



## TIP Application Comments as of 10/26/2022

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
<b>Adams County - McKay Rd. Operational Improvements - 104th Ave. to 96th Ave. - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Bryce Bradley		I support this project.	Support grade separation.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	David W		I support this project.	The SPRT crossing is dangerous. Drivers regularly do not stop, even for the blinking lights.
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	We need safe bike paths connections, and building a separated underground crossing is vital to reducing collisions between motorists and pedestrians/bikers.
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	Trails that cross above or below roadways are always better!
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project includes a grade separated crossing for the Front Range Trail that will create a trail crossing underneath the roadway.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project includes a grade separated crossing for the Front Range Trail that will create a trail crossing underneath the roadway.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	Finally.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Zuben Bastani		I support this project.	YES! Create a trail crossing underneath the roadway.
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I have concerns about this project.	Road widening makes no sense. Stop giving more spaces to cars. Implement the trail grade separation, but widening roads is not the answer.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I have concerns about this project.	I support building the grade separated crossing for the Front Range Trail, but I am very opposed to widening the road.
Comment Map	John H.	Broomfield Bikes transportation advocacy group	I have concerns about this project.	I support a separated grade crossing, but do NOT support widening roads during a climate emergency. Also, it is very bold of the applicant to label road widening an "improvement"; that is certainly debatable.
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I have concerns about this project.	I am all for a grade separated bike/ped crossing, but I am worried that the city of Thornton or other stakeholders will try to widen the roadway. Widening roads is not the answer. Providing good transit is!
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I have concerns about this project.	While I very much support a grade separated crossing of the Front Range Trail, it's a shame to have it bundled in with a road widening. A road widening will not only make the road more dangerous to cross at all other locations, it will increase VMT and Greenhouse gases.
<b>Adams County - McKay Rd. Operational Improvements - 104th Ave. to 96th Ave. - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I am opposed to this project.	I support building the grade separated crossing for the Front Range Trail, but I am very opposed to widening the road.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I am opposed to this project.	This application states that "VMT may be reduced through network capacity and reliability improvements which currently force indirect route choices and increase out-of-direction travel". However, the application's problem statement also says that "Residents ... use this corridor to bypass traffic congestion on the nearby arterials". Thus, the use of this road IS an indirect route choice, and widening the road will only increase residents' capability to continue those choices that the problem statement seeks to avoid. While I support the grade separation for the Colorado Front Range trail crossing, this project is primarily a road widening project, and thus I cannot support the current proposal. If the project were slimmed down to just the grade crossing, it would cost less and better meet its targets. As designed, this project will more likely increase VMT than decrease it.
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I am opposed to this project.	Just do the grade crossing. No need to expand the busy street.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	While I very much support a grade separated crossing of the Front Range Trail, it's a shame to have it bundled in with a road widening. A road widening will not only make the road more dangerous to cross at all other locations, it will increase VMT and Greenhouse gases.
<b>Arapahoe County - High Line Canal Trail Underpass at Broadway</b>				
Comment Map	Alex Parks		I support this project.	More of these!
Comment Map	Alex St. Angelo		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I support this project.	Very much support this to allow for alternative modes of transportation.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	This is a really dangerous street to cross for people that walk and bike. It's exciting to see this very good safety and mobility improvement for getting under Broadway safely.
Comment Map	Allie Molinda	High Line Canal Conservancy	I support this project.	This is a dangerous area for crossing Broadway to continue through on the High Line canal. Many people use this as a turn around spot because of the hassle and danger of crossing. The underpass would give tons of people reason to go further and explore more of such a valuable resource, the High Line Canal.
Comment Map	Andy O'Brien		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Blaine N.		I support this project.	I support this project since it significantly increases the safety for the thousands of cyclists each year who use this part of the High Line Canal (including me). Broadway is an extremely busy road, making it dangerous to cross.
Comment Map	Bob Perchonok		I support this project.	As an avid cyclist and frequent user of the High Line Canal Trail system, I feel much safer and more inclined to use a trail when intersections at busy crossroads avoid a surface crossing. Please proceed with this project.
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brandon Nuechterlein		I support this project.	I support this project since it significantly increases the safety for the thousands of cyclists each year who use this part of the High Line Canal. Broadway is an extremely busy road, making it dangerous to cross. By creating safe spaces for cycling, you dramatically increase the number of people commuting on bikes which in turn benefits an entire community through decreased pollution and better health from exercising.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	This will greatly improve the trail.
Comment Map	Brian Bergeler		I support this project.	Grade separated crossings are safer for trail users.
Comment Map	C.J. Whelan		I support this project.	The High Line Canal Trail is one of the most highly utilized trail systems in the metro area. Its crossing of Broadway is currently inconvenient, unintuitive, and most importantly, very dangerous. There have been many important improvements of the HLCT in the past few years, and this is one of the most critical remaining.
Comment Map	Carla B		I support this project.	This is a much needed enhancement to make the high line safer.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	Dramatically improves safety for the thousands of pedestrians and cyclists who use this trail.
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Casey Roberts	None	I support this project.	I love biking this section of the High Line Canal trail, and this crossing often involves a long, exhaust filled wait. I would feel much more comfortable bringing my son on this trail on his bike if we had an underpass.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Charlotte A.		I support this project.	Great safety and mobility improvement.
Comment Map	Chris Gorrie		I support this project.	
Comment Map	D Forbes		I support this project.	Improves saftey for trail users.
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Helps make High Line Canal useful transit corridor for cyclists, reduces unnecessary auto trips
Comment Map	Daniel Florez		I support this project.	
Comment Map	David Dungan		I support this project.	This is a worthwhile project but I wonder if this will tie in E-W cycling access as efficiently as a crossing at either Ridge or Caley
Comment Map	David Kimmett		I support this project.	
Comment Map	David Lyskawa		I support this project.	This project will greatly improve the safety of riding the southern section of the Highline Canal trail. The current Broadway road crossings are not safe for younger riders.
Comment Map	Dustin Ram		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Elizabeth Morales		I support this project.	Need this improvement
<b>Arapahoe County - High Line Canal Trail Underpass at Broadway</b>				
Comment Map	G. Carney		I support this project.	This is one of the worst at-grade crossings of any path in the metro area and is desperately in need of improvements for convenience—and especially for safety. Crossing FIVE lanes of 40 MPH traffic with no stop light or even signage to warn motorists (as currently designed) is taking one's life in one's hands—and the hands of motorists who can't be trusted to stay off their phones.
