represents more danger to bikers in spite of the silly mallards.   |
| 1     | current treatment is confusing, especially at night   |
| 1     | folsom is a major auto travel corridor in the city of boulder. The center turn lane is useless as I have never seen anyone using it. Transportation is better served by making the roads wider not narrowing them down and causing congestion, frustration and road rage. If Boulder is truly interested in protecting bicyclists then it will construct lanes just for bikes. Not try to steal them from autos and not make pedestrians share sidewalks. We need to invest in a separate place for bicycles. As someone who uses Folsom regularly it makes no sense to change the whole structure of the road to accomodate bicycle use for 4 months of the year. There is rarely any bicycle traffic in the winter months |
| 1     | freekin ridiculos put it back the way it was stupidest thing ever   |
| 1     | it is much safer having the center turn lane. Cars are not jumping out to pass other cars stopped to turn.  |

**Count    Response**

- | Count | Response  |
|-------|---|
| 1     | lanes are ok but the process was terrible. Based on experience, I have no trust or faith in planners to be honest or smart about future projects.   |
| 1     | protected bike lanes the whole way  |
| 1     | remove or reduce the size of the bollards. Maybe just a curb to separate the lanes  |
| 1     | the last set of changes seemed to clear up the auto traffic issues.   |
| 1     | the new bike lanes have made things less safe for bikes and everyone, causing traffic backups and dangerous situations for cars turning. It also makes it hard for cars to take lefts because of no breaks in oncoming traffic                      |
| 1     | the previous existing bike path is very adequate  |
| 1     | the worst idea yet. i am 76 working toward 80 and drive to markets to commercial sites etc. alslo the flashing lights are often ignored BY PEOPLE ON BIKES AND WALKING WITHOUT LOOKING.   |
| 1     | there was an adequate bike path before, please stop thinking autos are second class citizens, there are a reality!!   |
| 1     | this is not how it is today may 11 2016. but when it was this way there was wasted space without the bike lane gaining much width and it was harder for bikes to pass.  |
| 1     | this seemed to be a solution looking for a problem. i'm a 72 year old woman who has enjoyed riding on the Folsom bike paths for years.  |
| 1     | this stretch of Folsom has a bit of elevation gain, so I feel substantially safer riding my bike with the protected lanes. I've never seen any traffic backed up at this stretch of Folsom, either - before or after the installation of the lanes. |
| 1     | traffic backs up a lot/people don't know that they need to go to the single land at Spruce and there's lots of confusion and horn blowing   |

2. Today, Folsom has conventional bike lanes from Spruce to Canyon. BEFORE: Four travel lanes, some center turn lanes and conventional bike lanes Summer 2015: Two travel lanes, full center turn lane and protected bike lanes TODAY: Four travel lanes, some center turn lanes and conventional bike lanes Based on your experience with the current treatment, what do you recommend? - comments

Count	Response
3	Bring back the protected bike lanes.
2	Go back to the protected lanes
2	Go back to two travel lanes, full center turn lane and protected bike lanes
1	As seen with the original plan, cutting down lanes would cause a gridlock. Due to the nature of my work I must drive fulsome sometimes six times a day. Those times occur at all different hours so I have experienced the gridlock with the original plan please do not change fulsome between Spruce and Canyon.
1	"Drop It" should be an option! This survey is invalid.
1	"Refine" as in remove.
1	A hybrid of the summer 2015 and current set up would be better. The cars just feel so close to the rider on this section - the space feels tighter (I don't know whether it actually is but it feels that way).
1	A protected lane between Spruce & Canyon will make bicycling safer and easier and encourage more people (of all ages and abilities) to bike. The benefits of this restored protected lane outweigh the inconvenience of slightly longer driving times on Folsom during rush hours.
1	Absolutely none of the above!! There are plenty of ways to get around Boulder on bikes without clogging major automobile corridors.
1	Add /keep the enhanced markings & boxes in the bike lanes (only)
1	Add bollards along the entire trafficked section of Folsom, north south.
1	Add colored chip-seal to highlight the bike lane, like London, UK does. When I lived there it seemed to work very well.
1	Add the four lanes north of Pine so all traffic can get through the stop light on Pine, in one light change.
1	Admit these ideas failed and move on....they only obstructed and angered your citizens, while attempting to respond to a few vocal bikers.
1	Again, I need more space than a bike and not to obstruct faster bike travelers. Also, sustainability requires that we DISCOURAGE single-passenger automobile traffic!

## Count Response

---

- | Count | Response   |
|-------|--|
| 1     | Again, I think the idea is there - but no matter what you do, Folsom will be high-traffic (cars) and is not an ideal street to do this.  |
| 1     | Again, cyclist and autos should not be on same streets   |
| 1     | Again. You are showing a different section of road. UGH! Fix the Potholes in the Bike Lane first.  |
| 1     | All very confusing, especially for people who do not use the route frequently.   |
| 1     | An unprotected bike lane with four lanes of traffic is stressful and dangerous. At the very least a multi-use path like that on the north side of Arapahoe going east from Folsom would be an improvement.   |
| 1     | As a cyclist and a driver who uses Folsom often, and during heavy traffic times, I would re-install the "right-size" treatments or a refined version. Especially between Arapahoe and Canyon.  |
| 1     | As a driver, I am always scared of hitting bikers/peds and there are a lot! I would rather have slower traffic but a safer barrier for them  |
| 1     | As someone who occasionally cycles i love the idea of protected bike lanes, but honestly rush hour is already bad enough.  |
| 1     | Back to four travel lanes  |
| 1     | Back to original   |
| 1     | Back to protected bike lane  |
| 1     | Back to protected bike lane and 1 lane of traffic in either direction.   |
| 1     | Because Folsom is straighter and flatter here, the current bike lanes aren't unreasonable, but when the lane systems switch back and forth, that causes confusion (and frustration, I think). Perhaps having three lanes (two directional, one turn lane) and wider bike lanes but without the bollards would be a good compromise.  |
| 1     | Because there is so much more traffic near McGuckin Hardware, and more bicycles, the traffic needs to slow down and be careful.  |
| 1     | Because this eastern area of Boulder has been designated for high density housing, Folsom will need to take some of the traffic overflow from 28th St. I am in favor of improving pedestrian and biking experiences, but not at the sake of having diminished capacity for cars. I don't believe we can dramatically increase housing in this area while taking away driving lanes. The capacity for cars is already over extended. Walking around 28th St. is not a pleasant experience because of the noise, pollution, and buildings that lack character. New buildings in the area seem to be modeled after new buildings in downtown Denver that are modern and unwelcoming. Thus, I do not enjoy walking in the commercial and high housing density areas. |
| 1     | Bike lanes need to be wider, right now they are 50% gutter and force you too close to cars.  |
| 1     | Boulder has too many drivers to handle your Summer 2015 plan. This is not a small village anymore.   |
| 1     | Bring back full protected bike lanes, please.  |
| 1     | Bring back larger bike lanes. Do not use so many bollards but more attractive separation so drivers are aware of separation but not overwhelmed by number and color of bollards  |

**Count    Response**

1        Bring back protected bike lanes

1        Bring back protected bike lanes.

1        Bring back protected lanes.

1        Bring back the entire protected bike lane.

1        Bring back the full bike lane like we had in summer 15

1        Bring back the protected bike lanes

1        Bring back the protected lanes

1        Bring back the two travel lanes with a full center turn lane and protected bike lanes! I loved them!

1        Busy bike corridor. Make more room for bikes. Lower speed limit and make shared lanes.

1        But I do avoid driving this section, and never ride this section. Bike lanes are too narrow for the speed of cars for my comfort. Idea. Rebuild the road. Remove the medians. Make it a truly modern N/S multi-use corridor. Like they do in Munich.

1        By that I mean it was fine before the city messed with it and it is fine the way it has been restored.

1        Can you double stripe the white line, maybe not enough room - global comment for all of the narrower bike lanes is to make sure the pavement is smooth and kept swept/clean, especially where there is an asphalt/concrete edge

1        Change it back to how it was in summer 2015! I was appalled by the city council's decision to remove the protected bike lanes when motorists had adjusted to the new traffic layout, before the trial period had ended.

1        Change it back to the summer 2015 treatment. It was so nice for cycling.

1        Changing this back was the only option. You can't get rid of auto lanes in a commercial property section of the city.

1        Conventional bike lanes are fine. Need to keep the four travel lanes for cars. Traffic is bad enough without taking away driving lanes.

1        Conventional bike lanes are more than sufficient.

1        Conventional bike lanes were just fine here.

1        Could we have protected bike lanes with 4 travel lanes ?

1        Current accommodation for bikes is inadequate.

1        Current bike lanes are totally inadequate. They are too narrow for bikes to safely travel and a large portion of the lane is taken up by the concrete curb/gutter and potholes. This is the least safe portion of Folsom as it has the worst protection for cyclists and the heaviest car traffic.

## Count Response

---

- 1 Current bike lanes are very substandard, unsafe, and scary. Poor road surface and gutter pan contributes to this problem. Please make protected lanes again, but with permanent infrastructure. Consider traffic circles to ease the motor vehicle backups for the one hour each day it was a problem during the first treatment. Please make roads to move all residents rather than just cars carrying out-of-town commuters who choose to drive alone each day to our town.
- 1 Damned politicians sided with the used car dealer over the safety of cyclists and pedestrians. Seriously! That was so embarrassing, and the result is that I won't ride a bike there. It's far too dangerous. Thank you, Lisa Morzel.
- 1 Direct cyclists off Folsom, there bike paths and side streets that off a much more pleasant riding experience with little to no added travel time
- 1 Do not add bike lanes. Again, there are very few bikers -- especially in winter months and in bad weather -- who use bikes. The street should be optimized for those who use it -- CARS!!
- 1 Don't change a THING! The center turn lane at Bluff is useful for left turns when coming off Bluff.
- 1 EXCELLENT WAY TO TRAVEL BY BIKE.
- 1 Expand bike lane protection.
- 1 Farther south and widened.
- 1 Feels better when driving. Speed seems more controlled and calm.
- 1 Folsom is as bad or worse than 28th these days
- 1 For this part of the project, the volume of bikers does not justify the inconvenience to car drivers and to store owners.
- 1 Four travel lanes and conventional bike lanes seems optimal.
- 1 Go back to BEFORE
- 1 Go back to Summer 2015 configuration.
- 1 Go back to Summer 2015 treatment with separated bike lanes
- 1 Go back to Summer 2015! If Boulder is going to restrict parking and focus on green transportation, please reward cyclists with safe passage to their destinations!
- 1 Go back to Summer 2015.
- 1 Go back to Summer 2015: Two travel lanes, full center turn lane and protected bike lanes
- 1 Go back to protected bike lanes
- 1 Go back to protected bike lanes. Protected bike lanes made cars more aware of cyclists, creating a safer environment. The extended wait times for traffic seemed negligible.
- 1 Go back to protected lanes!

## Count Response

1 Go back to protected lanes.

1 Go back to protected!!

1 Go back to the fully protected bike lanes. The drivers who think they lose time here are not living in reality. Folsom is one of the most heavily populated bike routes in the city and needs protection there. Drivers just use Folsom because it's faster than 28th St currently and they are bummed they lost that speed. Bring back bike lanes that are protected and make this city progressive. Not the NIMBY-regressive one it is now.

1 Go back to the old protected bicycle lanes

1 Go back to the protected bike lanes and reduce the speed limit to 30 miles per hour, and enforce that with police. Cars travel too fast on this road as it is and many people use it as a shortcut to bypass 28th when it's congested, which adds too much traffic to side streets like this that should be safe for cyclists and pedestrians.

1 Go back to the summer 2015 configuration. The current bike lanes are too narrow to be safe, as evidenced by the fact that the painted green, rectangular lane markers don't even fit within the lane. Also, there's a lot of brush on the southbound side that is often unpruned, forcing cyclists to swerve to their left.

1 Go back to the summer 2015 treatment! Otherwise this is a long stretch where it does not feel safe to bike, which has made it hard for me to use Folsom as a through corridor. I bike with kids in a trailer and there is no way I would take them on Folsom in an area with 4 lanes of traffic and no protection for the bike lane. The center turn lane also helped for people entering/exiting side driveways.

1 Go back to the way it was before this fiasco started.

1 Go back to the way it was in summer 2015 with the protected bike lanes all down Folsom.

1 Go back to two travel lanes. I know. Impossible with the extreme reaction to Right-Sizing!

1 Go with Summer configuration

1 Good start but bikes should not have to mix with cars to make turns/left turns

1 Have four lanes.

1 Have never seen a bike on it

1 Having only one lane in each direction was a non-issue. I drove if many times and I didn't see any problem, nor could I understand why people were so angry about it. The protected bike lanes keep that much more space between bikes and distracted drivers.

1 Higher automobile traffic should continue to be accommodated along this stretch of Folsom.

1 I LOVED Right-Sizing. If we are serious about combating global warming, everything possible should be done to encourage biking.

1 I am very happy to not be spending several trips a day, literally yelling and cursing in my car. Yeah, it really was that shitty with the "Summer 2015" configuration.

## Count Response

- | Count | Response   |
|-------|--|
| 1     | I answered this as Refine because there was not "Go back to the original". I can't move on since I have to pick one, but the response may be erroneously recorded as a vote for change. I think the original "before" situation was fine. The changes that have been made are more for show than the actual use of these lanes. Calling the changes proposed as Complete Streets is just a cover up of the same term "Right Sizing". |
| 1     | I believe the cross walk at Walnut still needs to be addressed. It flashes automatically for bikes crossing, which is nice, but the duration is much longer than needed for any bike to pass through. Could the button push give a longer flash and the sensor in the road give a shorter one?   |
| 1     | I believe the present treatment of this area works well. When riding this section in Summer 2015, I was really uncomfortable where the automobile lanes crossed the bicycle lanes for right turns, because they were very abrupt and really put the two modes of transit at odds with each other. The present treatment flows well and each mode of transit has high awareness of the other.   |
| 1     | I bicycle through here every workday, but the traffic was horrible after the right-sizing and drivers were (rightly) angry. That made it less safe to bicycle. Folsom needs to be four lanes through the middle of boulder. I think we should spend the money and build an off street bikepath, hopefully separated from both the road and the sidewalk but a multiuse path would be ok in this zone.                                |
| 1     | I did love the safer and wider bike lanes during Summer 2015, but it did seem like too much car traffic backed up.   |
| 1     | I did not have an issue with the reduction in automobile travel lanes once I figured out where to start turn lanes. Those who had issues sounded like selfish whiners in my opinion  |
| 1     | I didn't mind the protected bike lanes during the summer. I think it may be safer for cars and bikers.   |
| 1     | I do feel safer as a biker, but turning right onto Folsom from spruce in a car sucks. A forever long line of cars No one wants to let you in.  |
| 1     | I don't like coming to the stop lights on big roads unprotected. I'd like to have more of a barrier or signage or painting at the stop signs and lights bc I am afraid that a driver might 'turn right' into me.   |
| 1     | I don't think it was ever a "broken" thing in the first place and that there is some simple face-saving going on. But enough changes to it.  |
| 1     | I felt VERY uncomfortable riding in the experimental arrangement and did NOT like being mixed with the vehicles. Very unnerving. Much clearer to be on the right side of the road.   |
| 1     | I felt safer with the protected bike lanes.  |
| 1     | I find it curious that 'remove' isn't in the list... isn't that essentially asking for what you want to hear? If you simply want to hear what you want, why take the time to have this survey?   |
| 1     | I go out of my way to ride Folsom for safety   |
| 1     | I go to the dentist in a building on Folsom just north of Canyon-the turn lane is not defined and it is sometimes very difficult to turn left into the driveway.   |
| 1     | I like having some kind of separation or barrier between the bikes and the cars, but I don't think it needs to take up a whole lane.   |
| 1     | I like how it is today.  |

## Count Response

---

- 1 I like protected areas for bikes because so many drivers are on their phones.
- 1 I liked the 2015 solution best - 2 travel lanes with center turn lane and protected bike lanes. I live on Folsom. It appears that less people ride on Folsom in 2016 than when the other solution existed in 2015. I saw more families, kids, and folks with cargo type bikes on Folsom prior to today's solution. If I can't have the 2015 solution, then I will live with today's solution.
- 1 I liked the buffered lanes, but I don't think it makes that much difference for that small stretch of a few blocks.
- 1 I made more trips through town on Folsom during the summer when there was a large, protected lane. It was great. I realize car drivers were quick to blame the bike lane for their traffic woes, but I would point out that most drivers in that area are, at all times, angry and frustrated while driving. That same section of road, now back at two lanes, appears to create the same levels of frustration for all car drivers. I generally now try to avoid that section of Folsom when on a bicycle.
- 1 I personally thought it was a mistake to revert back to the car-centric 4 lanes. A minor driver inconvenience is worth protecting a life. (source: Driver & Biker).
- 1 I prefer the protected bike lanes but simple bike lanes are ok during most travel. Protected space at intersections really helps.
- 1 I prefer the protected lanes
- 1 I really liked the protected bike lanes. It seemed to me that they weren't kept long enough last summer for people to adjust their travel patterns and see the full impact of the change
- 1 I really miss the protected bike lanes, and especially the right hand only car traffic turn lanes that were installed at Canyon and Pearl. As a cyclist, I've had many close calls with cars who were making a right hand turn as I was going straight through the intersection. There are sections of the current bike lanes, particularly on the southbound side of Folsom between Pearl and Arapahoe, where about half the width of the bike lane is in the gutter. The gutter currently has many potholes along this stretch, and is also commonly filled with various debris.
- 1 I recommend returning to the Summer 2015 state. I was hit by a car turning right on southbound folsom at Canyon in 2009 and think that protecting this zone should be one of the top priorities. As an occasional driver I recommend improved notices for those turning onto Folsom (I accidentally turned into the protected lane instead of the car lane when turning from westbound pearl to northbound folsom) early in the trial of these lanes.
- 1 I think this was an absolute disaster. This has too much car traffic to condense down to one lane. Again, the conventional bike lanes were fine. I do not think there was good business reason to change.
- 1 I think traffic was too backed up during peak times with just 2 lanes for cars. Drivers were angry with bikes too much already to cause so much grief on a road that bikes could avoid and which already had an adequate bike lane.
- 1 I think you should restore Folsom to a 4-lane through road. The turn lanes are unnecessary to me when I drive, and the old bike lanes were just fine.
- 1 I understand the political pushback from the lane reduction last summer. I would like to see more traffic enforcement along the corridor so cars are incentivized to pay attention to all road users' safety.