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Geneva Hooten	N/A	I support this project.	This is a much-needed improvement to the High Line Canal.
Comment Map	Graham Hollis	self	I support this project.	Broadway needs a safe crossing
Comment Map	Greg		I support this project.	I ride and drive the area affected by this project regularly. An underpass would be a dramatic improvement for all users. The underpass at Hampden and Colorado has greatly improved the Highline's use. We should continue implementing similar projects along the Highline.
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I support this project.	This underpass is needed to make the region's walking and cycling network more continuous and useful. This intersection is one of many in the region where pedestrians are forced to cross high speed 4-6 lane traffic. It makes the walking and cycling network stressful and inefficient for getting between destinations. To increase uptake in cycling and walking as modes of transportation, planners need more high comfort crossings such as proposed.
Comment Map	Hamilton Reed	self	I support this project.	Love to see bike & pedestrian trails get safety and comfort by adding underpasses.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	I support this project because it eliminates motorist and pedestrians/bicyclists collisions.
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jeff Walters		I support this project.	Many of the Highline Canal greenway paths cross busy intersections that don't include signaled traffic crossings. Underpasses improve both the flow of automobile traffic and ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians. This is a worthwhile project.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	An underpass here would dramatically improve safety and provide a more pleasant experience for those using the trail
Comment Map	John DiMattia		I support this project.	
Comment Map	John Pitek	We Ride 4	I support this project.	This is a regular bike ride for me and a safety concern due to high traffic volume and high speed traffic.
Comment Map	John Turner	We Ride 4	I support this project.	A much needed project for user safety
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I support this project.	As a bike commuter, this will be a welcome improvement. I want to be safe as I commute in my bike!
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	Safe underpass!

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I support this project.	Yes. Any effort to separate vehicle traffic from multi-modal transportation options (including foot traffic and mobility aids) has my complete support.
Comment Map	Kirk		I support this project.	This is a very dangerous crossing of the High Line canal and it badly needs an underpass.
Comment Map	Kyle Plastino		I support this project.	Providing infrastructure that gives people a *legitimate* transportation option other than the car is the first step toward permanently reducing traffic congestion (including for motorists), increasing local air quality, decreasing local noise pollution, increasing the safety of our roads, increasing the health/fitness of the population, and ultimately leading to a significantly higher quality of life for everyone.
Comment Map	Larry C		I support this project.	I live to the West in Lakewood, but try to make this ride from the C-470 area N/NE to Hampden/285 at least once a year. But this segment-3 crossings on Broadway-is the worst part of this ride. You have 3 crossing within a few miles, with back tracking on Broadway to get to a stop light-necessary. And the waits at the lights. And I have(as others have mentioned) used Broadway (on the East side-N. bound)but it stinks-skinny sidewalk at best and passing commercial areas/driveways.With just one underpass-a good start..but maybe a decent bike path-WIDE sidewalk, or adjacent neighborhood street, etc. also. Thanks.
Comment Map	Lisa Byington	We Ride 4	I support this project.	This is such a treacherous crossing that would be made so much safer by an underpass.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
<b>Arapahoe County - High Line Canal Trail Underpass at Broadway</b>				
Comment Map	Mat T		I support this project.	This will improve safety for people walking and biking since Broadway continues to be a very dangerous street dominated by fast car traffic.
Comment Map	Matt Parsons		I support this project.	This would improve the crossing significantly. However, there's so little of the trail on the other side of Broadway before it comes back over. It may be worthwhile to reroute instead of a costly underpass
Comment Map	Matt S		I support this project.	This will be a welcome safety improvement for cyclists and pedestrians.
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	An underpass here would dramatically improve safety and provide a more pleasant experience for those using the trail
Comment Map	Michael Ernst		I support this project.	I sometimes bicycle in this area. Currently, this intersection is awkward on a bicycle and improvement would be welcome.
Comment Map	Mike Tchou		I support this project.	Great improvement for walkers and cyclists (and traffic as well)
Comment Map	Natasha T Koermer	Ride or Die Collective (local women's cycling team)	I support this project.	It's so important to help cyclists safely cross this busy road!
Comment Map	Nate Pitzer		I support this project.	Having a safe route across Broadway will be better for trail users and for the cars on Broadway that will no longer need to wait for trail users to cross the street.
Comment Map	Olaf Wyberneit	pvt	I support this project.	This project will increase the safety of cyclists, runners and peds in general.
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	safety improvements on the Highline beneficial for all
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project builds an underpass for the High Line Canal Trail so people can safely cross Broadway.
Comment Map	Peter Warner		I support this project.	Needs to be safer for bikers and pedestrians
Comment Map	Piotr R		I support this project.	This is indeed a very dangerous intersection (I've almost been run over when walking my bike at the crosswalk at the light by someone turning left from Arapahoe Rd) and needs an underpass, but there are a few Highline/Broadway crossings and I feel like the one at Caley Ave is the more critical one. Both this one and the one at Ridge Rd can be avoided by taking the sidewalk down Broadway (not ideal, but mostly painless). The Caley Ave one is unavoidable.
Comment Map	Rich Loving		I support this project.	The Broadway road crossing is a heavily trafficked bike and pedestrian path. The exposure is higher because the exit from 470 westbound onto Northbound broad was and the entrance to 470 westbound from southbound Broadway do not have stop signs. An underpass would improve traffic flow and improve safety for bikers and pedestrians.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	SUPPORT - An underpass here would dramatically improve safety and provide a more pleasant experience for those using the trail
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project builds an underpass for the High Line Canal Trail so people can safely cross Broadway.
Comment Map	Rob Osterburg	Self	I support this project.	Let's encourage more people to walk and ride their bikes by reducing difficult crossings on busy streets.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	Long overdue. Thanks for recognizing the need.
Comment Map	Ron W	Local Littleton resident	I support this project.	Horrible signal at Broadway and Arapahoe Rd confuses pedestrians and drivers. A "T" intersection causes many Highline Canal users to illegally cross Broadway south of the main intersection in four lanes of traffic creating danger for cars, bikers and pedestrians! This underpass fix has been needed for many years. This project is critical to our overall safety!!!!
Comment Map	Russ Shaw	self	I support this project.	An underpass at this location will definitely improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and, I anticipate, motorists. I also hope this is the first step to solving the issue at the other locations where the HLCT crosses Broadway.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Ryan D		I support this project.	I'm always in favor of infrastructure that safely separates cyclists and motorists.
Comment Map	Ryan Frazer		I support this project.	This is an important project for improving safety of otherwise vulnerable road users
Comment Map	Sam Brown		I support this project.	Improving safety at major crossings should be prioritized.
Comment Map	Sam Long		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Sharon Madison	We Ride 4	I support this project.	We support this project to make gravel riding and getting across Broadway safer for all our club members.
<b>Arapahoe County - High Line Canal Trail Underpass at Broadway</b>				
Comment Map	Steve B		I support this project.	This is the kind of project that incentivizes taking healthier and safer transportation decisions and benefits the neighborhoods as well by connecting them without risk of car-related injury
Comment Map	Steve Goshorn		I support this project.	I do think for a first underpass in this area that the intersection of Ridge and Broadway might be a better choice. Pedestrians crossing at that intersection are always running to get out of the way of traffic coming out of Ridge onto Broadway. For that matter Caley and Broadway for the same reasons.
Comment Map	Steve Roe	Bike Jeffco	I support this project.	Underground crossings are great but this is an unusual situation because the canal crosses Broadway 3 times between Caley and Ridge Road. It may not be feasible to have 3 crossings and having one is only a partial solution. When riding a bike I typically get on Broadway (Or sidewalks) to get from the canal at Caley to The canal at Ridge Road. This way I only cross Broadway once.
Comment Map	Susan Foppe		I support this project.	I ride across this intersection a lot from the south to gain access to the 470 bike path. It's dangerous as cars cross over the bike lane to access the highway on ramp.
Comment Map	Susan Larson		I support this project.	As a cyclist, I very much support this project for safety.
Comment Map	t roby		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I support this project.	Safer crossing of roadway will lead to less injury/accidents and increase bike trips while reducing unneeded auto trips.
Comment Map	Tom Quinn		I support this project.	Good bike/ped connections are critical.
Comment Map	Zuben Bastani		I support this project.	YES! It's terrifying to cross this insection. Someone is going to get hurt!
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	Should also explore options at Broadway and Caley as well.
Comment Map			I support this project.	This trail is widely used and this is a safety improvement
Comment Map	David W		I have concerns about this project.	The Highline Canal Trail crosses Broadway three times in 1.5 miles: twice at intersections with crosswalks, and once here at this awkward and dangerous diagonal crossing. Ideally, yes, an underpass for this intersection would be nice, but for \$16 million dollars, re-routing makes much more sense.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
<b>Arapahoe County - High Line Canal Trail Underpass at Quebec St.</b>				
Comment Map	Alex Parks		I support this project.	would make the high line canal user experience so much better and safer!
Comment Map	Alex St. Angelo		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	This is a really scary crossing. Great to see safety improvements being made for people that walk, use wheel chairs, and ride on bikes.
Comment Map	Andy O'Brien		I support this project.	Yes please!
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Blaine N.		I support this project.	I support this project since it significantly increases the safety for the thousands of cyclists each year who use this part of the High Line Canal. Quebec is a very busy road, making it dangerous to cross.
Comment Map	Bob Perchonok		I support this project.	As an avid cyclist and frequent user of the High Line Canal Trail system, I feel much safer and more inclined to use a trail when intersections at busy crossroads avoid a surface crossing. Please proceed with this project.
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I support this project.	I support this project since it significantly increases the safety for the thousands of cyclists each year who use this part of the High Line Canal . Quebec is an extremely busy road, making it dangerous to cross. By creating safe spaces for cycling, you dramatically increase the number of people commuting on bikes which in turn benefits an entire community through decreased pollution and better health from exercising.
Comment Map	Bret Taber		I support this project.	Please fund this project. We need to support safe transit routes.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	An underpass is needed here.
Comment Map	Brian Bergeler		I support this project.	Grade seperated crossings increase safety for trail users.
Comment Map	Bruce Baskette		I support this project.	Personally I seem to be biking across here when vehicular traffic isn't too bad. But this would benefit greatly from an underpass! Would make it so much quicker and safer. (Just like Colorado, Hampden, and Leetsdale.)
Comment Map	Bryce Bradley		I support this project.	Removing as many major intersection crossings from HLC and similar trails should be a priority across the region for safety and usability.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	It's important to create unobstructed bikeways whenever possible.
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Casey Roberts	none	I support this project.	This crossing feels particularly unsafe (as well as being an unwelcome wait and interruption of the natural experience on the HLC trail). Would love to see an underpass here!
Comment Map	Charlotte A.		I support this project.	Great safety and mobility improvement.
Comment Map	Chris Gorrie		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Makes High Line Canal legit transit for cyclists, reduces unnecessary auto trips
Comment Map	David Williams		I support this project.	Yes please, crossing Quebec makes this trail much less accessible IMO, providing passage without having to confront traffic would make the trail much more useful for commuting
Comment Map	Dustin Ram		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Fred Glick		I support this project.	Fantastic, much needed improvement!
Comment Map	Fritz Clauson		I support this project.	Improvements to the trail crossing are critically needed here, existing crossing is unsignalled and unsafe
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	I live near here and would use this overpass frequently for errands and random trips. It's not on my commute but I am a big supporter of not having to cross the streets with the cars.
Comment Map	Graham Hollis	self	I support this project.	this will provide a safe crossing of this busy street
Comment Map	Greg		I support this project.	I ride and drive the area affected by this project regularly. An underpass would be a dramatic improvement for all users. The underpass at Hampden and Colorado has greatly improved the Highline's use. We should continue implementing similar projects along the Highline.
<b>Arapahoe County - High Line Canal Trail Underpass at Quebec St.</b>				

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I support this project.	All of the DRCOG region's pedestrian and cycling network suffers from facilities that are disrupted and disconnected by the abundance of 4-6 lane high speed surface roads like Quebec. These roads are very stressful and dangerous to cross. The region needs many more crossings like this to make the walking and cycling network more continuous and useful for getting to destinations.
Comment Map	H colwell		I support this project.	Improvements like this are vital to making our city more biker friendly and so reducing our carbon footprint.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	I support this project because it eliminates motorist and pedestrians/bicyclists collisions.
Comment Map	Jacque McIntyre		I support this project.	