## Count Response

---

- 1 I want the protected bike lanes to be put back where they were during the summer.
- 1 I was disappointed that the city dialed back the protected lanes along the area that feels like it needs it the most. I would love to see those lanes re-protected in a way that feels good for everyone.
- 1 I was very sorry to see the protected bike lanes get removed, but I did see how the medians and other features of those few blocks made it problematic. I'd love to see a long-term plan for bringing them back as part of a larger re-do of Folsom.
- 1 I we can't have the buffered bike lanes, perhaps we could at least have the plastic pylons. I have never seen a car run over the pylons, I see cars cross the bike lane white stripe all the time.
- 1 I will support any and all improvements made for bicycling in Boulder.
- 1 I would like to find a way to make this section of Folsom more bike-friendly and safe for all. I appreciate that many car drivers were upset that summer 2015 treatment caused some minor travel delays, but I expect that, if the experiment had been left in place longer, some travel habits (e.g., route, time of day, and mode of transport decisions) would have adjusted so that car delays would have moved downward. I would like to have City staff consider trying another experiment, perhaps widening the bike lane and narrowing the car lanes.
- 1 I would like to see protected lanes reinstated.
- 1 I would like to see the protected lanes again. I do not feel safe on those exposed stretches. 30th St. is even worse. I'm an experienced bike commuter. I do not ride on 30th unless traffic is very light.
- 1 I would love to see the protected bike lanes.
- 1 I wouldn't change this back - in the more heavily car traffic areas I feel the current bike lanes are adequate.
- 1 I'd like to see a separation of sort between bikes and cars.
- 1 I'd rather have the full protected bike lane back.
- 1 I'm Posts not necessary. Painted surface slippery when wet. What is the cost of maintaining the lines?
- 1 I'm not sure what "refine" means
- 1 I'm not sure whether to choose "keep" or "refine" here because I much prefer the Summer 2015 protected bike lanes. I actually felt safe from distracted drivers on Folsom for the first time when the protected lanes were put in. I regret not attending the City Council hearing on revision to these lanes because what I
- 1 I'm not sure whether to choose "keep" or "refine" here because I much prefer the Summer 2015 protected bike lanes. I actually felt safe from distracted drivers on Folsom for the first time when the protected lanes were put in. I regret not attending the City Council hearing on revisions to these lanes because I have heard that the protected bike lanes were taken away due to a "squeaky wheel gets the grease" kind of situation. Apparently business owners on Folsom were claiming that protected bike lanes negatively affected their business because drivers were confused. I believe that if drivers cannot figure out how to turn their cars left and right then they should not be driving a motor vehicles. I also believe that the community should consider the results of vehicle crashes on cyclists. If I'm going to be dead, the protected bolsters should at least total their car.

**Count    Response**

---

- 1        IMHO, the trial configuration did not work well because it was basically a new alignment slapped down on the existing roadbed, and most of the congestion resulted from the lack of accommodation with Folsom's existing left turn lanes, especially the one to turn eastbound at Pearl. The bumpouts for those left turn lanes are relatively short but it was never that big of an issue before because overflow out of the bumpout only blocked one lane; after the realignment that same overflow would block ALL of the Folsom traffic.
- 1        If the protected lanes were re-installed, I would gladly ride and walk in this area more often. Folsom feels too dangerous for biking now, and I try not to walk there when I can avoid it. I'm having a baby soon and I expect to walk on Folsom even less after that. But if the protected lanes were removed, I know I would ride and walk Folsom more often, because I did when those lanes were there in summer 2015.
- 1        Improve cues for turning cars, but bring back the protected lanes. I would love to be able to get from Valmont to Boulder Creek with my toddler.
- 1        In this segment I think the protected bike lanes created more hazards for cyclists, such as cars creeping into the space. With the protected lanes, it was more challenging for riders to avoid obstacles. I also think drivers were frustrated with traffic back-ups and therefore were more willing to be aggressive towards cyclists.
- 1        It didn't work. Stop trying to force it.
- 1        It is an absolute travesty that the protected bike lanes, which represent a crystal clear best practice in virtually every metric, were pulled. They should be returned immediately before someone is killed on a bike on Folsom street.
- 1        It is much better the way it is now/was before the experiment. We must have 4 lanes for traffic here.
- 1        It used to be nice to be physically separated from the cars. Now I don't frequent ANY of the businesses along Folsom- just too stressful to ride.
- 1        It was a good system and I am very glad you replaced it after your ill-planned experiment in summer 2015
- 1        It was better before, with just one lane of traffic.
- 1        It was better when right sized. 4 drive lanes is too many
- 1        It would be great to go back to the improvements made from July 2015. I know the commuting population was upset with the changes but I feel like they were not tested for a long enough period.
- 1        It's definitely better to have the bigger bike lanes. It keeps vehicle speeds down which in turn makes cycling safer. Unfortunately drivers get upset when they don't have both lanes.
- 1        It's too busy of a road to remove lanes of traffic, especially with all the new housing being added to the area
- 1        It's too complex.
- 1        Just leave it the way it was before this ridiculous project was entertained. These are busy streets... Stop messing with traffic. It's already terrible in this town...
- 1        Keep 4 general travel lanes along the entire corridor. Review and simplify remaining torturous bicycle lane meanders. Riding a bike along this corridor should not require dancing with turning cars.

## Count Response

1	Keep 4 lanes with conventional bike lane. Traffic flow was improved when changed back to original formation. I never see high bike traffic when I'm on Folsom.
1	Keep Four Lanes
1	Keep as it is today. restore the space between mapleton and valmont as it was before all the experiments
1	Keep as many lanes of traffic as possible.
1	Keep bicycles and cars separate, teach drivers how to use the left lane as a passing lane, not a driving lane, teach everyone the laws that apply to bicyclists, do not increase vehicular traffic (ergo, congestion, frustration, pollution, and accidents, etc.) by taking away their space and giving it to bicycles, which are an order of magnitude less in size and then some in numbers.
1	Keep conventional bike lane
1	Keep four travel lanes.
1	Keep it the way you put it back - four drive lanes & bike lanes on either side.
1	Keep the 4 lanes, but consider a multi use path where the sidewalk is.
1	Keep the 4 travel lanes. Travel is too congested and too dangerous without them.
1	Keep the four lanes and bike lane.
1	Keep this structure and configuration as it presently stands. The manipulation of the lanes with the bollards was just plain stupid.
1	Keep what you have today.
1	Keeping with my former comments, I find the protected bicycle lanes (i.e. poles) to be a poor solution.
1	Last summer absolutely sucked with one car lane on Folsom. A regular bike lane is completely sufficient, and I bike regularly. But the amount of traffic back up was insane. You can not go back to that.
1	Last summer's restrictions were a disaster
1	Leave it at Four travel lanes, some center turn lanes and conventional bike lanes.
1	Leave the bike lanes as conventional.
1	Like I said earlier, the protected lanes were MUCH nicer. I wish there were more protected bike lanes and wider bike lanes in general all around the city. Pretty sad that, in Boulder of all places, we don't have much bike infrastructure.
1	Make sure to talk to each of the area businesses and the Chamber. Their input is important. I can live with multi-use lanes, like those on Arapahoe east of Folsom.
1	Make the bike lane bigger. And/or expand the bike lane to the sidewalk. Elevate the bike lane to separate it from the street. Like the University bike lane along Broadway.

**Count    Response**

---

- 1        More protected bike lanes would be nice. Conventional bike lanes are a bare minimum
- 1        My choice is to get rid of.
- 1        Need more center turn lanes to serve businesses and medical facilities along Folsom.
- 1        Need protected bike lanes!
- 1        Need to be sure that cars can't use Nike lanes as parking lanes
- 1        North-bound lanes are narrow and bumpy. Navigating turning traffic onto west-bound Canyon requires a lot of caution.
- 1        Not refine. Do away with this whole idea
- 1        Personally, I'm always for bolstering alternative transportation infrastructure and reducing car infrastructure, but I realize I'm rather biased. (Since I don't own a car and I walk / bike / bus everywhere.) As a biker, I still feel comfortable with normal bike lanes, and I rarely travel at very congested times.
- 1        Please add protected bike lanes
- 1        Please do not spend any additional monies on this.
- 1        Please extend the protected bike lanes.
- 1        Please go back to summer 2015 conditions - protected bike lanes.
- 1        Please keep the 4 travel lanes through this area. Its too congested to narrow to 2 lanes and not enough cyclists to justify.
- 1        Please remove the "right sizing" completely and help restore my trust in the city government
- 1        Please return Folsom to it's original status. Thank you. (FOUR travel lanes, bike lanes and some turn lanes.).
- 1        Please return this part of Folsom to the full the conditions of Sommer 2015 (protected bike lanes and turn lanes)!
- 1        Protected
- 1        Protected bike lane Iris to Creek path. If we are serious about the promise to make 30% of trips in Boulder without the car, this has to happen. Routes must CONNECT. Its not an option. Or just be honest and say the transportation master plan was a dream you are not willing to implement.
- 1        Protected bike lanes option
- 1        Protected bike lanes please...
- 1        Protected bike lanes should continue south from Spruce to CU, not just stop at Spruce.
- 1        Protected bike lines where possible.
- 1        Protected lanes

## Count Response

1 Pushing all the cars into one lane between spruce and Mapleton \*north of Hoshi Motors) is a problem. accidents waiting to happen

1 Put it back the way it was

1 Put protected bike lanes in

1 Put the protected bike lanes back in.

1 Put the protected lanes back.

1 REMOVE

1 REMOVE!!!! Families shouldn't be riding bikes on a main thoroughfare. Period. That'll help with safety issues and accidents.

1 Refine by doing away with the alleged improvements.

1 Reinstall protected bike lanes

1 Reinstall the protected bike lanes. The unprotected lanes feel like a death wish for me when I am on my bicycle, and Folsom is scarier than ever after the pedestrian was killed last week by a car.

1 Reinstall the removed cycling infrastructure.

1 Remove median to give bike lane more space, but don't reduce traffic lanes

1 Remove the bicycle lanes

1 Remove the bike lanes and give us more bike paths.

1 Remove the bollards and confusing lane compressions.

1 Remove the protected bike lane, place a bike path adjacent to a repaired sidewalk

1 Remove the white/green bollards

1 Repair it so it's easier to understand where the lanes go. And start giving tickets to cyclists who break traffic laws.

1 Replace separators please!

1 Restore Folsom to its configuration before the pilot program

1 Restore the two travel lanes, full center turn lane and protected bike lanes. Shame on the City for removing this redesign.

1 Restore to previous perfectly fine configuration

1 Return Folsom to its practical former state. We don't need "big brother" deciding what's best for us!!

## Count Response

---

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Return it to the two travel lanes plus center turn lane!! It is much, much safer for both biking and walking. There was just a fatal accident at Folsom & Canyon involving a pedestrian. We have to prioritize bike and pedestrian safety over car speed. |
| 1 | Return to 2 travel lanes and buffered bike lane   |
| 1 | Return to Summer 2015 configuration with two vehicle travel lanes.  |
| 1 | Return to Summer 2015 status. Center turn lane facilitated better and safer traffic flow for vehicles as well as safety margin for cyclists with wider bike lane (as both a driver and commuter).   |
| 1 | Return to four lanes and conventional bike lanes.   |
| 1 | Return to full protected bike lane  |
| 1 | Return to protected bike lanes  |
| 1 | Return to protected bike lanes.   |
| 1 | Return to summer 2015 state   |
| 1 | Return to summer, 2015 configuration long enough to get adequate data on effectiveness safety.  |
| 1 | Return to the "before" with four travel lanes.  |
| 1 | Return to the protected bike lanes with 2 motor vehicles....It was much safer last summer...Thanks  |
| 1 | Riding on this section of Folsom is unnerving. It was GREAT last summer when we had protected bike lanes.   |
| 1 | Right-sizing on that portion of Folsom created terrible traffic conditions for vehicles and dangerous conditions for cyclists. Please do not go back to that!!  |
| 1 | Road too busy for only two lanes. Last summer was a disaster, not safer for bikes either.   |
| 1 | Same as previous comment. The Folsom experiment has just made me question the city's judgment, ability to use data, and management of funds generally.  |
| 1 | See my previous Comment.  |
| 1 | See my previous comment regarding this stretch of Folsom. The initial experiment for this stretch was a big time mistake, can't imagine there was anything other than emotion that went into the decision. LEAVE AS IS!!!!!!                              |
| 1 | See previous comment  |
| 1 | See previous comment.   |
| 1 | See prior comments regarding stretch between just south of Valmont and north of Pearl   |
| 1 | Separated bike lanes are essential, and should take priority over travel lanes for cars.  |
| 1 | Somebody was crazy to think that the two lane configuration would work.   |

## Count Response

- | Count | Response  |
|-------|---|
| 1     | Spend time and money on things much more important and enforce EXISTING BIKE RIDING LAWS> Lights, single file riding in existing bike lanes This was the biggest waste of time and money I have ever seen. What a friggin eyesore as well. Love how the white marker were almost invisible at night when they were covered with dirt and snow for three months.   |
| 1     | Stop wasting \$\$ on projects like this and start enforcing bikes riding "within" the existing SINGLE FILE bike lanes !!  |
| 1     | Summer 2015 is best for biking and promoting bike (reducing carbon emissions)   |
| 1     | Summer 2015 lanes.  |
| 1     | Summer 2015 was a ridiculous mess. It makes absolutely no sense to torture 95% of the traffic on the theory that the 5% bike trips are going to increase. I'm not taking my kids on Folsom no matter what you do to it, because of turning vehicle traffic. But I would take them on 23rd if you worked on it.  |
| 1     | Summer 2015 was good  |
| 1     | Take it back to summer 2015, the glory days of biking on folsom!  |
| 1     | Take the protected lane all the way up the hill to Colorado. Encourage cars to use alternate route. Folsom isn't really well suited for high speed travel the way 28th, Broadway or Foothills are. Keep Folsom a neighborhood street with protected bike lanes and sidewalks. The drivers will scream of course but let them, they have many good alternatives. Cyclists don't  |
| 1     | Thank God we are back to 4 lanes in the commercial areas.   |
| 1     | The "protected" bike lanes did not offer any real protection, but rather a false sense of protection. It did allow bikers to ride side by side occasionally, which put them about as close to the cars as they were before for the inside rider (but those bollards would stop of car from turning hitting them of course because of their invisible force field?). And I'll repeat, the cones are hideously ugly and make the streets look like permanent construction zones! In addition, the turn lanes and markings used during the "experiment" had car traffic criss crossing with bike traffic in a worse and more confusing way the it was before. And I say this as a Boulder resident and bike rider. If it's confusing to locals, think how bad must be for others who do not live here (Boulder never gets any tourist traffic though of course). Personally, if that's how our we're going to "improve" our streets for biking, I'll find a different, safer, more pleasant route to take. |
| 1     | The "right-sized" version was visually very confusing to me as a driver, and thus way more dangerous to cyclists! I hate those stick-up things, too much visual clutter--the less clutter the easier it is to spot cyclists. Painting the street green was confusing too.   |
| 1     | The 2015 was the biggest clusterfuck in all of Boulder bike history.  |
| 1     | The Before and current treatment are unsafe at the portion of the road where traffic is the highest and car traffic speeds are higher. Car speeds need to be enforced or speed limits should be adjusted to reflect the danger.   |
| 1     | The Original system is preferred by me both in car and on bike  |
| 1     | The Summer 2015 configuration felt dramatically safer. I was sad to see this forward-looking change reversed so quickly.  |