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jeff Walters		I support this project.	Many of the Highline Canal greenway paths cross busy intersections that don't include signaled traffic crossings. Underpasses improve both the flow of automobile traffic and ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians. This is a worthwhile project.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	An underpass here would dramatically improve safety and provide a more pleasant experience for those using the trail
Comment Map	John Hess		I support this project.	
Comment Map	John Pitek	We Ride 4	I support this project.	This is a regular bike ride for me and a safety concern due to the risk of crossing the road without a light.
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I support this project.	Excellent idea!
Comment Map	Kari N		I support this project.	I support this project, it would improve safety!
Comment Map	Karl Friedman		I support this project.	Helping to complete 71 miles of an unobstructed pedestrian and bike passage.
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	Safe underpass!
Comment Map	KC McFerson	Self	I support this project.	
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I support this project.	The recent year-plus work to separate transportation modes at the Mississippi & Parker trail crossing was a real pain as both a bicyclist/pedestrian and when driving -- and the results were worth every minute and then some. In fact, two-odd years on and work to finish up some of the details still closes the tunnel and/or road from time to time, an annoyance I will happily put up with to achieve the benefits such infrastructure improvements will bring. I expect nothing less for the Quebec crossing, and at other locations as the work to separate transportation modes on our trail and street networks move ahead in coming years. I absolutely support this effort.
Comment Map	Kyle Plastino		I support this project.	Providing infrastructure that gives people a *legitimate* transportation option other than the car is the first step toward permanently reducing traffic congestion (including for motorists), increasing local air quality, decreasing local noise pollution, increasing the safety of our roads, increasing the health/fitness of the population, and ultimately leading to a significantly higher quality of life for everyone.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Mark Grantz		I support this project.	Very much needed.
Comment Map	Mat T		I support this project.	Very dangerous trail crossing. As long as this street remains a high-speed, high-volume car sewer, a grade separated crossing is needed to keep people safe.
Comment Map	Matt S		I support this project.	This is an important safety improvement to this busy intersection and will protect motorists and cyclists.
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	Yes. This would be a huge safety improvement
Comment Map	Natasha T Koermer	Ride or Die Collective (local women's cycling team)	I support this project.	High Line Canal is well-loved and trafficked by cyclists in the area. It's crucial to make it safer and easier to travel!
Comment Map	Olaf Wyberneit	pvt	I support this project.	This will make a busy intersection much safer for everybody. I ride >500 miles of HLC every year and this will increase safety.
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project builds an underpass for the High Line Canal Trail so people can safely cross Quebec.



Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
<b>Arapahoe County - High Line Canal Trail Underpass at Quebec St.</b>				
Comment Map	Peter Warner		I support this project.	Needs to be safer for walkers and cyclists
Comment Map	Rich Loving		I support this project.	This is a heavily trafficked crossing with very little protection. An underpass would improve the flow of traffic and improve trail user safety
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	An underpass here would dramatically improve safety and provide a more pleasant experience for those using the trail
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project builds an underpass for the High Line Canal Trail so people can safely cross Quebec.
Comment Map	Richard Hansen		I support this project.	Very busy street. Hard to cross while on the trail.
Comment Map	Rob Osterburg	Self	I support this project.	This project will help improve the safety of trail users by reducing conflicts with motorists.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	Just do it!
Comment Map	Russ Shaw	self	I support this project.	An underpass at this intersection of the HLCT and S. Quebec will significantly improve safety for all trail users.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Ryan D		I support this project.	I'm always in favor of infrastructure that safely separates cyclists and motorists.
Comment Map	Sam Brown		I support this project.	Improving safety at major crossings should be prioritized.
Comment Map	Sam Long		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Scott Sanderson		I support this project.	looks good
Comment Map	Stephanie Perez-Carrillo	Self	I support this project.	These small changes make a big difference for cyclists and pedestrians. Avoiding intersections with speeding cars makes for safer commutes. This is a welcome change.
Comment Map	Steve Litt		I support this project.	This is a great idea. The current crossing is dangerous and is often like playing dodge ball with speeding cars and trucks. Love to ride under it all,
Comment Map	Susan Foppe		I support this project.	This will add safety to cross the busy street.
Comment Map	Susan Larson		I support this project.	As a cyclist, I very much support this project for safety reasons.
Comment Map	t roby		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I support this project.	The ability to safely cross Broadway is a huge improvement that will reduce accidents and will encourage more trips via bike and reduce need for car trips.
Comment Map	Zuben Bastani		I support this project.	YES! It's terrifying to cross this. Someone is going to get hurt!
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map		None	I support this project.	This is a very difficult crossing as drivers are not often kind enough to stop and let cyclists cross. The cars also appear to be driving at high speeds in the section of roadway.
Comment Map		None	I support this project.	Next do Yale and Holly please
Comment Map			I support this project.	Anything that will prevent bike rider and pedestrians from having to cross a busy street is a good idea.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	Massively support this. I don't typically travel the trail over there because it is such a safety issue.
<b>Aurora - Peoria St. Bridge Replacement: Over Sand Creek - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I have concerns about this project.	
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I have concerns about this project.	do not widen the road, just improve the pedestrian and bike access on the sides.
Comment Map	Bret Taber		I have concerns about this project.	There is a total lack of safe foot and bike routes in this area. Widening the road is not going to improve safety our usability to anyone except vehicles.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I have concerns about this project.	I applaud the bike and pedestrian access improvements, but am leery about any kind of road widening. If cars have to slow down to cross the bridge, is that a bad thing?
Comment Map	D Forbes		I have concerns about this project.	Sidewalk improvement is welcome. Adding car lanes is not.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Dan K		I have concerns about this project.	This project includes key investments for safe walking and biking and will offer a safe north-south crossing at Sand Creek. It will also widen bridge lanes from four to six. There are current safety issues for all users as vehicle lanes narrow from six lanes approaching the bridge.
Comment Map	David W		I have concerns about this project.	For improving walking and biking infrastructure, against adding for single-occupancy vehicles.
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I have concerns about this project.	Widening the road to six lanes is excessive and unnecessary given the current traffic volumes. An underpass to allow walkers and bikers to cross Peoria under the bridge would be a welcome safety and comfort improvement, as traffic is frequently speeding in this location and rarely yields to walkers and bikers at the current crossing.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I have concerns about this project.	Widening the road to six lanes is excessive and unnecessary given the current traffic volumes. An underpass to allow walkers and bikers to cross Peoria under the bridge would be a welcome safety and comfort improvement, as traffic is frequently speeding in this location and rarely yields to walkers and bikers at the current crossing.
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I have concerns about this project.	Good investments in walking and biking safety, but widening bridge lanes will increase traffic.
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I have concerns about this project.	I support the addition of multi-modal lanes-- but what do they connect to? Are there future plans to expand multi-modal lanes north and south along Peoria in this area? If multi-modal options are not in the future to the south and north of this area, how do we put those blocks -especially for crossing I70 and the train tracks- on the list? Crossing east/west is critical as well, though for now the trail is better than nothing in that regard (but definitely needs access improvements at the neighborhood level, as well as in-neighborhood improvements to move people from an address to the trail or lane). In other words, a start, but to what end?
Comment Map	M Koch		I have concerns about this project.	Concern about road widening
Comment Map	Matt Parsons		I have concerns about this project.	Increasing road width runs counter to climate and safety goals. The expanded walking and bike lanes will be a great improvement. The cost on widening roads could go to providing much better bike infrastructure nearby, which would do more to relieve congestion than widening roads (which would be worse, induced demand)
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I have concerns about this project.	Concerned that it widens the road for car traffic. I like the lane idea on both sides for safe biking and walking
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I have concerns about this project.	This project includes key investments for safe walking and biking and will offer a safe north-south crossing at Sand Creek. It will also widen bridge lanes from four to six. There are current safety issues for all users as vehicle lanes narrow from six lanes approaching the bridge.
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I have concerns about this project.	I am not in support of the adding extra lanes to Peoria St. as part of this project.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I have concerns about this project.	This project includes key investments for safe walking and biking and will offer a safe north-south crossing at Sand Creek. It will also widen bridge lanes from four to six. There are current safety issues for all users as vehicle lanes narrow from six lanes approaching the bridge.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I have concerns about this project.	Concerned about widening roads
Comment Map	Ryan D.		I have concerns about this project.	I agree with others that if the road widening happens then the lanes should be dedicated to transit/freight. I do understand that there's currently a congestion issue as the road narrows from 6 lanes to 4 on the bridge.
Comment Map	Scott Sanderson		I have concerns about this project.	Six lanes? Ugh
<b>Aurora - Peoria St. Bridge Replacement: Over Sand Creek - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	Self	I have concerns about this project.	This project includes key investments for safe walking and biking and will offer a safe north-south crossing at Sand Creek. It will also widenbridge lanes from four to six. There are current safety issues for all users as vehicle lanes narrow from six lanes approaching the bridge. I specifically am OPPOSED TO WIDENING THE ROADWAY.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	It's unfortunate that the expansion of Peoria north and south of the bridge has inevitably caused a legitimate bottleneck at this location. The widening is needed. But the provided project information states that, even with the widening, the corridor will still have a LOS "D" by 2050. Will we need to widen the bridge again in 30 years?
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	I support adding multi-use paths on both sides, connections to Sand Creek Regional Trail under the bridge, and filling sidewalk gaps along Peoria between 30th Ave. and Fitzsimons Pkwy, but I DO NOT support widening the roadway
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	Do not widen the road, just improve the pedestrian and bike access.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I am opposed to this project.	Widening this road will make it more dangerous for all users. It will result in increased VMT and GHG.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I am opposed to this project.	Bluff Lake Nature center, directly downstream of this project, will face extreme negative consequences from this project. Construction will devastatingly impact the delicate flora and fauna that live in the sensitive habitat of Sand Creek. The construction footprint of building trail connections on the West side of Peoria St. are too large and will destroy prairie dog. They are also unnecessary, as Sand Creek Trail ends at Peoria St. and only continues East. Most destructive of all will be the reduced water quality and stream bed destruction that will result in the death of the beavers living in Sand Hill Creek under the bridge. Beavers and many other animals unheard of in Denver, such as porcupine, muskrat, and rare birds have been able to survive in Sand Creek thanks, in part, to the effort of Bluff Lake Nature Center and protecting Sand Creek. The construction will very likely kill the beavers and become a new barrier for animals that use Sand Creek to connect with other habitats.
Comment Map	Bryce Bradley		I am opposed to this project.	The trail/pedestrian improvements should be done without widening the roadway to six lanes.
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I am opposed to this project.	It is criminal to purely call this a "Bridge Replacement". That is a deflection from the thing that we all know is problematic here which is roadway expansion.
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I am opposed to this project.	I do NOT support widening roadway, just increases traffic and car dependency
Comment Map	H Colwell		I am opposed to this project.	I believe we should focus on expanding public transport, bike ways and sidewalks NOT roads.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I am opposed to this project.	There are better ways to provide safe walking and biking infrastructure that don't involve widening streets for motorists.
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I am opposed to this project.	This project, as proposed, does not best support its own problem statement. Core goals identified in that statement are to improve "freight reliability" and "transit efficiency", alongside multimodal improvements. If those are core goals of the project, then the bridge widening should only occur if the added lanes are reserved for transit and freight, instead of establishing new general travel lanes. As proposed, this project is more likely to worsen transit efficiency and freight reliability - adding new general travel lanes will induce further demand from SOV-users, creating additional congestion in the path of our transit and freight providers. Thus, this project will fail to meet its own stated goals while simultaneously enhancing SOV-dependency. This project should not be funded without revisions.
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I am opposed to this project.	Keep the pedestrian and multi modal improvements. Widening the road will just lead to more traffic. Scrap that and use the \$\$ only for the pedestrian improvements.
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I am opposed to this project.	I cannot support this project if it includes a road-widening. Improving multimodal infrastructure would actually improve congestion and environmental impact, while widening the road would have the opposite effect, as well as increasing noise and air pollution
Comment Map	Rob P		I am opposed to this project.	More lanes for traffic? Nyet.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	I oppose this project as it is adding SOV capacity.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	This bridge can be replaced without widening the road. There is no need to continue widening roads in the midst of a climate crisis.
<b>Boulder - SH-119 BAT Lanes: Boulder &amp; Longmont</b>				
Email	Alexey Davies		I support this project.	Please fund these proposals for safety and to meet Boulder County's vision zero goals.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	This is a great project to make a dangerous road safer and more sustainable
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I support this project.	I support this project since it significantly increases the safety for the thousands of cyclists each year who make this commute . . By creating safe spaces for cycling, you dramatically increase the number of people commuting on bikes which in turn benefits an entire community through decreased pollution and better health from exercising.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Calvin Ryan		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	
Comment Map	D Forbes		I support this project.	Increases safety for cyclists.