## Count Response

---

- 1 The Summer 2015 configuration made the car traffic lanes a little bit narrow. However, the use of a buffered bike lane again would be wonderful. I saw so many more parents taking their kids through Folsom on bike when the buffered lane was there. The return to 4 travel lanes smelled like Boulder prioritizing car traffic over alternate methods in a downtown environment where heavy car use should not be the norm.
- 1 The Summer 2015 lanes were much safer and more environmentally friendly. We need to push people to start being responsible and riding their bikes more, driving less!
- 1 The Summer 2015 option was good, but a HAWK (like the one at Regent and the E-Center on campus) was necessary to avoid gridlock from the crosswalks.
- 1 The added bike lanes in that southern portion actually made me feel LESS safe as a bicyclist, especially with regards to turning cars. Thank you for listening to the feedback and removing that treatment there. I really do appreciate the bike lane up near Valmont tho. Cars seem to travel slower there and there are few turns there anyway. So I think that was a good trade off for everyone.
- 1 The addition of the center turn lanes was a huge improvement. That was the first thing I experienced and I felt more secure as a driver. And look at that driver in the top photo encroaching in the bike lane! Let's bring back the protection along the whole length.
- 1 The barriers were nice. They kept drivers out of bike lanes, and provided at least a psychological division between the bike lane and the road. Even if the lane wasn't expanded again, I think the barriers should go back up.
- 1 The bike lane is narrow along this section and I see cars half in it in my commute daily. It seemed safer for all involved when there were protected bike lanes. The number of cars speeding has increased since the removal of protected bike lanes.
- 1 The bike lane is narrow and cars regularly drive over the line into the bike lane. It's scary riding a bike through this section.
- 1 The bike lanes from Spruce to Canyon are pothole ridden and too narrow.
- 1 The bikers had a good lane before. It creates too much traffic that needs to go for the car lane.
- 1 The blinking crosswalk at Folsom and Walnut is a death trap with the 2 lanes of traffic each way. The second lane can't see the peds/bikes that are trying to cross.
- 1 The center turn lane at Spruce (?) sometimes creates messy, dangerous merging of cars as a single through lane proceeds from 2 lanes.
- 1 The center turn lane is helpful, but the bike lanes may be too wide.
- 1 The center turn lanes are a waste of a lane and rarely used. If we must have bike lanes, which I don't support, at least figure out a way to squeeze in more traffic lanes.
- 1 The changes on Folsom were horrendous for commuting. I am so happy they have restored the 4 lanes. It is so much less stressful than the two lanes, which caused too much traffic congestion and snarled nerves.
- 1 The comments that I've read that this section was "perfectly fine" before and after the "right-sizing" are bald-faced lies. The experiment should have continued for a year as initially planned and then evaluated.

## Count Response

- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | The four Lane configuration is much less pleasant to ride than the two lane configuration. Riding Folsom is terrifying and there aren't many other options in this area to travel north south.  |
| 1 | The important option is (not surprisingly) absent. The whole mindless operation accomplished nothing. Unfortunately if people 'stick to the offered choices' you'll still keep your (I suspect high paying) jobs. But then I'm too old to know everything.  |
| 1 | The old lane arrangement was just fine--changes were not needed and made traffic on Folsom worse without increasing bike traffic. Who came up with this ill-conceived notion? Give that person another job to do!!!   |
| 1 | The only problematic sections along this stretch seem to be the right turns lanes at Canyon or Pearl. Cars turning right don't always realize there's a bike in the bike lane.  |
| 1 | The plan previously implemented was horrendous, and I am thankful it reverted back to four lanes.   |
| 1 | The protected bike lanes are much better. Cars are constantly riding over the white line as it is today.  |
| 1 | The protected bike lanes caused terrible congestion and confusion.  |
| 1 | The protected bike lanes felt much safer in this central corridor. Often passed by cyclists, or passing other cyclists, which means the demand for wider road is there, to ensure bicycle safety.   |
| 1 | The protected bike lanes really work! Please put them back so that I can be safe riding on Folsom.  |
| 1 | The protected lanes were better   |
| 1 | The street needs to be reconstructed and widened to accommodate a larger bike lane, even if this means changing the existing sidewalk and properties  |
| 1 | The temporary change was a disaster   |
| 1 | The two car lanes with protected bike lanes was an improvement. City leadership over-reacted to the squeaky wheel. There was some delay by car northbound at Pearl due to the Walnut pedestrian crossing that could have been improved.   |
| 1 | The volume of vehicular traffic on this stretch will always be high due to the many shops and businesses and the intersection with Arapahoe Avenue - a major city thoroughfare. In a perfect world, four traffic lanes and protected bike lanes would be ideal. But given the space constraints, the need for vehicles to easily access this stretch - both to make it reasonably usable by drivers and, critically, to sustain the customer base of local businesses - must win out. |
| 1 | The white poles are idiotic, they do nothing to enhance safety. Additionally, the intersections are totally confusing when you're making a right turn. And what does the green paint on the asphalt mean exactly?   |
| 1 | There are so many quieter side streets where bike traffic would be more appropriate. I think Folsom is too busy for bikes.  |
| 1 | There definitely needs to be two lanes of traffic each way between Arapahoe and Pine.   |
| 1 | There is far too much traffic to remove two lanes, especially with cars needing to turn in multiple directions. This was a bad idea that should have never happened to begin with.  |

## Count Response

- | Count | Response   |
|-------|--|
| 1     | There needs to be a safe bicycle access to the village complex and the 29th St mall from north Boulder, and there currently isn't one. Protected bike lanes on Folsom would partially solve this (although an off-road path, like an extension to the Elmer's 2 mile route would be most preferable).  |
| 1     | There never was a problem for bikers along Folsom. It, and 19th, have always been the best streets to get around town on a bike. I never understood why Folsom was targeted to 'right-size'. It has always been the right size.  |
| 1     | There should be two protected bike lanes on this corridor.   |
| 1     | These bike lanes are VERY narrow. You can see that the green and white bicycle logos in the lane don't even fit in the lane. For bicycle lanes, I'd prefer wider lanes, and protected lanes are even better.   |
| 1     | This area is congested and bicyclist need the additional protection. The sheer disadvantage a pedestrian/biker has against a 2000# metal can has to be factored into this. The bike hits a car and acts like a fly on the windshield. Turn on the wipers and wash them away. A car taps a cyclist or pedestrian and its is game over. The recent accident with the 84 year old woman crossing the street is a perfect example of the impact. I feel for the driver but also the now deceased woman. There is no bringing her back. I've watched through the rear windows drivers on their phones. The tight quarters in this area makes one slip up or lack of attention disastrous. |
| 1     | This configuration seems to be working.  |
| 1     | This is a busy stretch of Folsom, as it's between the two major thru-ways to downtown - Pearl and Canyon. Automobile traffic is a bit more intense along this stretch, and it would be nice to have a bit more space between myself and automotive traffic while riding. I also never saw the alleged traffic jams that occurred during the right-sizing project and think that they were exaggerated by drivers.  |
| 1     | This is a busy stretch with lots of cars, moving quickly, and unsafe for pedestrians/bikes. Need better bike facilities.   |
| 1     | This is a tough one. In principal I support rightsizing through the Pearl-Arapahoe area on Folsom, however it really seemed to be a problem when only one lane of traffic was able to clear the lights, causing southbound backups past Mapleton, and causing a substantial amount of trips to divert through the Pine/Spruce area. What other creative options are there?   |
| 1     | This is fine now. It really wasn't working with the bollards and fewer lanes, and that is coming from a bicyclist. I don't drive enough for it to matter to me, but I think there are still auto traffic bottlenecks during rush hour around Pine. Maybe it should be four lanes past pine to north in both directions?  |
| 1     | This is much safer and makes people ride their bikes. Don't be stupid and take them away! This is the reason why I moved to Boulder in the first place, like so many others.   |
| 1     | This is the most efficient method. Cars and bikers be aware of each other.   |
| 1     | This is the setup that works. Don't mess with it. Nothing is perfectly safe anyway.  |
| 1     | This project was a foreseeable and preventable disaster. This question is poorly worded. If I say "keep" the city can claim that I support what was done. If I say "refine" the city can claim that I support the city efforts at refinement. How about a third choice "restore" as in restore it to its original condition which was better before the city attempted to refine it.   |

## Count Response

---

- 1 This question is unclear, vague and poorly worded as to what "keep" means. I am choosing "keep" because 4 lanes of vehicular traffic are needed in this section of roadway. As a daily cyclist I never felt unsafe with the old bike lanes. The right-sizing made it less safe for me as a cyclist because of the the bollards force turning motorists to be less clear about their intentions--cars can't edge over to the right before the intersections but instead have to make sharp turns in front of you. I have had more trouble being cut off by right-turning vehicles with the "protected" bike lanes than with the old ones. Fortunately there are fewer intersections north of Mapleton, so the current design mostly works. All that being said, I'd certainly support a curb-separated bike path.
- 1 This question is unclear. By keep I assume it means to bring the protected bike lane back.
- 1 This section appeared to have bad traffic when it had less travel lanes, causing an angry car driver uproar that did not make for a favorable biking experience either.
- 1 This section sucks. Cars expect cyclists to ride in the gutter. There is no protection from aggressive drivers or big trucks. People in cars would rather pass a cyclists within an inch of the riders life than use their brakes to slow down until it is safe for THEM to pass (isn't that how it works with slow moving vehicles??)
- 1 This segment was more congested than the one further north, so good to keep 4 lanes in this section.
- 1 This works.
- 1 Too congested for only 2 auto lanes.
- 1 Too much space is given to bicycles
- 1 Traffic flows well, bikers are safer.
- 1 Travel time and congestion varied widely in this area yet the only thing that was reported was averages on the main street - Folsom. What was the side street delay? left turning delay? variation in travel times.
- 1 Turn it back to conventional bike lanes. BTW -- the Summer 2015 picture the riders are riding ILLEGALLY as they are NOT SINGLE FILE.
- 1 Two travel lanes, full center turn lane and protected bike lanes
- 1 Way too narrow to feel safe considering the gutter, the pavement deteriorating where the gutter meets the asphalt, and vehicle within 3' of riders.
- 1 We have 28th st for cars, keep making Folsom more bike friendly
- 1 We have to be willing to suffer some inconvenience to increase safety and the number of people biking. With the original protected lanes I felt comfortable taking my grandkids. Now I don't. But I do appreciate, for my own safety, the part you kept. And I am an experienced cyclist, riding 4000+ miles annually.
- 1 We need the 4 lanes and a center turn lane. build a separate structure for bicycles that gets them away from autos and pedestrians
- 1 We should go back to having protected bike lanes there.
- 1 When did the bike lane get removed? I didn't know that it went back to a 4-lane road?

**Count    Response**

---

- 1        When it was narrowed, there was serious congestion at some times of day.
- 1        When there was a protected bike lane, I was able to take my kid to daycare in a bike trailer along Folsom. It cut a mile off of my commute each way.
- 1        Where children under the age of 14 are expected to be using paths, they should be more defined and removed from auto traffic.
- 1        Why no other option?
- 1        Widen bike lanes, improve sidewalks, but DO NOT REMOVE the four automobile travel lanes.
- 1        Widen bike path & protect. Use imminent domain if necessary & create protected intersections. Look at your top photo. There's no way that Jeep is giving the legally necessary 3' to pass & most people would feel uncomfortable letting their children ride in a conventional bike lane which should be your barrameter of success.
- 1        With the conventional bike lanes it's scary riding on such a busy road.
- 1        Works fine
- 1        Works just fine as is. This was a very bad street to experiment on. My confidence in the city was somewhat restored with this was reversed.
- 1        Would like to see more bike protection
- 1        Would love a longer protected bike lane
- 1        Would love to see the bigger, protected bike lanes go back in. This is a high-traffic area and people drive like total morons.
- 1        Would prefer easier/safer bike access to CU with bigger bike lanes. Live in 27th and Valmont.
- 1        YOU DON'T HAVE FULL CENTER TURN LANES. BETWEEN ARAPAHO AND MAPLETON THERE IS HARDSCAPE. YOU ARE IGNORING AND SUPPORTING A KNOWN DEFECT IN THE PLAN.
- 1        You guys fixed this section. Well done.
- 1        You have to be crazy to bike with your kid on Folsom. Street is too busy with in-commuters. As long as transit sucks, we are going to have a lot of in-commuters. Their bike rate is less than 1%.
- 1        You've got to keep the four lanes of travel -- the two lanes was a complete failure, especially for winter travel.
- 1        Your idiotic lanes made cars cut sharply across the bike lanes to turn. With more room is more opportunity to avoid a problem
- 1        again, you are solving for a non problem. it wasn't a problem before and now you are putting in place a solution for 1/10 of the users. Maybe 1/100? Based on volume, cars are much heavier users than bikes.
- 1        go back to Summer 2015 - 2 car lanes
- 1        go back to Summer 2015 with more protected bike lanes

## Count Response

1 go back to original lanes

1 i work off of spruce and folsom, i rode my bike more to work as it was so much easier.

1 it should be right sized again with one travel lane for cars and a protected bicycle lane.

1 it works well as it is, and those stick things are really ugly (and they seem to be appearing all over town... horrible at Boulder Junction)

1 keep it 4 lanes.

1 keep it as it is. Families rarely use this even with the former test, most people are just getting somewhere and are fine with cars.

1 leave 2 car lanes

1 make existing bike lanes more obvious (color?)

1 make it like it used to be!

1 move barrier back to original bike lane

1 prefer "Summer 2015: Two travel lanes, full center turn lane and protected bike lanes"

1 protected bike lanes

1 protected bike lanes

1 put it back the way it was before this stupid fiasco

1 return to normal. This area has too much car traffic to reduce to 2 lanes. why can't you just put up cones on existing lanes and not destroy current flow?

1 see above

1 see prior comment

1 should go back to four lanes

1 single lanes both ways was HORRIBLE traffic jam and slowed progress to make for more pollution by cars continually waiting to drive forward

1 still confusion if bikers and drivers are not paying attention, which some are not. i see near misses and saw some hits.

1 summer 2015

1 summer 2015 was the safest way to travel

1 the lanes are too narrow. it's scary to ride them.

1 the protected bike lanes were great! too bad they got taken out.

**Count**   **Response**

---

1      the redirect of left lane only turns onto pine is helpful the merge however into one lane prior is dangerous' the hairpin left from northbound folsom onto spruce is dangerous in general the city of boulder makes roadways more dangerous straight is safer than curved curved/wavy lanes on eastbound pearl approaching 28th are dangerous

1      the resizing created a nightmare for cars traveling on the road. The medians created lots of backed up traffic.

1      there are major north south and east west auto corridors now. please stop compromising their volume by dropping lanes for bikes find alt routes for bikes if standard bike lanes not enough. Why frustrate autos for convenience of a few bikes? Majority rule?

1      unexpected sharp lane changes could be dangerous and are definitely confusing

1      use protected bike lines like in the last question; I don't know what "keep" and "refine" mean in this question

3. Today, the Folsom and Pearl Street intersection has a dashed green stripe. BEFORE: Skip striping between bike lane and travel lanes TODAY: Green dash right turn Based on your experience with the current treatment, what do you recommend? - comments

Count	Response
1	"skip" and "green dash" are euphemisms for "the bike lane degrades and cars are encouraged to crash into bicyclist at intersections when many drivers are distracted by other traffic and their maps and whatever else they are doing". I think this is problematic. At intersection are where cars should be encouraged to go slower, check mirrors etc. They should not be encouraged to cut the corner and kill as many people as possible.
1	A waste of green paint that has no meaning to drivers or people from out of town.
1	Add cones or some physical barrier
1	Adds to clarity of the lane
1	Again, anything that contributes to safer streets for cycling is a big plus.
1	Any pavement treatment that encourages caution, communication and cooperation among motorists and people on bikes is a good thing. Keep it.
1	Anything that clarifies which way bike traffic will travel is helpful for everybody.
1	Are we to automatically know what a colored road is supposed to mean? People don't even know the *current* rules of the road, nor do they abide by them. Nor do the majority of both drivers and bicyclists know the rules/laws for bicycles (!) To make matters worse, these rules/laws change spontaneously without notice (to anyone) as one drives/bicycles from one part of town to another. Please don't complicate it further by now throwing color-codes into the mix. Instead: Keep bicycles and cars separate, teach drivers how to use the left lane as a passing lane, not a driving lane, teach everyone the laws that apply to bicyclists, do not increase vehicular traffic (ergo, congestion, frustration, pollution, and accidents, etc.) by taking away their space and giving it to bicycles, which are an order of magnitude less in size and then some in numbers.
1	As a bike commuter, I really appreciate the bright paint treatment. It makes it clear to motorists that I am supposed to exist on the street, which makes me feel safer. For turns, I do really appreciate the green blocks that are turning areas for bikes making left turns - like the ones on Valmont and 30th. There is not a lot of bike traffic on Pearl, but it seems like a simple treatment that makes it easier to interact off of the standard routes to get to where you need to go as a biker.
1	As a cyclist, I would love to see a protected lane (with bollards). The green paint by itself doesn't do much to make me feel safe/visible.
1	As no data as proven whether this new process has mitigated either safety or traffic flow, no additional work should be accomplished if and until the data substantiates a positive ROI.
1	As noted previously, the green - lines are confusing to drivers and cyclists alike. There has not been any education on what exactly to do. I have seen drivers pull over to the right to make a right-hand turn as well as stay to the left of the bike lane and turn left. People don't know what to do.