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Promotes responsible transit
Comment Map	Daniel Florez		I support this project.	28th is a death trap for non-drivers, anything to improve it helps
Comment Map	David Kimmett		I support this project.	Especially the portion in Longmont -- it's a tricky and dangerous area.
Comment Map	David Roederer		I support this project.	These projects are very much needed as well as separated bicycle ways in general
Comment Map	Floyd Williams	Self	I support this project.	A great addition
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	George Gerstle	Cyclists for Community PLAN Boulder County	I support this project.	This project is a longstanding and critically needed priority project providing multimodal safety and operational improvements in a corridor connecting Boulder, Longmont and Weld County. This is one of the highest use bike and transit corridors in Boulder County and is a key component in achieving multimodal system safety goals and critical to achieving climate change emission reduction goals.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	I support this projects because it improves transit efficiency and bike/ped path connections.
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	This project is a longstanding and critically needed priority project providing multimodal safety and operational improvements in a corridor connecting Boulder, Longmont and Weld County. This is one of the highest use bike and transit corridors in Boulder County and is a key component in achieving multimodal system safety goals and critical to achieving climate change emission reduction goals.
Comment Map	John H.	Broomfield Bikes transportation advocacy group	I support this project.	I support projects that invest in more sustainable multi-modal transportation such as biking and bus mass transit.
Comment Map	Jonathan Jones		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Joseph Vigil	Self	I support this project.	This will make conditions much safer!
Comment Map	Julia Collins	Boulder resident	I support this project.	
Comment Map	Karl Rábago	self	I support this project.	
Comment Map	Kris Thompson		I support this project.	
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Mat T		I support this project.	
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Approve all of Boulder County's applications
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	Improvements to transit and multimodal transportation? Yes please
Comment Map	Mike McQueeney		I support this project.	A dedicated bike path and upgrades will save lives on the heavily travelled thoroughfare

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
<b>Boulder - SH-119 BAT Lanes: Boulder &amp; Longmont</b>				
Comment Map	Nels Beckman		I support this project.	These are excellent investments in our biking and pedestrian network!
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	Improving transit and multimodal efficiency and safety is a great plan and benefits everyone
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project will improve transit service efficiency while also investing in the bike and pedestrian network
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This project is a good investment to reduce bus journey times & delays.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project will improve transit service efficiency while also investing in the bike and pedestrian network.
Comment Map	Richard Hansen		I support this project.	Any bike lane or trail to avoid Hwy 93 is needed.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	Uhm....yes!
Comment Map	Robby Mann		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Russell Chandler	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Project will result in more bus and bicycle trips and fewer vehicle trips between Longmont and Boulder.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Sam Long		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Steven Kurland		I support this project.	This project will save lives.
Comment Map	t roby		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I support this project.	Improving transit efficiency and investing in bike/pedestrian networks is good for everyone, making travel safer and reducing reliance on personal vehicles.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
<b>Boulder County - SH-119 &amp; Niwot Rd. BRT and Bikeway Improvements</b>				
Email	Alexey Davies		I support this project.	I support the CO119 bikeway as a safe alternative to the existing dangerous conditions. A direct & separated bikeway from the high speed traffic will encourage more people to bike more for commuting, errands, and recreation.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Great to see safety improvements on this dangerous section of road.
Email	Becky Thelen		I support this project.	I want to express support for funding the Highway 119 and Niwot road improvements as part of the larger diagonal highway improvement project.
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I support this project.	increasing bike trails improves the health of communities
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	Helps prioritize bike and transit lanes.
Email	Bruce (Biff) Warren		I support this project.	The bikeway will help provide practical means to get from Longmont and Niwot to Boulder.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I support this project.	
Email	Chris Angelovic		I support this project.	The safety and mobility improvements will make reliable and faster transit possible between the two communities that make up 2/3 of the total population of the county. This is an important corridor and one that the tax payers already set funds aside years ago to pay for the train that never came.
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Promotes cycling alternatives safely separate from high speed traffic
Comment Map	Daniel Florez		I support this project.	

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Email	David Roederer		I support this project.	I am writing in support of this project and the approval of a DRCOG grant.
Comment Map	Elaine Erb	Niwot Resident	I support this project.	It's been years since I have felt comfortable riding my bike along SH 119. There's too much traffic, it travels too fast and often 10 mph above the speed limit. Creating the new bike lane in this area expands cycling options very well. Not only does it create a key link between Niwot and Longmont, it enhances rides to Hygiene to and from Niwot by encouraging a circle route. Separating cyclists from the high speed traffic is a great step. The proposed BRT service is also very exciting. Peak period traffic backs up around intersections like Hwy 52 and Niwot Road. Allowing a bus to bypass the cars will encourage more transit users. Moving the bus stops to the inside of the median means I will feel a bit more separated from the traffic and only have to cross one side of Hwy 119 to get to and from the bus. Many Niwot residents bike and walk to the transit stops. Anything we can do to improve the safety at the intersection of Niwot Road and SH 119 is welcome. Lower the speed to 55 Niwot N
Email	Emily Jacobson		I support this project.	I want to express my full support for the Diagonal Improvements projects.
Comment Map	Erin Witter		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Floyd Williams	Self	I support this project.	A great addition
Email	Frank Barrett		I support this project.	Feels as though the road is deteriorating and lacks the needed improvements. Niwot Road has a fatality about a month ago and the traffic light there is often ignored by CO 119 drivers.
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Email	Hortense Plummer		I support this project.	A resident of Longmont
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	Yes to transit efficiency and more bikeway.
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	Improve safety for lots of bikes and cars
Email	Jan Borstein		I support this project.	Lives in Gunbarrel and frequently travels on the Diagonal Highway to Boulder and Longmont. Frequently cycles across the intersection of Diagonal and Niwot Rd for recreation and errands. This project will improve traffic flow for vehicles and will make it easier to cycle from the Gunbarrel and Niwot neighborhoods to either Longmont or Boulder
Comment Map	Jeff Lee		I support this project.	Great addition that will greatly improve safety at 119/Airport intersection.
<b>Boulder County - SH-119 &amp; Niwot Rd. BRT and Bikeway Improvements</b>				
Comment Map	Jennifer Arnett		I support this project.	Creating more access for bikes is important.