## Count Response

1	At minimum, keep this improvement. I would support experiment with additional measures to remind cars turning right that a bike lane exists. I do not think the green stripes are visible enough, though I do not have a specific recommendation for something more visible.
1	At this point I do not understand or easily recognize the meaning of the green stripes. They seem different than the way green is used on streets downtown. This may change over time as familiarity increases.
1	Bicyclists seem to be the only people who are well versed in what the green markings mean. Better signage or more periodic educational campaigns might be helpful.
1	Both as a motorist and. Biker, I don't find the greens particularly safe when not buffered
1	But not nearly as good as a protected lane and protected intersection as being done in Salt Lake, Davis, and Austin.
1	Can't see them as well. HOW about NEON green?
1	Cars do not respect the bike lane and it should be delineated.
1	Cars turning across a bike lane is among the most dangerous situations for a biker. Definitely keep and keep improving!
1	Certain streets should be just for cyclists
1	Color makes biking a bit safer; cars are more likely to notice the bike lane before they turn.
1	Color the whole area GREEN. San Francisco does an amazing job of this and it shows motorists that this is not an appropriate place to park between cyclists. We all pay for roads through various taxes yet cars somehow monopolize the roads. Its not unreasonable to paint 4 feet of the road to denote safe cycle passage.
1	Confusing as it now is. It was more clear during the "before" stage.
1	Confusing. What does it mean?
1	Consider green box at intersections that put bikes forward of cars for visibility (Dutch design).
1	Cyclists do not respect drivers trying to turn
1	Do not do the Criss-Cross like you had at Folsom and Canyon. Very dangerous. Holland stopped doing that 30 years ago.
1	Do you really think the people who are a problem pay any attention to details like this?
1	Does anyone actually think this is important?
1	Doesn't make a difference, really, one way or the other.
1	Doesn't matter one way or the other
1	Doesn't matter. I drive it all the time and never noticed those green dashes. I do watch carefully for bikes, though. I just don't notice the green paint on the street.

**Count    Response**

---

- 1        Don't care.
- 1        Don't feel this simple paint job does much, but no need to remove. I believe the point is to make the bike lane more visible to cars. Perhaps this can be done by alternating with other colors, like orange.
- 1        Don't think it makes a difference
- 1        Drivers avoid the green dash lanes slightly more than the conventional lanes.
- 1        Either go back to the original or use a white bike symbol--that would get the idea across more clearly to me than green lines.
- 1        Either way is okay
- 1        Fix signal timing to allow people walking and people who ride bikes to enter the intersection first.
- 1        For unaccustomed drivers, signage should explain what the green paint means. Visitors may be totally unaware of their meaning.
- 1        GREAT FOR BIKERS AND DRIVERS.
- 1        Give Bikes and Peds 5 second head start at the light. \* Watch out for the potholes and buckling pavement on Pearl/Folsom intersection. It will throw you off the bike.
- 1        Go back to the fully protected lanes. At the very least keep the green striping.
- 1        Good to have better protection for bicyclists
- 1        Good to remind motorists to watch out for bikes in turn lanes
- 1        Green dash is code for "right turn"? Good to know...
- 1        Green is more noticeable? Feels like the people in cars notice me better now when I am stopped there at a light, but may it's just in my head!
- 1        Green is nice but I am not sure cars understand it. I think yellow would help better. Thanks!
- 1        Green lines remind me to check my mirror to look for cyclists.
- 1        Green paint is an eyesore and confusing for drivers, especially out of town visitors who have no idea what the color coding means.
- 1        Green paint seems to came drivers slightly more conscious of the lane's existence.
- 1        Green stripes do help to clarify the use. But I still disagree with removing traffic lanes
- 1        Green stripes do nothing to inform an out-of-town driver when to pull to the right to make a right turn (especially when the light is red) nor do anything to solve the problem of seeing cyclists whizzing up behind you when you're signalling a right turn, and there is no way to tell if the cyclist is going straight or turning. If autos are supposed to turn from the middle of the street instead of pulling to the right first, there might be a painted arrow indicating this.

## Count Response

1	Green zones encourage bikers to simply ride without paying attention or heed to cars, in the false notion they are safe now because of some paint. The idea of the paint vs. the behavioral changes of riders are at odds with each other.
1	Have you educated drivers and cyclists about what green paint means? Signage, etc. Road users don't see a lot of green paint (in most towns)
1	Honestly I did not (and still do not) understand what the green represents. There are solid parts and dashed parts.
1	Honestly, most people (including me, an avid cyclist and occasional driver) don't know what these mean. Drivers NEED to know what these mean. We need a big educational campaign.
1	How would anyone who has not kept abreast of these changes/developments know what the green paint meant?
1	I am not sure what the dashed green lines mean, as there is no signage explaining what cars are supposed to do vis a vis the dashed lines.
1	I appreciate that the green paint provides a visual cue for drivers that the lane has a purpose for bikes.
1	I appreciate the criticism that the green striping clutters the intersection and creates distraction. However, I also have observed that it results in greater caution. Cyclists have greater visibility and get cut off far less from southbound drivers turning west.
1	I believe that the green dashing does make drivers more aware of the potential for bicycles in that area, although I feel that cyclists must yield to cars turning for their safety
1	I can't tell that it makes any difference. Your questions should allow for this option.
1	I don't experience the green mixing zones as all that different. I think the city should focus on educating bicyclists that the law states that they must stop behind the first car stopped at a light if it has its right turn signal on. This is a regular mistake I see made by other bicyclists. They tend to ride around them to the right and try to get in front of them.
1	I don't know how much green paint will actually help, but there is no downside in my mind.
1	I don't know if it could be applied here, but I really like the green bike boxes at intersections. Makes me feel really safe when I am biking.
1	I don't see the point of the ugly green lines, how are they even remotely different from what we had before?
1	I don't think anyone understands it! Especially the drivers!
1	I don't think drivers notice or understand the changes. I don't know what they do in other bike-friendly cities, but some refinement is needed to help drivers see & respect the separation.
1	I don't think it makes a difference at all
1	I don't think the green does much, but keep it, I guess.
1	I don't think they have much effect either way, so don't spend any more money changing it!

## Count Response

---

- 1 I don't think this makes much of a difference. The green doesn't make the lane any easier to see than when it was just a white dash line.
- 1 I don't understand the dashed white lines implying it's alright for cars to cross into the bike lane. I'd rather have a solid white line straight into the intersection. Vehicles can turn once they enter the intersection, they don't need to drift into the bike lane. I would also rather see a green bike box extend into the intersection.
- 1 I find the green stripes meaningless particularly since there is no effort made to educate the car driving public. Drivers need to be educated on rights of cyclists. Cyclists need to be educated on how to use infra properly and legally.
- 1 I find these help with awareness and visibility. But drivers still don't understand that the dashes mean mixing zone
- 1 I got hit on my bike on Arapahoe and Folsom in the bike lane. I was going straight and the car next to me was going right. The car hit my front tire, sped up and continued to drive.
- 1 I guess keep although I am not sure what they mean.
- 1 I have made right turns using the far right as a turn lane when unoccupied, but it is confusing if this is allowed. There is no signage and this is not standard practice. Even as locals figure it out, tourists and other visitors will be continually confused.
- 1 I like it, but it is small enough that it feels like drivers might not even notice the green. Maybe tabs or grooves between right turn lanes?
- 1 I like the attention that the green striping gets from motorists. This could probably be greatly expanded elsewhere. Anything to jolt drivers out of their stupor.
- 1 I like the extra visual key.
- 1 I like the green for the bikes.
- 1 I like the green stripes
- 1 I never even noticed the green striping and I walk along that area every couple of weeks!
- 1 I prefer the solid line nearly all the way to the intersection, as before. The green color is an improvement, though doesn't actually do much to help bicycle riders feel safer in an unprotected bike lane.
- 1 I see bikes almost get hit here A LOT! Vehicles turning seem confused.
- 1 I think I've noticed less cars edge into this space with the green.
- 1 I think it's a fine way to remind folks that there is a bike lane there.
- 1 I think some reflective bumps would be helpful as the green is not always visible.
- 1 I think that the point of the green lanes is to call attention to bikes in their lane, but the markings don't feel like adequate protection, considering that the lane is still the same width.
- 1 I think the dashed green stripes are fine.

## Count Response

---

- 1 I think the green is a stronger signal to drivers to pay attention for bikes.
- 1 I think the green stripes are helpful.
- 1 I think the markings for bike lanes are good
- 1 I think the striped green helps advise cars that bicycles are turning. But what about pedestrians?
- 1 I think the whole strategy of the green striped section needs to be revisited or at least needs an education campaign as neither cyclists nor vehicles know how these sections are supposed to be used.
- 1 I think this could be a little more prominent and maybe some more protection / plastic posts before the line dots.
- 1 I think this helps better distinguish for drivers when they see it that this is a bike lane... Keep it.
- 1 I think this is a great improvement and hope that it can be expanded. I have seen enough texting drivers on Folsom to wish for protected bike lanes all the way from CU to Valmont.
- 1 I think we should keep the green stripes but I'm not sure drivers really understand what they mean.
- 1 I would like to see an addition that is more visible in inclement weather and at night such as embedded reflectors or reflective paint.
- 1 I'm a bicyclist, and I STILL don't know what this street striping means. AFAIK, this does not comply with any national or international traffic standards, but appears to be some ad hoc scheme perhaps copied from another "bike friendly" community. My feeling in general has been that when Boulder's traffic engineers "go rogue" with these types of schemes the results are not necessarily safer or better. It only takes one out-of-town driver (read: a new CU freshman) unfamiliar with these local, non-standard traffic patterns to create a tragedy because of confusion or distraction.
- 1 I'm not convinced it helps, but it can't hurt.
- 1 I'm not sure what this does? But removing it is EXPENSIVE and Boulder has already spent enough tearing down projects
- 1 I'm okay if it makes drivers such as myself more aware of cyclists -- the color seems to do that. Just make sure you repaint each year and/or don't let the green fade over time.
- 1 IF this means keeping the striping and nothing else.
- 1 IMO, the current markings make more of an impact.
- 1 If those stripes are supposed to draw attention to danger zones, they should be more attention grabbing
- 1 If we keep this needs to be consistent throughout Boulder
- 1 Improves safety, but it's only paint. How about addressing vehicular turning actions and signal timing?!
- 1 In addition to striping, signage needs to be better for winter months where striping may be obscured.
- 1 Include a series of R turn arrows

**Count Response**

1 Indifferent,

1 It doesn't add any new information for me.

1 It is a terrific visual for all users.

1 It is confusing since people have not seen this in other cities so visitor could be dangerous

1 It is fine, but insignificant and meaningless. Not worth spending money removing--or doing elsewhere.

1 It looks like the children of the neighborhood found some green paint and had a great time!

1 It might be better if there was some continuous marking through the intersection that reminded drivers that there was a lane of traffic they may be crossing over

1 It really does not make any difference visually - in fact can be confusing.

1 It's a great heads up to right-turning vehicles.

1 It's a joke the way it is. Put the protected lanes in

1 It's a safety hazard because it has emboldened the already entitled bicyclists.

1 It's not clear what the green striping means. Appears to have a different meaning in different places; isn't always present in the bike lane; doesn't tell a car what to do when it is making a right turn.

1 It's not much, but at least it might signal to a few drivers that they are not where they should be. (I get drivers encroaching prior to turning all the time either way.)

1 It's not that easily visible.

1 Keep and ticket cars that use these boxes as turn lanes. It occurs daily and nearly every cycle.

1 Keep but better educate both drivers and cyclists what the green treatment signifies.

1 Keep the current treatment which clearly demarcates the bike lane.

1 Keep, but add back the protected lanes.

1 Like I said, I avoid Folsom every which way possible. I do not care what you do.

1 Like it- increases car drivers' awareness of cyclists.

1 Love the green dash--makes me feel more comfortable waiting in that lane instead of a car trying to encroach into the lane to make a right turn.

1 Love the stripes.

1 Love these, even when driving it's a great reminder

1 Make it solid green

**Count    Response**

1        Make solid green rather than dashed.

1        Maybe add "Blue" zones for pedestrians, where bicycles have to yield to pedestrians.

1        Maybe yellow would be better

1        Meaningless

1        Money would be better spent dealing with the seam between the bike lane and gutter and solving the problem in the summer of there almost always being water in the gutter--pools in places--because of sprinklers. Those pools are a bigger hazzard in the mornings.

1        More green would help catch motorists eyes and raise awareness

1        More protected bike lanes please...

1        Move towards bike protected intersections: <http://www.protectedintersection.com>

1        Much more conspicuous for drivers to pay attention to bikes when they are about to turn right.

1        Need more signs warning people to stay out of the bike lanes and give bikes the right of way when they are turning right

1        Nice, now only if there was some way to educate out-of-town folks about these...

1        No comment. Leave it to the bikers

1        No one ever explained the green paint. It wasn't necessary. Why confuse people who drive and have no idea what various paint colors mean?

1        No one knows what these confusing, arbitrary markings mean.

1        No one knows what this means.

1        No opinion. Drivers who didn't understand skip striping aren't going to respect green-dashing either. The green paint would have more impact if applied consistently throughout the city. Otherwise it's just more noise.