Email	Joan Cell		I support this project.	A Boulder resident who cycles in the vicinity of 119 and Niwot Rd in favor of anything that can improve bicycle and pedestrian safety in/near 119 and Niwot Rd.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	This will continue to increase safety for folks biking between Boulder/Longmont.
Comment Map	John H.	Broomfield Bikes transportation advocacy group	I support this project.	I support projects that invest in more sustainable multi-modal transportation such as biking and bus mass transit.
Comment Map	John Webb	Second Wind Cycling Club	I support this project.	I have been meeting my friends and fellow cyclists for more than 10 years at the Niwot Park & Ride on Hwy 119. The intersection is hazardous to cross on foot or bike, even with the aid of traffic signals, which often are too short to allow safe crossing of 119 on foot or by members of our cycling club. Motorists traveling through the intersection at high speeds and "missing" the traffic signal or deliberately failing to stop are also a serious hazard to pedestrians and cyclists. In addition, the shoulders of Hwy 119 from Niwot rd to Airport rd, though wide, host a lot of highway debris, and with traffic traveling at high speeds, this particular route is both harrowing and hazardous.
Comment Map	Jonathan Jones		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Joseph	Self	I support this project.	This will make commuting much safer.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Email	Judd Nutting		I support this project.	Would use and appreciate bike infrastructure in Longmont.
Comment Map	Julia Collins	Boulder resident	I support this project.	SH 119 is increasingly dangerous as a route for cyclists. I support plans to create dedicated bike paths with a buffer between automobile and bicycle traffic. Safety bikeways benefit recreational cyclists, those commuting by bike, and reduce the changes of car/bike accidents.
Email	Karen Dolphin		I support this project.	Lives on the west side of Niwot rd and is very cognizant of traffic along 119.
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	I support new bikeways.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Email	Martine Elianor		I support this project.	Frequently commute through this busy corridor from Boulder to the Gunbarrel area. The existing road route on the shoulder of CO 119 exposes cycling commuters to dangerous high speed cars. Funding the CO 119 Bikeway would help cyclists safely commute via a direct route between the city and Gunbarrel/Longmont. Asking DRCOG to please consider issuing a grant to support this vital project which will promote safer, environmentally friendly transportation for residents.
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Approve the role model nature of the bicycling facility included in the project, it's effect on safety outcomes, and its contribution to connectivity for livability.
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	This would greatly improve safety, create sorely needed bicycle infrastructure and improve transit efficiency.
Comment Map	Mike McQueeney		I support this project.	Great addition that will improve safety at 119/Airport intersection.
Email	Nicole and Gerry Wienholt		I support this project.	Residents for over 10 years who frequently use the Diagonal Highway and approve of the improvements
Comment Map	Olaf Wyberneit		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project will enhance transit operations as well as build two miles of new bikeway and a bike underpass
<b>Boulder County - SH-119 &amp; Niwot Rd. BRT and Bikeway Improvements</b>				
Email	Penn Richmann and Bruce Hoffmann		I support this project.	Agree with the following points made by the County in regards to the benefits of these improvements: 1. This vitally important piece of the projects needs funding to complete a major piece of the Bikeway and Safety and Mobility Projects. 2. The CO 119 BRT, Safety and Mobility and Improvements project will be critical to optimizing regional connectivity and mobility between Boulder and Longmont and the Bikeway is an integral element of the multimodal vision plan connecting Boulder and Longmont communities. 3. CO 119 is a vital regional transportation corridor serving the economic health of Boulder County. The Safety and Mobility improvements will make reliable and faster transit possible between the two communities that make up 2/3 of the total population of the County. 4. The bikeway will provide the only safe, direct, comfortable bicycle connection between the two cities.
Email	Peter and Shona Crampton		I support this project.	The planned BRT, commuter bikeway, and other safety improvements are long overdue to help speed up the commute times between Longmont and Boulder.
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This project is a good investment to reduce bus journey times & delays.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project will enhance transit operations as well as build two miles of new bikeway and a bike underpass
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	What is not to like?
Comment Map	Robby mann		I support this project.	

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Robert Prestley		I support this project.	As a regular Longmont-Boulder commuter on the BOLT bus, I am wholeheartedly in support of this project. Niwot Road is frequently a traffic choke point during rush hour. Allowing busses to bypass traffic will improve the reliability of bus service and incentivize commuters to use public transit instead of driving. Additionally, other improvements will make it easier to access bus stops and improve bike access, which will further increase the diversity of transit options available to those commuting along this corridor. In conjunction with previously funded projects along this corridor, this project will help to make the Diagonal Highway safer and more efficient.
Comment Map	Russell Chandler	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	This project will make cycling between Longmont and Boulder safer and encourage more people to leave their cars home.
Email	Ryan Bonick		I support this project.	A cyclist who is excited by better cycling infrastructure along CO 119
Comment Map	Sam Brown		I support this project.	I support bikeways and protecting riders through the area from cars and distracted drivers!
Email	Sandy Myers		I support this project.	Yes yes yes, please get this done!
Comment Map	Steve Kurland		I support this project.	Great addition!
Email	Steven Horn		I support this project.	As a recent Boulder county resident living in Longmont, at age 70 I have tried riding on the shoulder of 119 and find it too dangerous to my health due to the lack of auto attention to environment and bicyclist by the auto drivers. I am in full support of the proposed bikeway. Having lived in Summit county I reference the bikeway over Vail pass as something that Boulder and Longmont residents should aspire to.
Comment Map	t roby		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Tina Hart		I support this project.	This will continue to increase safety for folks biking between Boulder/Longmont.
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I support this project.	Improved bikeways and BRT lanes make alternative to single occupancy vehicles more feasible and help everyone!
Comment Map	Tracy Earles		I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	Niwot Rd and 119 is a busy bike intersection and an underpass will make it much safer.