1        No real opinion on green dashed lines

1        Nobody knows what the green stripes mean. When I'm on my bike I sure don't trust them to keep me safe.

1        Not important. I do wonder about composition of the green paint.

1        Not required when different modes of transportation are not mixes.

1        Not sure this is clear enough to keep cars from forgetting bikes may be there and turning into them. Prefer bike first signals and some additional bike box

1        Not sure w this one. Cars just wear off the green paint and its a waste of tax payers money.

1        Not sure what the purpose of the green stripes are, compared to the white stripes. It makes no difference

## Count Response

---

- 1 Not sure.
- 1 Notice the uneven pavement in the second picture. Even out the pavement. Cars tend to swerve into the next lane when bicycle riders ride to the left of their lane to avoid uneven pavement.
- 1 OK but not great. I'm still worried someone turning right will hit me.
- 1 OMG - needing a handbook to try to understand the markings when I'm driving or cycling is insanely dangerous. Get rid of these unfamiliar markings. Just leave it the way it was and route bike traffic on 28th or 29th or 30th Street. Five year olds do NOT belong in the street, and nothing you do will change that. Put them on the sidewalk. The goal should never be to get preschoolers next to trucks, I'm sorry, that is not good public policy or a good use of taxpayer dollars.
- 1 Or, do what the bicyclists want on this one.
- 1 Other than some increased visibility, I'm not sure how useful this striping is. I was disappointed that when the protected lanes were removed from Pine to Arapahoe, that the green striping across all the intersections was removed as well. I think the green striping through the intersections has a greater visibility factor and therefore creates safer streets for cyclists, pedestrians and car traffic.
- 1 Otherwise, inattentive drivers treat it as a right turn lane and block the bike lane at red lights.
- 1 Paint is a great idea to increase visibility of bikes on the roadway
- 1 Painted road surfaces are slippery when wet.
- 1 People from out of town have NO IDEA what these green markers even mean. How can that be safe?
- 1 Please extend green striping through the intersection
- 1 Prefer solid striping. Also, I have concerns about traction on large painted areas in wet weather. Has testing been done to confirm the large green areas do not present a slip hazard, especially since they tend to be located near street edges where the crown makes the slope steeper than other parts of the roadway?
- 1 Prevent cars from passing bikes, just to turn right in front of them.
- 1 Protected bike lanes would make this better.
- 1 Protected intersections are even more important than travel lanes!
- 1 Raising awareness for cars that there may be cyclists around is great!
- 1 Re, my earlier comment. The green intersections are confusing, can you drive on the green? Are only bikes allowed on it? That "green code" doesn't work as no one knows what it is!
- 1 Really no opinion on this - doesn't really make a difference.
- 1 Really?
- 1 Reminds cars that this is a bike lane

## Count Response

---

- 1 Remove a through lane in both directions, as well as the mid-block crossing signals. The signals contributed to the hostility directed toward the right-sizing.
- 1 Return to original skip striping.
- 1 Safer. But I would not ride it.
- 1 See previous comment
- 1 Seems OK
- 1 Seems to alert people to bikes
- 1 Signage to educate both bikers and cars.
- 1 Skip striping seemed fine. Green mats give false sense of security to bikers and confuse cars drivers.
- 1 Some drivers need to have the place for bikes in the intersection more in their face.
- 1 Stop making up problems that don't exist. We are lucky to have so many bike lanes. Perhaps people should open their eyes !!
- 1 Sure why not. I believe the markings help to inform drivers and cyclists both about what should be done at intersections.
- 1 Thank you for helping automobile drivers be aware of where bikes travel.
- 1 That is the ONLY feature acceptable of this project as it is a SAFETY feature that 'might' wake up a motorist.
- 1 The Green is very distracting, causes me to take my eyes off the road in front of me, thus far more dangerous for bikers than the more common and familiar white striping. GO BAK TO WHITE!!!
- 1 The bike lane should be solid green
- 1 The colored lane striping is the ONLY feature of the test project to keep - get rid of everything else
- 1 The colors don't help anything. I don't understand why anyone would think this is safer than no striping. Its just confusing. Lets keep it simple and clean. Remove all the 'right-sizing' paraphernalia and repave the mess you've made of this street.
- 1 The dashed striping is nice, but green bike boxes in front of the cars and bike turning boxes would be helpful.
- 1 The extra green paint has no impact on traffic. It's fine.
- 1 The green alerts people to the presence of cyclists.
- 1 The green bicycle marking makes tons of sense. It raises awareness of drivers, particularly for people from out of town who are not used to so many cyclists on the road.
- 1 The green color does draw more attention and awareness to the bike lanes, which is good, but there does not seem to be a clear understanding of what the new markings really mean besides "be aware".

Count	Response
1	The green is confusing.
1	The green is everywhere and loses its meaning when repeated so much
1	The green lanes call attention to those areas. Expanding them would be beneficial.
1	The green lines are the only thing keeping this new system safe in many places! It can be otherwise very confusing and I recommend keeping them for sure!
1	The green paint as it is today helps alert motorists that bicyclists may be around, and helps ensure cyclists have plenty of space to ride safely.
1	The green paint catches your eye when you are driving. This treatment has to make the bike lanes safer.
1	The green paint helps drivers see the bike lane better I think.
1	The green paint is helpful, but not at night! We need reflectors, and ideally something that has sufficient height that cars know when they drive over them.
1	The green paint treatment works well and should be used, rather than trying to block off (protect) bike lanes. It's a good visual cue for cars and bikes.
1	The green seems to help remind the drivers that there may be bikes on their right hand side.
1	The green stripes are confusing. I don't think they should stay.
1	The green stripes are fine.
1	The green stripes give a good visual cue to right turning drivers at a key intersection between modes of traffic, and I think they're an improvement.
1	The green stripes help better define the bike lane to motorists who notice.
1	The green stripes helps for cars & bikes to be aware
1	The green striping helps cars to see that there's bike lane they are turning into.
1	The green striping is more easily visible to drivers and tells them to be on the lookout for cyclists. I see no reason why this should be changed, as it doesn't impede drivers whatsoever.
1	The green strips aren't horrible, at least compared to the bollards and cross over lanes painted during the "experiment", but I have to wonder if they are really accomplishing anything or if anyone really knows what they stand for or why they are there. Unless we have a comprehensive, easy to understand plan for marking the bike lanes that is consistent throughout the city, we may just be wasting more money, labor, and time to create useless confusion. And is it really doing anything to beautify the city?
1	The green zones are confusing to motorists.
1	The markings are very confusing, but if kept may eventually make sense
1	The meaning of the green stripes is not clear.

**Count    Response**

1        The more high visibility, the better. How about a few neon yellow street signs that say "get off your phone and pay attention"

1        The white dashed lines are clear but the green paint is nearly gone.

1        These are beneficial and make drivers aware at intersections.

1        These are very minor differences that make no difference to me.

1        These don't do anything at all to promote safety.

1        These green stripes are a great safety feature to ensure cars are aware of bicyclists on their right as they approach an intersection. They should be added to other intersections and extend through the intersection for additional safety.

1        These many different line and color patterns are confusing. Things seemed to be working well before.

1        These markings are a plus

1        They just give bikers a false sense of security and encourage a sense of infallibility... I've seen them take stupid chances with this confusion of entitlement to flaunt the laws of the road.

1        This definitely helps visually when driving to remember that bikes may be present, and to take care when turning right.

1        This draws drivers attention to the fact that there may or will be bikes in this area. It adds a little space for cyclists and pedestrians. Without it cars feel free to pull right up and through without a second thought. Case in point would be the same intersection on Pearl heading East/West. There isn't the green striping and cars take up as much area as possible. Seriously go watch where cars stop N/S vs. E/W and you'll see the positive impact that I believe the green stripes create.

1        This is great for awareness, keep it!

1        This paint scheme confuses those not familiar with local issues.

1        This seems to be telling the motorist it is OK to drive in the skipped area to avoid a right hook situation. Is that what is intended?

1        This was a waste of money for a very minor change. Removing it would be another waste of money.

1        Though it makes little difference, the green patches might make drivers more aware. However if the driver doesn't see the biker, he probably won't notice the green patches.

1        Today, green dash turn lane.

1        Unclear. Did not prevent recent traffic/pedestrian fatality.

1        Unless there is also signage, who knows what the "green dash" means?

1        Use colored chip seal for the entire bike lane.

1        Use skip striping again

**Count    Response**

---

- 1      Useless
- 1      Very confusing painting. Someone is going to run over a biker. I really am afraid this will happen. I have seen many near misses.
- 1      Very confusing to have something only used in Boulder. The dashed white lines are much clearer.
- 1      Whatever.
- 1      While the green blocks make it more visual to where the bike lane is, car traffic at the Folsom and Pearl intersecting ignore the lanes and try to squeeze by on the right creating a 3rd lane so, they can make a quick right turn.
- 1      Who cares.
- 1      Why are we paying to paint the streets green? People know what a bike lane is and how to use it, except for maybe the bicyclists...They seem to enjoy taking up the entire road whenever they want to.
- 1      You still feel very vulnerable with 2 narrow lanes and no protection, but anything that makes drivers more aware you exist is good I guess.
- 1      add obstacle between bike and car lane
- 1      annoying!
- 1      dashed lines are better than simply having the lanes go away at intersections. when that happens, drivers encroach on what should be bike space at intersections.
- 1      don't care
- 1      green makes it easy to see. you could also put little flasher reflector things on the edge of the bike lane so cars could see where their lane ends.
- 1      green paint can be slippery when wet
- 1      green paint is a good cue -- i like it a lot.
- 1      helpful without destroying normal traffic flow.
- 1      helps cars know where bikes are
- 1      i dont care about bikers.
- 1      it's ok but unimportant either way
- 1      it's very confusing
- 1      keep the concept but see if it can be made a bit safer. by the way why green?? people respond to yellow: like we do not cross yellow double lines. go to yellow. green is nice as an environmental color not a safety color. green lite= go; red=stop; yellow/orange= caution. go for safely and not pretty. duh!
- 1      keeps cars out of "my" lane

**Count    Response**

---

1        marginal improvement

1        much of the new striping is confusing and contradictory. This is useless and reduces safety.

1        no clue what the strip means

1        no idea what the dashed green means.

1        nobody has adapted to safe use of a turn lane, same goes for your treatment of bus only lanes at arapahoe and 63rd what a waste of money on 6 and 8 foot wide sidewalks on arapaho east of 63rd. years of construction for nothing.

1        paint to tal lane green and plastic posts if a must but snow removal with posts tough?

1        put it back the way it was before this stupid lab thing

1        seems safer for cyclists

1        the solid green (not striped) bike lane paint is more noticeable.

1        these green stripes are very confusing -- what do they mean?

1        this is good! it reminds cars that bikes belong here and to keep an eye out for them. this would be good at more intersections.

1        too obtrusive

1        what's the point of the expense of adding colors?????? Anyone with Red/Green color blindness is just going to see gray against gray pavement anyway

1        who cares about color - stop wasting time and money on this road

4. Today, Folsom Street between Canyon and Arapahoe has conventional bike lanes and a bike box at the Canyon and Arapahoe intersection. BEFORE: Four travel lanes, some center turn lanes and conventional bike lanes TODAY: Four travel lanes, some center turn lanes, conventional bike lanes and a bike box at the Canyon and Arapahoe intersection Based on your experience with the current treatment, what do you recommend? - comments

Count	Response
1	Take out 1 car Travel lane and expand bike lane.
1	A "bike box" really? What does one do in a bike box?
1	A waste of time and money. KISS.
1	Add cones or some physical barrier to draw attention to bike lane
1	Add protected bike lanes.
1	After the outrage from drivers about the changes to Folsom, I DO NOT use the bike box. Someone would certainly run me over. I highly doubt any bikers feel confident about the safety of that bike box.
1	Again I don't see the point of this, I would never use anything but the right hand space when on my bike. I wouldn't want to be in front of a whole line of hostile drivers. I've never seen other people on bikes use this space to the left of the bike lane either.
1	Again this is a matter of consistency throughout Boulder and educating both drivers and cyclists as to what these boxes mean. Boulder is very inconsistent in marking and it is confusing for everyone.
1	Again, I think anything you can do to send a noticeable signal to drivers that they need to be careful of bikes is a positive thing.
1	Again, I wish for this area to be protected. I do not use the bike box because drivers don't understand it and stop on the bike box. Like the cyclist in the photo, I keep way over to the side, then cross the street on the crosswalks instead of turning left with the cars.
1	Again, all the green paint is confusing, even to me and I've lived here for a long time! What was wrong with the way it was before? Were hundreds of people dying in bike accidents? Solve the car traffic problem here and work on air pollution in other ways that work for the majority of people. Light Rail between Boulder and DIA? Light Rail between East and West Pearl/Arapahoe/Canyon?
1	Again, anything that makes cars more aware is good.
1	Again, doesn't seem to do much to protect bikers.

## Count Response

- 1 Again, fairly useless. Most of the positive change I have experienced on my way to CU is from the no right turn on red. That helped, the bike box makes no difference. You might consider that signage at Canyon too. Or why not allow the peds/bikes a few seconds of walk before the light changes?
- 1 Again, no good data on how this change has either benefitted or detracted from requirements at this intersection. No additional changes until a transparent ROI indicates what the value of this work has accomplished.
- 1 Again, not sure the "bike box" has really improved anything. I don't think things were unclear before this. They actually seemed simpler. I kind of feel this whole "experiment" has been a poorly thought out, poorly researched attempt to fix something that wasn't really broken. Sure it would be nice to see some improvements to bike route options, but Boulder already has a lot of options compared to most places. Putting up cone zones, splashing colorful paint all over things, and restricting auto traffic so a few people can ride side by side, isn't going to improve the transportation issues in Boulder, or force people out of their cars onto bikes or onto the bus. Better bus routes, more frequent service, cheaper access to the bus, and bike routes away from autos and not in "construction" type zones will go further to help, rather than throwing money at poorly constructed experiments.
- 1 Again, signage to explain what a green "bike box" area is for. Unless you know, the green paint is meaningless.
- 1 Again, the so-called bike-box helps nothing and makes nothing safer.
- 1 Again, these lanes are VERY narrow. The painted bicycle logo doesn't even fit in the lanes. Would be nice to have wider bicycle lanes.
- 1 Again, why are we paying our taxes to paint streets green??? If bikers want this much special attention, then they should pay their own taxes that make these changes, not everyone else's tax dollars that do not require any of this! This entire project is beyond ridiculous and a perfect example as to why Boulder is a laughing stock to other Colorado cities and other states. Why should the majority of the people who drive cars and pay for the streets, suffer so that a few people can ride their bikes and have no consequences for their actions?
- 1 Although I think both drivers and cyclists need a little bit of education regarding they should/should not be when stopped.
- 1 And bring back protected lanes.
- 1 Another great safety feature to ensure drivers are aware of cyclists to their right at an intersection! It helps with awareness, even if there is a green light. If the light is red, cars are still able to turn right if a bicyclist is on the right side of the green box, as depicted in the photo above. Therefore, this safety measure should not impede traffic very much.
- 1 Anything that helps cars see that there is a bike lane is helpful.
- 1 As a cyclist - does the bike box mean I should travel in front of vehicles stopped at a red light? Need signage/education on proper use.
- 1 At the very least, keep the bike box. Additional protections might be nice, too, as this is a heavily-trafficked intersection for both cars and bikes. Given that a lot of CU students - many of whom might be from out-of-town and are unfamiliar with the city's geography - ride this on their bikes, I think it's in the city's interest to ensure that the students have an infrastructure designed to protect them.
- 1 Better educate what the box means to both motorists and cyclists.

## Count Response

---

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Bigger bike box?  |
| 1 | Bike biz is better then striped green lines   |
| 1 | Bike box is confusing - ppl don't know what it means/what to do. This is such busy intersection, it holds up traffic turning right, too   |
| 1 | Bike box is fine. Center turn lane is a waste of a lane   |
| 1 | Bike box is good. It would be even better with protected bike lanes restored in the Spruce to Canyon section, where it can help transition smoothly from 2 to 4 traffic lanes.  |
| 1 | Bike box is still simply confusing. Bikes don't get in front of vehicles in the painted areas, I lived in Portland when they 'unveiled' this new concept and the same confusion reigned there.  |
| 1 | Bike box is useless without a bike specific signal.   |
| 1 | Bike box seems like a good idea.  |
| 1 | Bike boxes are better than nothing. Keep them and continue to repaint them, as they fade quickly.   |
| 1 | Bike boxes are the "sharrows" of intersection treatments--they are window dressing with little actual safety improvement. But they are better than nothing, and perhaps improve cyclist visibility a bit. A protected intersection would be a better choice.  |
| 1 | Bike boxes make me feel much safer on a bike as I don't worry about inattentive drivers turning right into me.  |
| 1 | Bike boxes seem to be an improvement as they give the bicycles more visibility at the intersection. However the bike lanes between canyon and arapahoe are inadequately narrow and ill-repaired. Additionally conflict with the HOP bus stops often forces bikes to dangerously merge with heavy traffic when the bus sits at a stop. |
| 1 | Box is confusing if you are not used to that.   |
| 1 | Boxes are okay, they encourage cars to be on the lookout for bikes AND appear to give bikes the right to move up at a red light and be first to start. But this stretch of Folsom feels like the bike lanes are very narrow, so I'd rather have lanes widened even green paint went away.   |
| 1 | Bring back protected bike lanes.  |
| 1 | Bring back the protected lanes  |
| 1 | Can't see that it is making any difference and color coding is confusing to tourists and others.  |
| 1 | Conventional bike lanes are fine. Stop wasting time and tax money.  |
| 1 | Conventional bike lanes seemed to work well. Bike box is confusing and leads to uncertainty for both bikers and car drivers.  |
| 1 | Could be better /more protected.  |
| 1 | Cyclists and autos should not be on same streets  |

## Count Response

- | Count | Response   |
|-------|--|
| 1     | Definitely keep the bike box. In my experience the cars definitely tend to keep out of that space when there are bikes around.   |
| 1     | Do not know what a Bike Box is supposed to do  |
| 1     | Do not understand your question concerning the "Canyon and Arapahoe intersection." No intersection of these streets exists. Also, see my comment about traction during wet weather for the green-painted bike box.   |
| 1     | Does anyone know what a bike box is?? This is the only one in town I know of and what is the purpose. Do bikers and cars know how to use this?   |
| 1     | Doesn't make a difference  |
| 1     | Doesn't make sense to allow bikes to pile up at stop lights in front of cars. The cars are in a line, the bikes can be in a line also  |
| 1     | Don't care.  |
| 1     | Don't understand how that's used. Does it mean bikes can pull ahead in front of the cars? Confusing.   |
| 1     | Don't like unbuffered bike lanes especially between cars   |
| 1     | Drivers can legally go right on red. Cyclists need to stop at the rear bumper of the first car at the light.   |
| 1     | Drivers routinely stop in the bike box. Remove the second white stripe abutting the crosswalk that seems to confuse them. Even without a car in the bike box, it is awkward to use it when cycling because it requires a very tight turn. Increase the length of the bike box so cyclists can use it more comfortably.   |
| 1     | Either way is okay.  |
| 1     | Everyone knows Boulder has a lot of bikes. Adding a bunch of eyesore, confused road markings does nothing but waste money and create eyesores of unwanted and unnecessary paint on the roads. Stop with the signs, road marking etc.   |
| 1     | Explanatory but simple key in box  |
| 1     | For all the reasons listed on the Pearl and Folsom intersection. All you have to do is look at the photos included. The green bug in the first photo is right on the line. 3' to pass rule? Doesn't seem to apply within the city. The car in the second photo has stopped properly at the white traffic line and offers the cyclist a little buffer. This is huge having this little space when negotiating the streets. It also allows the cyclist to get a slight head start on the traffic and come closer to the speed the cars are traveling. I think having some uniformity around speed of movement helps all the way around. When there are large differentials this is what causes the problems for all. |
| 1     | Good way for all to be aware   |
| 1     | Green paint doesn't make anyone safer. How about adjusting light timing to allow bikes and walkers an early start across the intersection?   |
| 1     | Green paint to the N is between intersections. What is the difference and how is a biker or driver to know what green means when there is not a consistent use? Same for University. Oh, here's an idea for you--paint the entire bike lanes green--NOT!   |

**Count    Response**

1        Have consistent intersections so everyone knows what to expect. People get distracted when they are trying to figure out what different markings mean and distraction is dangerous, particularly to cyclists.

1        Helps me see the bikers which is SO helpful for everyone

1        Here's another treatment I don't think all users understand. It's challenging when in many scenarios bikes should not pass motor vehicles and here it is encouraged. Much as I hate excess signage, I would encourage something that encourages move to the front. And don't forget to share the cute Lego video on bike box use!

1        Honestly, i haven't paid much heed to this feature. I'll try to notice next time. Sounds good on paper/monitor. Perhaps expand elsewhere.

1        How does the bike box help me? I'm not going to get in front of the cars even if there is a green box.

1        I almost got majorly squished here last week. :( I don't know what the answer is. I ride both cars and bikes here. Cars are just badly behaved, and I never see anyone enforcing the law. Chattanooga did a thing recently where a bike cop with a camera stopped cars, showed them what less than 3 feet looks like to a cyclist and educated on what the law was. Most drivers hadn't thought of it from that viewpoint. Folsom would be a good area to do that. Slow enough to catch the cars on a bike!!!

1        I am not sure why a bike box is useful or helpful at that location. I'd prefer to see it removed. Of course, that is not in keeping with radically multi-modal orientation of the City, so I doubt that any amount of feedback like mine will make any difference, but I applaud your interest in my opinion.

1        I bike commute a lot and am confident in mixed traffic, but I do not feel comfortable using the bike box as the designers intend. I think it begs drivers to be aggressive with their throttles and horns.

1        I do not understand a "bike box"

1        I don't even notice the difference and I ride this all the time.

1        I don't see that it did any good. And it's confusing.

1        I don't see what the bike box is supposed to do. The picture shows a car stopped at it and line the cyclist in the picture, I would stay to the right and not be in front of the car, so what is the purpose?

1        I don't understand the bike box

1        I don't understand the bike box. It does not make sense to put bikes in front of cars, particularly when most people unfortunately are on their phones in some way while driving. And, again with the traffic patterns...it would be good to not antagonize the drivers in Boulder (many of them who are also cyclists). Slowing traffic doesn't get people out of their cars, it just makes them angry.

1        I don't understand the purpose of the "bike box."

1        I don't understand the purpose of the bike box. If it is to mean that cars should be behind bikes, then that is illogical. If there is that much traffic, a bike either needs to exist with the cars (to make a left turn, for example), or cross like a pedestrian in two segments. Plus, it is confusing to cars making right turns.

1        I find the green paint areas scary because I don't know what I'm supposed to do or not do as a driver. I know how to scan for cyclists. I expect them to ride on the right except for intersections where they need to turn, and otherwise cross with the lights. KEEP IT SIMPLE!

## Count Response

---

- 1 I find this to be confusing for both cyclists and drivers-- cyclists don't really use it because as soon as the light changes they have to get back over anyway. Drivers often ignore it to turn right on red.
- 1 I generally appreciate bike boxes when more protected bike space is not possible.
- 1 I have no clue what a "bike box" is. Is it anything like a batter's box?
- 1 I just don't see how letting bicycles pass stopped cars to bunch up together in front of them so that when the light turns green, the whole line of cars (which are quicker, faster vehicles) needs to drive at 1/4 speed until the box clears in order to get around the bicycles. More congestion, more detriment, etc., etc.
- 1 I like 'bike boxes'! (and now I know what they are called)
- 1 I like the bike box. Especially if it were legally enforced to keep cars out of the bike area.
- 1 I like the bike boxes and the intersection striping. Would love to see a protected and wider bike lane.
- 1 I love the stripes and bike boxes! Keep those up.
- 1 I never knew it was called a bike box or what purpose it is supposed to serve. Why does it go in front of car lane?
- 1 I never notice the bike box so I don't have an opinion. I am aware of the cyclists, not the color on the pavement.
- 1 I still feel that a protected bike lane would be the best option.
- 1 I think the bike box is a good idea
- 1 I think this configuration is good but the signal timing needs to be adjusted to allow bikes and peds to enter the space first. Consider adding a separate cross signal for bikes.
- 1 I use this bike box often! However, there are also many times when I pull into this intersection as a cyclist and the bike box has cars in it. With this being the ONLY bike box that I know of in the city, and there isn't one in the opposite direction of traffic at that intersection, I don't think car drivers are aware of what a bike box is, or how to use it. I would love to see more bike boxes at all the major intersections along the Folsom and 30th street corridors... I've cycled in Portland, OR where bike boxes are a common occurrence and seen both cyclists and car drivers navigate them with ease. So, I think having more of them in Boulder would actually increase their success because they would just become an accepted part of traffic culture in this city.
- 1 I would go back to protected bike lanes and two lanes of traffic.
- 1 I'd like to see a pedestrian safety box.
- 1 I'm neutral on this feature. It seems to impede right turning vehicle traffic a bit, but getting bikes out slightly ahead of cars at stoplights has a positive impact.
- 1 I'm not exactly sure of what it's supposed to do or if drivers even see it!
- 1 I'm not sure of the purpose of the box. I wish more info had been disseminated on how the decisions were made. What do other cities do, what has been found effective where, why were these specific routes chosen? Iris is still dangerous. I hope that the dangerous part east of 30th is improved by the current construction.

## Count Response

1	I've never noticed these 'bike boxes' and I'm not sure what they are supposed to accomplish. If is to put bikes in the lane with the cars that seems very dangerous. Why would you do this on purpose? Are you trying to get people hurt?
1	Improvements are good, but more separation would be better. This intersection is still scary as hell.
1	Indifferent.
1	It is RIDICULOUS that the bus can stop in the bike lane!!! Stupid.
1	It's not clear what bikes and cars are supposed to do there
1	It's over kill and confusing... no one understand what a 'bike box' even is.
1	Just make the whole thing go away.
1	Just put it back the way it was before it all started. No more weird markings. This is Braille to most folks. As I mentioned earlier, five year olds and the elderly should not be the target of this public policy. These vulnerable riders belong on the sidewalk or on bike paths. They are not commuting to work, why do they need to be in the street? I don't understand the thinking here, and as an ardent cyclist, I understand the public outcry. Your policy is not practical, is not responding to real needs. What you need to do is make cycling safer for adults who are on the fence, not for the most vulnerable. No preschoolers on the blacktop. Creek path is for them. Families don't ride with their kids to work at rush hour, they don't need this approach. There are plenty of lovely places for the timid and vulnerable to ride.
1	Keep bike box, add protected bike lane
1	Keep bike box. Reduce speed limit, make shared lanes w/bikes and cars.
1	Keep only the colored bike lane differentiation - get rid of everything else from test
1	Keep the bike box but add protection. Very dangerous intersection for cyclist to day
1	Keep the bike box, and find a way to add protected bike lanes all the way to campus. I am not a huge biker, but I live in the area (Depot Junction) and drive this street regularly. It has to be one of the busiest streets for bikes in all of Boulder. I see a huge need for a safe north-south connection on that side of town.
1	Keep the bike box. Any green paint treatment provides a good visual cue and keeps the traffic flow of both bikes and cars from getting too tight.
1	Lanes are narrow. It's scary to ride a bike through this section, but the green paint improves the situation. I'm not sure whether the bike boxes are used. I stay to the right in the bike lane at that intersection.
1	Lanes narrow and bumpy.
1	Like bike box.
1	Lots of traffic here. Canyon & Folsom was a horrible corner for bike accidents prior to 2015.
1	Love the bike box. A protected lane would make sense here too.

## Count Response

---

- 1 Make a protected bike lane. People don't drive the speed limit, they drive at the rate that seems safe to them. Narrowing the street results in slower speeds, which is safer for bikers, pedestrians, AND car drivers.
- 1 Make a wider bike lane. Elevate it from car lanes. Incorporate the bike line into the sidewalk. Include a walking/pedestrian lane. Make it like the bike lane on Broadway from 20th Street to Arapahoe. Also remove bus stopping in bike lane. I suffered a major concussion and broken pelvis while trying to pass a stopped/loading HOP bus while on my bike on March 31, 2015. Had to merge into the left car lane. But when I looked over my left shoulder, I wobbled and crashed. This is a very dangerous mix of bikes and cars area. I'm lucky to be alive.
- 1 Make more apparent
- 1 Make more bike friendly
- 1 Makes it too confusing for both drivers and riders
- 1 Makes right hand turns on red confusing. Also it would be nice if 'No right hand turns on red' were eliminated throughout the city.
- 1 More protected bike lanes please...
- 1 More protection for the bike lane would be better.
- 1 Most accidents happen at or in intersections due to volume. Bikes are at risk more in this area.
- 1 Move toward bike protected intersections <http://www.protectedintersection.com>
- 1 Much more clear in recognizing the presence of bikes and therefore safer.
- 1 Need straight thru bike lane NOT in front of the cars.
- 1 Needs better bike and pedestrian facilities.
- 1 Needs to be clearer at night and in the rain.
- 1 Neither cyclists or drivers seem to know what to make of this.
- 1 Never turn right from here - didn't know the bike box was there. I'm good either way.
- 1 No one ever introduced bike boxes to explain how bikers and drivers are supposed to use them, so no one uses them.
- 1 No one knows what these confusing, arbitrary markings mean.
- 1 No one knows what this green box means, how they are supposed to react to it. It is confusing. Locals may learn, visitors will be confused always.
- 1 No opinion
- 1 No strong feelings.
- 1 Notice uneven pavement in both photos.

Count	Response
1	Now bikes block the x-walk for me when I walk. Hate these!
1	Omit the markings in the mv lanes. Keep & enhance the bike lane markings
1	Once again, creative painting and "bike boxes" mean nothing to drivers from out of town and they impede the flow of traffic.
1	One motor vehicle lane and a protected bike lane, Please!
1	Or do what the bicyclists feel is best.
1	People who aren't familiar with this design can easily no understand what the hell to do.
1	Perhaps, move the bike box back so cars (and bikes) turning right can still do so without interference.
1	Please add protected bike lanes here, and continue them through to the Boulder Creek Path.
1	Please consider expanding the protected bike lanes!
1	Protect cyclists from right-turn vehicles (particularly CU construction traffic at Arapahoe) by installing cement or plastic dividers.
1	Protect us from cars with a barrier. We want to survive our commutes.
1	Protected
1	Protected Bike lanes and single lane of traffic in either direction.
1	Protected lanes are safer
1	Put a bike path adjacent to a renewed/repared sidewalk and move on. Quitscrewing around. This is adding aggravation to people's lives that just don't need aggravated. Rather than blowing money on this airy fairy stuff, repair the roads.
1	Put up a great big sign at the intersection explaining what the hell a "bike box" is!
1	Reduce traffic lanes. This still prioritizes vehicle traffic over other users (and right now I drive more often on this street and am concerned for the cyclists). Keep bike box. A lost minute or two for cars is nothing compared to a human life. Cars may also use 28th for north south, but Folsom is important link for bikes in this direction.
1	Remove a through lane in both directions of Folsom.
1	Remove bike box.
1	Remove double left turn lanes from Folsom to Canyon Westbound, visibility is poor for turning autos with high potential to hit southbound peds and cyclists.
1	Remove the bike box. For bikes going straight or turning right there is room to queue in the bikelane
1	Ridiculous
1	Safer. Again, I will not use it.

**Count    Response**

1        Safety hazard. Instead of aggressively "encouraging" bicycling, encourage different bike routes.

1        Same comment as before.

1        See previous comment, ticket drivers at Folsom/Arapahoe that use the box as a turn lane.

1        Seems confusing.

1        Seems like with resurfacing and perhaps by taking out part of the island we could get back a protected bike lane and still allow two lanes of traffic. That would be nice.

1        Some people don't really understand the role of the bike box versus a bike lane.

1        Still got hit on Arapahoe and Folsom

1        TONS OF BIKES THERE SO GREAT IDEA..

1        That green really alerts drivers to the presence of cyclists. They are more likely to give cyclists a safe space.

1        The "bike box" is confusing and ugly. I don't know where to position myself when I'm cycling through it, and I don't know how to drive through it (right turns, anyone?) when I'm in my car. And AFAIK, there is no "Canyon and Arapahoe intersection" as referred to in this question.

1        The Bike lane needs better separation from the car lanes.

1        The bike box in front of cars is unnecessary.

1        The bike box is GREAT! Please add the bike box to all similar intersections.

1        The bike box is an improvement. I like that there is space for bikes to congregate at the front of the lane and clear traffic before it starts turning and there's a risk of getting right hooked.

1        The bike box is fine, but do not expect people to honor it. Rode my bike too many years to trust anything.

1        The bike box is misleading to riders. I assume it is used at this sort of intersection because there is no right turn on red, and to allow bikes to queue-jump at such intersections. That's only permissible if the first car stopped at the light doesn't have it's right turn signal on. Unfortunately, I think it encourages the unsafe behavior where cyclists always think they can pass stopped cars at a light. I don't believe the law allows for queue-jumping the first car (stopped at the light with its right turn signal on) even when it is posted that there is no turn on red. The bike boxes should be removed.

1        The bike box is unnecessary and doesn't make sense--cars should not have to wait behind bikes.

1        The bike box is unnecessary and people don't know what it is for anyway.

1        The bike boxes actually seem to be honored by more cars...

1        The bike lanes, as you can see in your photo, do not have level pavement. Hence, bicycles tend to keep left, close to traffic. If the pavement was level, perhaps bicycles would ride in the center of the bicycle lane. Keep the green box!

1        The conventional lanes are crowded there at peak times.

## Count Response

---

- | Count | Response   |
|-------|--|
| 1     | The double turn lane here seems necessary for traffic flow. I'd prefer a safer treatment for bikes since this stretch is so busy, especially with students, but I can live with the current treatment.   |
| 1     | The fact that you have offered four different questions over such a short stretch of road means that it is over-engineered and confusing.  |
| 1     | The green bike boxes are safer for bikers because they can enter the intersection before cars. Do they also reduce red-light running because cars need to stop farther back?   |
| 1     | The green is confusing--the meaning unclear.   |
| 1     | The green paint is nice, but a full lane bike box is not needed and potentially impedes right-turning cars at the red light when there is just one bicycle waiting.  |
| 1     | The green zones are confusing to motorists and cause undue congestion.   |
| 1     | The survey requires me to answer this question, but I have not used this section of Folsom, so I have no opinion.  |
| 1     | The visual mass of bike boxes and gathering up of riders creates a safer interaction at intersections. This concept should be expanded and modeled upon traffic flow for scooters in Taiwan as a good example of how to integrate different travel modes in congested areas.   |
| 1     | There is no signage to indicate if "stop here" refers only to when there are bicycles present, or always. The box effectively eliminates the legal right turn on red at this intersection.   |
| 1     | There should be protected bike lanes on Folsom Street between Canyon and Arapahoe.   |
| 1     | These are better than the dashed striping but again, protected intersections are the single biggest improvement along with some bollards that you could make for everyone's safety!  |
| 1     | These are too slippery. Also kind of pointless.  |
| 1     | These green bike boxes are stupid. Don't you know your own city traffic laws? Bicycles are not allowed to overtake the first vehicle stopped at a red light on the right when the car has its right turn signal on. Let alone pool in groups in front of them. I remember learning about this law way back in elementary and middle school bike safety classes. I just checked, and it is still on the books... These bike boxes encourage breaking the law and UNSAFE bicycling! Remove them! |
| 1     | They need more frequent repainting as it fades quite quickly.  |
| 1     | This change improves space for cyclists at a busy intersection.  |
| 1     | This intersection feels better on a bicycle; it seems cars are more aware of me when I'm there. However, I would like to see a fully protected lane added.   |
| 1     | This intersection is a DEATH TRAP. Buy up the Subway shop and make it wider and safer for all.   |
| 1     | This intersection is extremely confusing, and can't be understood by either cyclists or drivers in terms of "road rights" and responsibilities. This hasn't helped at all.   |

## Count Response

---

- 1 This intersection is still very challenging for southbound, left-turning bicycle riders. Cars seem to not even consider that a bike rider might want to turn left using the car lanes with the protected arrow. If there is a way to make this a more obvious choice that can be shared by bikes and cars that would be great. Bike boxes and green paint are an improvement from before.
- 1 This is a case where as a motorist or a bicyclist I do not know what to do with the "bike box". Why is it there and what are the traffic rules?
- 1 This is a challenging intersection, the bike box is a nice buffer zone where numerous bikes can safely wait for the green light.
- 1 This is a very busy area and it need to have its own bike lane with a border. Cars frequently pull into the green bike area when making a right hand turn.
- 1 This is an unsafe option for bikes. I don't choose to ride in the narrow, unprotected bike lanes when I have a choice. Multi-use sidewalks are far safer.
- 1 This is like a bike and pedestrian death trap. Drivers are always impatiently trying to turn left or right here. The only thing that seemed to improve my feeling of safety here was the protected lane.
- 1 This is nice, I like it. Folsom bike lane is very narrow in this right of way, both in absolute width and the shoddy curb cuts that squeeze you into traffic. Could these be redone so the entire bike lane is part of the concrete curb?
- 1 This is the most dangerous part of my commute the bike lane is narrow compared to state standards.
- 1 This may increase cyclist safety. You should really be basing this decision on statistics, as there is no apparent downside for drivers (that I can think of).
- 1 This prohibits or impedes legal right on red turns.
- 1 This section of Folsom has the highest level of cyclist and pedestrian travel, and the worst facilities! There's not even a freaking sidewalk on one side of the street for part of it! Grow a set, City of Boulder, and get us protected facilities!
- 1 This section of Folsom, between Arapahoe and Canyon, is in bad shape. Potholes, lots of driveways, Buses stopping in the bike lane.
- 1 This seems to be good also.
- 1 This was a waste of money for a very minor change. Removing or refining it would be another waste of money.
- 1 Today, keep bike box.
- 1 Two lane and protected bike lane
- 1 Unfortunately this is as good a solution as our city will likely allow to take place. We all know that the safest bicycling cities in the world have raised lanes. Has our organization had a conversation about how wide bike lanes are and how much room cyclists should give other cyclists to pass? If a serious roadie wants to pass a tourist on a cruiser, how much space is reasonable and does our current infrastructure support that?

**Count    Response**

1        Unless or until more can be done here, this is good as it does set the pedestrian/bikeway off from the lane for turning vehicles.

1        Unnecessary and dangerous.

1        Use conventional bike lanes

1        We had been assured that we'd get used to the new format. I still have not heard one positive comment - and I know quite a few people who use their bikes for transportation (most were my former students).

1        Well, maybe keep but not sure what they mean.

1        What exactly is a 'bike box'? See my previous note about new green markings not being well known.

1        What is a "bike box" for? I didn't even know it was there. Stop confusing people.

1        What is a bike box?? Looks ugly and have no idea how to navigate it.

1        What on earth is a bike box? What's it for?

1        What's a "bike box"? The paint and barriers and flashing lights are incredibly confusing and distracting.

1        What's a bike box?

1        What's the purpose of a bike box? It looks like the biker pictured in the "Today" picture is in the exact same spot as the biker in the "Before" picture, and the only thing different is that large driver attention distracting green area which apparently serves little purpose beyond making a statement.

1        Who cares

1        Why not keep the same striping as at Pearl? The problem with having multiple treatments to give visibility to cyclists is that drivers get confused. Is different yield behavior expected for stripe vs. box? Consistency will also make things feel less distracting to drivers.

1        Works just fine for me as a cyclist. And a driver.

1        You either have to make these intersections "no right on red", or remove the boxes. Vehicles are currently ignoring them. I don't bike enough to know whether boxes actually make bikes safer.

1        You should have a whatever column.

1        add obstacle between bike and car lanes

1        add pylons

1        again, confusing

1        bikes need a place to stop in order to avoid right-turning vehicles so the green boxes at intersections might be okay to stay

1        change color.

**Count    Response**

1        current markings are probably more relevant.

1        don't understand "Box"

1        experiment with making bikers continuing through the intersection more apparent for cars about to turn right). (perhaps a bike-only green light for rush hour times that allows bikes to start moving before cars get their green light)

1        helps drivers see bikes

1        i like the bike box (although i never noticed before and I rode up and down folsom every day!)

1        improve to reduce the frequent right hooks

1        make it one car lane

1        make protected bike lane

1        marginal improvement

1        new configurations can be confusing to residents and especially tourists

1        no comment/no thoughts

1        no one seems to know HOW TO USE the bike box - if it will remain there needs to be more education for both cyclists and drivers on how to use it properly

1        not an intelligent question and a stupid survey function if one has to pick one of 3 bad answers to a stupid question

1        not sure if this works...there is no canyon and arapahoe intersection, btw

1        protected bike lanes, please. be sure the bike box green paint, striping is fresh.

1        put it back the way it was!!!

1        remove green box

1        the bike box is helpful. It's scary when cars catch up to you mid-intersection as they can bleed into bike space on the far side of the intersection and squeeze you. Wider, protected lanes are more effective.

1        this is really great! leaves plenty of space for bikes and brings awareness to drivers! this needs to be done at all big intersections where there could be bikes!!! pearl and 28th. 30th and pearl. 28th and valmont. 30th and valmont. foothills and valmont. etc.

1        what is a bike box?

5. Today, Folsom Street between Arapahoe and Taft has buffered bike lanes. BEFORE: Two travel lanes, center turn lane and conventional bike lanes TODAY: Two travel lanes, center turn lane, and buffered bike lanes Based on your experience with the current treatment, what do you recommend? - comments

Count	Response
2	Add protected bike lanes
1	A little confusing without something blocking out the divider strip (between white lines).
1	Add bollards
1	Add bollards.
1	Add bollards.
1	Add some bollards or such to separate the cars from the bikes.
1	Add some sort of physical barrier or marking
1	Adding bollards to reduce car intrusion into the bike lanes and prevent people from temporarily parking in the bike lane would be appreciated.
1	Again, I like the separation between the cars and bikes. It feels safer when I'm on my bike. I think it would be even better to have off street bike lanes / paths and stop trying to force the mixing of bikes and cars.
1	Again, I'm a cyclist and I have no idea what this striping represents. Do I ride where the green picture tells me or where I'm used to riding: between conventional bike lane striping? Presumably everyone involved understands the acronym "KISS"?
1	Again, it wasn't needed before. You add space or lanes for something when it's congested, not in the hopes of increasing usage.
1	Again, no good data on how this change has either benefitted or detracted from requirements at this intersection. No additional changes until a transparent ROI indicates what the value of this work has accomplished.
1	Again, safer. Slight improvement. I avoid this section.
1	Again, the markings are inconsistent and there are no bollards here which confuses drivers. You need to figure out a consistent marking method for the entire area and keep it simple.
1	Allow pedestrians to use the throughway for events at CU that cause large crowds
1	As a cyclist I like the flexibility of the buffered bike lanes. I think they improve safety and do not prevent cyclists from avoiding obstacles.

**Count    Response**

- 1      As from Valmont to Pine, this section of Folsom has never felt dangerous to ride to me. It has little to do with the road itself and everything to do with it being less busy with fewer side streets and business entrances. Don't bother thinking about this section.
- 1      As to the north, the bikers do not feel unsafe since only a small percentage of them wear helmets. That is a very good measure of how bikers feel and you don't count it, as far as I have seen on your reports.
- 1      Bad idea which needs to be returned to the way it was.
- 1      Barrier to separate the bike lane from the traffic lane. Was just about run over by a FedEx truck yesterday. He was driving down the marked bike lane. Buffer does little to protect a rider from aggressive or distracted motorists
- 1      Barriers would be safer
- 1      Based on the fact that I've seen no real difference in the bicyclists use of the street and have never seen convincing evidence of frequent accidents at all, let alone because of "smaller" bike lanes I would say there is no need to make the vehicle lane skinnier to accommodate a "buffer" lane.
- 1      Buffer = better!
- 1      Buffer is better than bollards, but wasted expensive roadway seems unnecessary. I recommend returning to "BEFORE" configuration.
- 1      Buffer lane is good for the higher use CU traffic. But, again remove the painted surface as it is redundant and dangerous
- 1      Buffered bike lane is good. No bollards, hurray! Green indication is easy to understand.
- 1      Buffered bike lane is nice but I don't think it needs to be as wide as currently implemented.
- 1      Buffered bike lane with bollards or other physical separation would be an improvement.
- 1      Buffered bike lanes are a good compromise and might be a good approach for the section between Pearl and Arapahoe.
- 1      Buffered bike lanes are good, especially when there is on-street parking and a big hazard of getting doored, which obviously does not apply here but it is good nonetheless.
- 1      Buffered bike lanes are safer. They feel safer especially on curves.
- 1      Buffered is better than conventional, but not as good as protected. Busses still interfere with lane, as can heavy traffic, debris, etc.
- 1      Buffered is fine there because the street is wide enough to accommodate it.
- 1      Buffered lanes work well.
- 1      Buffering is far less stressful than a stripe.
- 1      Buffering is fine when traffic isn't impacted by removing vehicle travel lanes.

**Count    Response**

1        Buffering is good, but we could do better by putting up some pro'.

1        Buffering is not needed.

1        Car traffic is the greater volume and should be the priority. Return to two lanes. Standard bike lanes are more than sufficient.

1        Colored chip seal for the entire bike lane.

1        Conventional bike lanes are adequate. Stop messing with traffic.

1        Current setup is an improvement, but as with the other sections of Folsom, I would love to see a fully protected bike lane (not just paint).

1        Cyclists and autos should not be in same streets

1        Do you honestly think people pay attention to white lines??????

1        Don't know.

1        Don't really have a preference on this one, either way works, there's plenty of room and no problem.

1        Excellent. Much better than before.

1        Extra buffer space is a big bonus and doesn't impede or otherwise affect traffic in any way, as the street is wide enough to accommodate the full auto lane in addition to the buffered bike lane in both directions.

1        Get rid of the buffer. Protect.

1        Go back to the conventional bike lanes. What was wrong with that??

1        Good section. Only a few driveways. From Colorado to the creek it needs to be re-paved after all the heavy construction equipment. Make sidewalks wider!

1        High volume of fast moving traffic

1        How about a rumble strip in the barrier. They are super good at waking drivers up before they kill someone. So long as bikes have room to overtake each other without riding the strip then why not?

1        I am fine keeping this as is. There seems to be adequate space for both the auto lanes and the bicycle lanes. (As an aside, walking up to CU to teach this semester, I am amazed at how many cyclists take to the sidewalk northbound on the east side of Folsom! There is not enough space for both bicycles and pedestrians and I step into traffic to let the bicycles by. Seems crazy to me when there is a nice bike lane right there.)

1        I don't drive on this part so cannot comment

1        I don't find this section very different whether I am driving, walking or biking.

1        I don't know.

1        I don't see very much bike traffic.

## Count Response

- | Count | Response  |
|-------|---|
| 1     | I don't think the buffering looks like buffering. It looks like a bike passing lane, so remove it. It is safer to have wider lanes for cars (especially since Boulder doesn't plow the ice off of the roads in the winter) than to have bike passing lanes.   |
| 1     | I don't use this stretch of road. Only for CU students I would think. A paint stripe on the ground is not going to stop a car from hitting a bike no matter where you put the stripe.   |
| 1     | I haven't traveled this stretch of road for about 30 years, so don't have a feel for the traffic load and speeds. But it looks like a lower speed and volume road than Folsom between Arapahoe and Spruce, and it doesn't seem to impede the auto traffic, so I like the buffer zone between the car and biker lanes, and the green appears to be far enough removed from the cars to not be distracting. |
| 1     | I like the buffer, but the striping is confusing. Some cyclists ride between the white lines thinking it is a bike lane. Just make a proper curb-protected bike lane  |
| 1     | I like the buffering.   |
| 1     | I like the idea of the buffered lane, but markings are a little confusing. Looks like another lane.   |
| 1     | I like the post separating the cars from the bike lanes.  |
| 1     | I like the wide bike lanes.   |
| 1     | I love having the buffered bike lanes. Having that extra bit of space between me as a cyclist, and car traffic provides a wider margin of error for automobiles that tend to stray into the bike lanes.   |
| 1     | I love this part because then I can pass other cyclists safely  |
| 1     | I never drive here, no opinion. The questionnaire required an answer  |
| 1     | I never found this stretch of Folsom bothersome.  |
| 1     | I prefer this setup, but don't personally ride this section of Folsom.  |
| 1     | I really like these wider buffered bicycle lanes. When riding south, and you get to the bike lane south of Arapahoe, you breathe a sigh of relief.  |
| 1     | I see a lot of passing bikes here, and it's nice to keep the traffic to the left edge.  |
| 1     | I think buffered space on long straight sections works well. It keeps cars from coming too close. It is not visually distracting and provides reasonable flexibility. "bot dots" or similar that help remind cars of their space is a possible enhancement.   |
| 1     | I think it's actually a little unclear what's going on here. It looks like a bike lane next to traffic, with on-street parking. I suggest adding bollards to keep drivers out of the buffer and bike lane.  |
| 1     | I think it's fine   |
| 1     | I think the buffered bike lanes are unnecessary, but if they are not reducing the traffic flow, it's fine to keep them.   |
| 1     | I think the students feel much safer on this segment with buffered lanes especially on the curve.   |

## Count Response

- | Count | Response   |
|-------|--|
| 1     | I think this area works fine now. It is marginally better than before when I bicycle, and made no difference to me when I drive. Please don't add bollards here.   |
| 1     | I think this is pretty good, but I don't ride this section very often. So my opinion is short.   |
| 1     | I think this is working fine and from the cyclist's perspective it's an improvement over what was there. As a driver, I find these markings somewhat confusing - if the bike is in the far right, who goes between the dashed lines?   |
| 1     | I wish we could do this more, but can't. here it makes sense   |
| 1     | I would keep this mainly because of the waste of the taxpayer's dollars in changing it back to the original status. It shouldn't have happened in the first place.   |
| 1     | I'd still like some actual protection. And these views are southbound. Northbound at Taft is treacherous due to vehicles underestimating bike speeds.  |
| 1     | Ideally, protect the bike lanes (rather than just buffer)  |
| 1     | It appears that space is being wasted.   |
| 1     | It is better marked, not a better experience.  |
| 1     | It is nice to put some space between the bike lane and the traffic lane, but only as long as it doesn't congest traffic by cutting down on capacity.   |
| 1     | It used to scare me that the bikes did not have enough space.  |
| 1     | It's amazing what that second line provides. It seems safe enough that I even bike there while pulling a trailer at times.   |
| 1     | Just add some flap down bollards where ever possible!  |
| 1     | Just impedes traffic. Bikers and drivers are thrown into confrontation over these meaningless changes. For example: your pedestrian crossings are seriously abused by bikers, unwilling to go 20 extra yards to the regular traffic signals...they'd rather run over pedestrians and stop traffic!   |
| 1     | Keep as is, but perhaps reducing the speed limit for cars???   |
| 1     | Keep the buffered bike lanes.  |
| 1     | Keep them, but maybe add bollards! yeah!   |
| 1     | Keep. Drivers don't like lines. They are like cows and a cattle grate even if it is painted on. If there is a line on the pavement the majority of people driving have a hard time crossing it even if it shouldn't be an issue. Like a painted cattle grate. The additional buffer that the left most line creates is great. This allows me as a cyclist to pass slower cyclist in this high traffic area. Additionally, I don't feel as if I have to ride my skinny tires along asphalt cement curb boundary here and the associated pot holes. The left most stripe causes minimal to no disruption to the drivers. I say this speaking as both a rider and a driver. |
| 1     | Looks good.  |

**Count    Response**

---

1        Love and feel safe as a biker. Doesn't bother me as a driver.

1        Love the space for cyclists! Also when I'm in my car, I like the reminder.

1        Make the sidewalk better with a tree lawn, the buffer isn't necessary in this stretch but the road is too wide without it.

1        More confusing, arbitrary markings that no one can understand. It makes it look like bikes should be riding down the skinny strip between bike lane and cars.

1        More protected bike lanes please...

1        More protection all along Folsom would be better

1        More protection, especially some education for the bus drivers who blaze past cyclists or who block the bike lane.

1        My experience (biking up and down this street daily since ~2008) is that the traffic is substantially diminished once you pass canyon on southbound Folsom. Perhaps adding a protected barrier makes sense here, but it should be a lower priority than zones further north on Folsom.

1        Needs protected bike lanes, not mere paint. Paint doesn't keep cyclists out of the emergency room.

1        Needs reflectors set into the ground to improve demarcation.

1        Never drive in this part. Good either way.

1        No big deal either way

1        No strong opinion.

1        Not necessary.

1        Of any of the changes, this seems the simplest, most straightforward, and least offensive to the eye. Not sure the two white lines are really necessary, much less all the dashes, but the green painted bike symbol does show up a little better than if it were just a white symbol on the asphalt as before. Maybe keep it simple with using one white line as before, but give the bike lane more space like it has today. I doubt the "buffer" area created by all the extra paint and dashes really accomplished much. I like the idea of keeping it simple and straightforward.

1        Paint the lane and the buffer green. Change local laws to allow cars to safely enter the space as long as there isn't a cyclist within 50 feet. Cars never drive in the buffer yet car users get angry at cyclists for using this as entitled space. Let's settle it with some green paint.

1        Please add bollards here.

1        Please bring back the protective pylons.

1        Please keep the buffer zone. Distracted drivers (esp w/ Cellphones) are too careless with other people's lives.

1        Please make a protected bike lane. Use physical barriers to actually create something that stops cars from veering into bike lane please.

Count	Response
1	Pretty irrelevant
1	Probably where Folsom works best.
1	Protected bike lane
1	Put the bollards in at the very far left white line.
1	Really don't have an opinion because I don't travel in this area
1	Really should be protected bike lane.
1	Really?
1	Remove buffer, or split the difference and make the bike lane a bit wider.
1	Remove the buffered bike lane. They are not used properly. Bikers are enabled to ride 2 and 3 abreast.
1	Remove this stupid EXPERIMENT that cost tens of thousands of dollars and remove all new right size bike lanes. Back to 4 lanes !!!!
1	Restore the road to its prior number of auto lanes - keep only the bike lane coloring
1	Same comment - nuts that the bus can stop in the bike lane. Then they pull out and blast the bike rider with smelly noxious bus fumes.
1	See earlier comment about traction in wet weather of green-painted areas.
1	See my response to the previous question. Why not have the same road markings throughout the city? Looking at the above photo, what does the solid line between the auto lane and bike lane mean? Does it mean something different from the dashed line? Confusing, confusing.....
1	See previous comments
1	See previous comments!
1	Seems to be working well for both bicyclists and drivers. I don't need this but, hey, a little extra space feels nicer.
1	Separators would be nice :)
1	Since lanes were not taken away, keeping the buffered bike lane is fine.
1	Since this road is not wide enough to accommodate two car lanes on each side and a bike line, the buffered bike lane is a great use of space. It allows bicyclists to pass one another, and of course is safer because it keeps bikes and cars farther apart.
1	Southbound is reasonable. Northbound looks like cars are backed up. I personally don't drive this section so I can't say how well it works.
1	Surprised ya, didn't I? This treatment is fine, as long as you keep it in effect SOUTH of Arapahoe, where the University traffic is almost exclusive.

**Count    Response**

---

1        THERE IS NO CENTER TURN LANE. LOOK AT YOUR OWN PHOTOS. NO EMERGENCY SERVICES CAN PASS THROUGH ANY AREA WITH HARDSCAPING DURING PEAK HOURS.

1        Take away the buffer. Return the bike lanes to what they were before and give cars more room. The lines are confusing.

1        The added space between the lanes is great.

1        The buffer is essential as many drivers are not very good at staying in their own lane. the buffer allows for exactly that without putting bikers in danger.

1        The buffer makes it safer.

1        The buffered bike lane is essential. Traffic in this area is never bad with the buffered lanes, and this is a heavily trafficked cycling area due to the proximity to downtown, the university, and residential housing.

1        The buffered bike lane is one step toward "keeping bicycles and cars separate". However, if the car lane is made so narrow that one cannot do the speed limit safely, then the buffer should be reduced. I would even advocate encroaching on sidewalks and pedestrian space before throwing bikes and cars closer together. They do not belong together.

1        The buffered bike lanes are a big improvement. The previous arrangement was wasting road space with vehicle lanes that were way wider than they needed to be.

1        The buffered bike lanes are safer and better for the "interested but concerned" cyclist.

1        The buffered bike lanes are very helpful! Cars still have plenty of room, and the buffered bike lanes keep cars from encroaching on cyclists' space.

1        The buffered lane is nice. A curbed, protected lane would be even better.

1        The buffering is great!

1        The buffers are a good idea, but too large. The buffers could be altered to still be effective but take up less room.

1        The conventional bike lanes are fine through here. Again, the extra room seems to provide a false sense of safety for cyclists and causes you to let your guard down and ride more like you're on a bike path, which you are not.

1        The extra buffer wasted lane just frustrates car traffic which adds to the danger to bikes. The purpose should be to ease car traffic and provide for easy bike traffic. When you bunch up car traffic you also threaten bike traffic.

1        The only change here seemed to be additional stripes not changing the traffic patterns. Doesn't seem worth spending more money to change it back to basically the same situation.

1        The original pattern was fine.

1        The street is not wide enough for two vehicle lanes anyway, so giving bikes more space is fine.

1        The survey requires me to answer this question, but I haven't used this section of Folsom, so I have no opinion.

## Count Response

1	There is SO much bike traffic next to the university there that I like the protected lanes. People maintain the speed limit more often as a result.
1	There is probably more bike travel on this street section so I would keep the buffered lane.
1	There should be physical barriers there too. Those flexible plastic things would be perfect.
1	There should be protected bike lanes in this area.
1	These are great. I was glad to learn that it's planned to continue this up to Colorado Ave.
1	These buffered lanes are always nice, though I've seen drunk drivers all over them at night. Bolsters would at least keep them from hitting cyclists. I feel like the advocacy of non-protected bike lanes is used as a scare tactic. I shouldn't feel like I am putting my life at risk when I choose a mode of transport that doesn't harm my community.
1	This actually makes good sense. you don't need such a large lane so why not update the striping.
1	This area is utilized by clueless student drivers. Bikes here are at risk as their concentration is greater closer to campus than anywhere else on campus.
1	This feels much nicer, but some additional physical protection would feel much nicer.
1	This feels pretty safe but standards might help.
1	This is GREAT. Please buffer the bike lanes on 30th, between Arapaho and Iris, and on Valmont, between Foothills and Folsom.
1	This is a good improvement, however northbound at the bottom of the hill in the bike lanes there is some sort of hole covering that is depressed below street-level and I fear will take out bicycles that have gained a lot of momentum coming down the hill.
1	This is a high volume area with access to CU so I like the wider areas for cyclists. But why not just make the whole lane a bike lane, as is, it's a bit confusing why there is a conventional bike lane and then a green box with a bike and what may seem like a parking area.
1	This is a place where the buffered bike lane works really well. It offers a place for cyclists to pass in a particularly busy area for bikes, and conflict with cars is light due to the scarce number of right turns in the area. And thanks for not installing bollards here!
1	This is appropriate for this stretch of road.
1	This is better than it was, but if possible, create some sort of soft barrier between cars and bike lane.
1	This is definitely an improvement over the previous condition. Physical protection would be an improvement. Wider sidewalks are absolutely needed along Folsom as well.
1	This is fine. I'm not sure it makes much difference one way or the other.
1	This is less busy and fine by me
1	This is reasonable without all of the ugly bollards that tend to clutter your field of vision.

**Count    Response**

1	This is safer than four travel lanes and unprotected bike lanes. It can be approved with barriers, but those barriers should aesthetically pleasing. It is generally true that how the street looks affects how people drive.
1	This is simple enough, just keep it. It makes sense on this street, no lanes were lost, etc.
1	This is the best part of Folsom now - the cars have the same number of lanes and yet the bikes are buffered.
1	This is the heaviest area of bicycle traffic and the buffer is helpful
1	This is very appropriate for traffic past arapahoe. It is safer to walk on and bike on this street. PLEASE KEEP!
1	This offers the best compliment of cost-effectiveness and common sense. Traffic is not being impacted, and cyclists are given more room for safety.
1	This part of Folsom feels safer than the other non-protected bike lanes, I think because most of the traffic diverts from Folsom onto Arapaho. I like the current treatment.
1	This section of road has greatly improved in both directions with the protected bike lane at no detriment to vehicles. The only current problem is the Northbound intersection with Arapahoe where cars treat the bike lane as a right turn lane (this is usually only a problem at evening rush hour)
1	This seems reasonable. Green is great!
1	This treatment is a non-treatment. All it does is make the car lane seem restricted and requires more paint. Lets use less paint and give it a cleaner feel. Remove it all and repave this road.
1	This treatment works except when a bus pulls over to the curb. So, the "buffer" for bikes disappears with increased transit usage.
1	This was a waste of money for a very minor change. Removing or refining it would be another waste of money.
1	This was another major improvement to bicycle safety at no expense to travel lanes. And it does great without the separation sticks.
1	This works all right.
1	Too much paint. Replace buffer with something more attractive/vertical.
1	Unless you use this area daily, it's still a confused mess.
1	Use bollards or other physical divider, not just buffers.
1	Use conventional bike lanes
1	Very different traffic flow for north and southbound bikes. North bound bikes are traveling very fast after hill, should share complete lane with cars all the way to Arapahoe. Keep buffered bike lanes for S bound.
1	Very little difference.
1	Works fine.
1	add protection - make it all consistent

## Count Response

1	arapahoe to campus is student turf. bike lane is ok just review for safety. here it is likley stent car, bike,walkers competing for the roadway
1	buffered bike lanes are much safer and much more pleasant to ride a bike on.
1	buffered lane is safer for cyclists
1	buffers help. I do not like sharing a lane with cars, even when I'm going downhill. They want to go 30 and I feel unsafe going over 20.
1	doesn't impact the traffic pace
1	feels safer to cyclists
1	hate hate hate
1	haven't really noticed a difference
1	helpful without destroying normal flow.
1	i don't think the buffered lane is necessary.
1	improvement and does not impede drivers
1	in general when you waste space and over-mark people find it offensive, this slant like this of this slanted like that offends intelligent people. and in general your focus in on a subject without looking at bigger picture, of where are bike paths in the area and why are bikes not on the paths, is offensive. Same goes for 55th street, look at the matter of how bikes best get from A to Ab, not try to treat people like you in the lab are higher evolved and are going to force the rest of us into your mold
1	its an accident waiting to happen!!!
1	n/a
1	need a consistent approach along the whole way. So buffered but with small berms or something not big distracting bollards
1	no experience
1	so much more visible and safer
1	that buffered lane looks confusing. why not just give the bikes a bigger lane to begin with?
1	the more green painting the better
1	this is more of an appropriate biking area as you approach campus
1	this is probably okay -- lots of biking students, fewer cars. have there been accidents? have you found folks who didn't bike because of the old configuration?
1	this section of Folsom is great. Lane is wide and the buffer provides even more safety for bikes. Cars seem to go slowly, which is great.

Count	Response
-------	----------

1	typical lanes are enough
---	--------------------------

1	very confusing, especially at night
---	-------------------------------------

## 6. Additional comments and feedback:

Count	Response
9	
1	I'm a 62 year old native of Boulder. You have all completely lost touch with reality to even consider this project. Not a chance this will work at anytime, anywhere, in any season in this town. You have caused a serious loss to local business, put people in danger, inconvenienced and wasted an ungodly amount of our money to "study" and implement a dumb idea. All staff that put this up to council as a good idea should be immediately fired. The City council owes the tax payers an apology. And if any more time is wasted by staff (other than for the removal of the insane structure), Council should go! I'm a progressive democrat and have not missed a local election since 1972. You are starting to make Donald Trump look smart (if that's possible). I'm OVER the whole entitled cyclist mentality. When they pay transportation taxes, register & license their vehicles and pay insurance, let's revisit the question. Public safety is your number one responsibility, make them have lights, stop at
1	1. Something is wrong when things have to be this complicated. 2. I do not believe the City statements that 10% of our commuter traffic is by bicycle and that vehicle miles have not increased over the last several years. The survey and analysis methodology need an independent audit.
1	Again, I applaud your willingness to at least solicit my input, even though I know that there is minimal likelihood of seeing any changes to the present set up of traffic on Folsom.
1	Again, I've been going to Sprouts in Lafayette on my way home from work rather than going on Folsom which is near where I live. My tax dollars are going to a different city, I hope your 'living lab' is worth it.
1	Any bike infrastructure is good and greatly appreciated for those of us who commute mainly by bike. While I support the protected lanes on Folsom, there are other places I'd like to see more infrastructure, including Broadway. We NEED a bike lane from Iris all the way to Canyon and preferably well past Canyon. Any bike lane at all would be good there, though the wider the better. Also, on-street parking with bike lanes to the left are an absolutely horrible idea, as cars continually park well into the bike lane and cause a serious hazard, not to mention the threat of getting doored. If we can limit these, especially on high traffic roads like Broadway (up north) it would make things a lot safer. I know you guys have your hands full though. Thanks for all your efforts and ideas! -Kennett PS as a side note, I overheard some talk about how "expensive" it is to implement cross walks today. When discussing the costs of certain pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, you might want to compare
1	Appr cite the changes on Folsom. Makes it feel safer.
1	Appreciate city trying to make life safer and easier for bikes and encouraging people to get out of their cars. I think boulder should leave rtd and set up its own intracounty bus system with vans that make change or take credit cards. Contract with rtd only for regional on 36 and to airport. Rtd has screwed this county and city.
1	As a business on the corner of Folsom, we've observed first hand how right-sizing has been a nightmare and completely wrong for the vast majority of people who use the road: car drivers! Bikers do not use the street very much and it has caused confusion and disruption. Keep the streets the way they are!
1	As stated, I think this was one big mistake. Keeping the change north of Spruce to me makes no sense and was just a face-saving move. I hope some lessons have been learned and that egos have been shelved on this project. I think the lane consolidation has merely added unneeded congestion which is no help to cyclists or drivers. This was not a well-conceived plan or rollout.

## Count Response

- | Count | Response   |
|-------|--|
| 1     | As the intensity of traffic and the number of bicyclists has increased over the past 20 years, it is becoming increasingly difficult to traverse the city, by whatever means, without becoming more aware of the dangers of "multi-use" roadways. Boulder is not Amsterdam (a Dutch friend visiting was amazed at the lack of care taken by bicyclists on Boulder streets) and it probably never will be. This is a difficult problem, and fiddle faddling around with paint and poles and confusing signs will not and does not help. |
| 1     | Avid cyclist, bike commuter  |
| 1     | Ban bikes on Broadway between Baseline and Iris! They are unsafe, block traffic, and suitable bike lanes exist on 9th and 13th.  |
| 1     | Based on the negative community experience with this on Folsom, any possible further site locations need to be scrapped. Council needs to listen to the public- put this bad idea down and walk away entirely.   |
| 1     | Beyond the bike lane debacle, there are other traffic issues on Folsom which should be addressed (and which crop up in other parts of town as well). In particular, the 3 pedestrian signal crossings suffer from a number of egregious faults, mostly due to overly "creative" engineering approaches. Contact me at <a href="mailto:steve.hoge@gmail.com">steve.hoge@gmail.com</a> and I will certainly bend your ear on these!  |
| 1     | Big supporter of this project. I drive, ride, and work in Boulder. In my experience, we will ALWAYS get pushback from the commuters around any changes that may slow traffic down for the benefit of cyclists - it is simply not possible to make everyone happy. Boulder is renowned as a biking town, and we need to keep pushing and not looking back. Cars are NOT the future of this town or personal transportation, period. Boulder should be leading, and I hope this project continues to be on the front of that wave.       |
| 1     | Bike lanes are not for the sake of bikers, they are for the sake of cars. They move bikes from car lanes, making it possible for aggressive, high-speed car traffic to continue. If Boulder is serious about increasing the amount of trips completed without cars, the design paradigm will not be such to optimize such aggressive, high speed car traffic on all roads.   |
| 1     | Bike lanes rock and I feel much safer when they are separate from traffic. I have been hit by cars on a number of occasions whilst riding my bicycle.  |
| 1     | Bike laws need to be enforced as well as auto laws.eg Lights at night. speeding, going from bike to ped to bike lane. No signaling et cetera   |
| 1     | Bike safety is even more important with the increasing density and traffic in Boulder. It's a two way street; Driver and Biker Awareness is the key.   |