**Boulder County - SH-119 & Niwot Rd. BRT and Bikeway Improvements**



Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Email	Eric Bergeson	Niwot Business Association & Niwot Local Improvement District Advisory Committee (NLIDAC)	I have concerns about this project.	<p>First, we applaud and are excited about the overall plan and improvements along the diagonal and Niwot road - particularly the multi-modal aspects. However, we do have some serious concerns regarding the current version of the design. By far, the biggest concern is that the intersection will actually become more dangerous to cyclists and pedestrian traffic getting to the median and across the diagonal traveling either west or east. There is a lot going on at that intersection with the new design and it appears that it puts all emphasis on moving people up and down the diagonal with too little consideration for ingress and egress to and from the Niwot Business District and of course the large number of residences in town.</p> <p>We strongly urge planners and the county commissioners to incorporate a tunnel crossing near the intersection to facilitate safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian traffic into and out of Niwot. We of course know this is possible with the crossing that was installed off of the LOBO trail near Gunbarrel. We understand that a tunnel directly adjacent to the intersection is probably not feasible with everything going on there. But we believe the area just to the north would be ideal for an underpass that connects to the proposed bike path. Cyclists and pedestrians coming into Niwot from across the Diagonal, from a bus stop or from the proposed bikeway could enter town on 2nd Ave taking them right up the heart of town away from the vast majority of automobile traffic.</p> <p>Members of the NLIDAC are in the early stages of developing a master plan depicting what future improvements we would like to facilitate from the west entrance into town at the Diagonal on up through the intersection of 79th Street and Niwot Road. We would appreciate an opportunity to engage with Boulder County planners so we can describe what we have in mind and ensure that we make the most of this once in a generation opportunity to create a safe, efficient and attractive multimodal entrance into Niwot.</p>
Email	Michael Dombrowski		I have concerns about this project.	<p>1. Don't see how the project will make CO 119 safer based on proposed improvements. Slowing the speed of traffic on CO 119 should be the first priority. This can be done by installing cameras at every traffic light to issue tickets for people running the lights. 2. Suggest that a shuttle should be added for the town of Niwot both to take people to the bus stop and save people from having to use their cars. 3. Oppose putting the bikepath between lanes of CO 119 because it would severely impact any bird nesting areas. Both hawks and owls have been seen in that area. Although it would cost more, a bikepath on the south side of CO 119 would have less environmental impact because portions of the land are pasture. 4. Would like to see the project made more environmentally sustainable in limiting its use of concrete as much as possible. Since Boulder county has denied Cemtex permission to expand its concrete the cost of concrete will be more expensive when the project begins. 5. The Camera article mentioned a term which would only make sense to a traffic planner "safety que bypass lanes" if these are meant to be like those lanes added to the right side of the major traffic lanes on Rte. 42 at Baseline and South Boulder Road in Lafayette and Louisville, I'm opposed to them because it means there are vehicles illegally passing the main line of traffic on the right side in an unsafe manner at 65 miles an hour while the main line is pulling away from a stop light when the light turns green. 6. Opposed to an elevated cloverleaf at the Niwot Rd and Co 119 intersection because it destroys the historic and aesthetic value of this patch of road being the only unspoiled patch of plains along the route. 7. Even with additional stops and facilities along CO 119, the increase in bus ridership will be minimal because RTD has done practically nothing to expand its routes in the City of Boulder to match the growth of the city in the last 40 years. Any portion of the \$33 million could first be better spent developing new bus routes to encourage increased ridership in Boulder as well as Longmont. 8. Don't remember seeing any similar bikepath on Airport Road designed to route bicycle traffic within the city. The City of Longmont needs to step up and work on this aspect of their bike trails.</p>
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I have concerns about this project.	Concerned about the cost and how many people use that road/trail? I think there are other top priority jobs that better serve the region but multimodal projects are great

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Email	Susan Tannenbaum		I have concerns about this project.	The light sequencing at 119 and Niwot is terrible.
<b>Boulder County - SH-119 &amp; Niwot Rd. BRT and Bikeway Improvements</b>				
Email	Eileen Malloy		I am opposed to this project.	Believes all current proposed projects are a waste of money. Money and time would be better used on a train connecting Longmont and Boulder. Voters approved the money for light rail, where is the light rail and what happened to the money?
Email	Judy Fritz		I am opposed to this project.	Not convinced many people will ride bikes from Longmont to Boulder and back.
<b>Boulder County - SH-7 Transit Operations: Boulder to Brighton</b>				
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I support this project.	Transit it the way!
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Great to see this investment in transit.
Email	Anne Strawbridge		I support this project.	Currently frustrated by the lack of bus service between Lafayette and Boulder on Arapahoe. More bus service means more opportunities to take the bus.
Email	Ariel Kalishman Walsh		I support this project.	Writing to support the grant proposal for rapid bus transit between Brighton and Boulder along CO-7, serving communities between. Lives in Lafayette and experiences how challenging traveling between communities is without a car. As communities expand and the need to reduce emissions increases, providing more effective, accessible, affordable and reliable public transportation is essential.
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Calvin Ryan		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Great, just need MORE! More service, more frequency, more better!
Comment Map	Daniel Florez		I support this project.	
Email	Devin Detwiler		I support this project.	I support this grant request.
Comment Map	Eric Long	Wednesday Morning Velo	I support this project.	I'm scared to death to ride my bike on Hwy 7 East of 75th in Boulder and avoid it. This is the most direct way to get to Boulder from many housing developments.
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	George Gerstle	PLAN Boulder County Cyclist for Community	I support this project.	This corridor is an important, and growing, commuter corridor in the north metro area, which has no good bike facilities despite being ripe for more bike usage. Providing improved transit service and safe bike infrastructure we can make progress towards our mobility and climate change goals.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	Woohoo for more transit!
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	Need more transit in this growth area
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	This corridor is an important, and growing, commuter corridor in the north metro area, which has no good bike facilities despite being ripe for more bike usage. Providing improved transit service and safe bike infrastructure we can make progress towards our mobility and climate change goals.
Comment Map	John H.	Broomfield Bikes transportation advocacy group	I support this project.	I support projects that invest in more sustainable multi-modal transportation such as biking and bus mass transit. Ideally, service would be MORE frequent than every 30 minutes; every 10 minutes is best.
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Joseph Vigil	Self	I support this project.	I used to ride out in this area a lot on in the early 90's but over the last 20+ it is just way too unsafe. It would be nice to feel comfortable out in this area again.
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	I support new transit service

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Email	Kathryn Boyd		I support this project.	Myself and many others would highly benefit rapid transit along CO 7 and I am looking forward to when it is reality. A grant that would help improve the corridor and test aspects of this system seems like a good opportunity in the meantime. Please consider improving transit in the suburbs of Boulder, as right now it is quite difficult to easily transit in and out of the city, putting more and more cars on the road and contributing to climate change issues.
Email	Laura Free		I support this project.	In support of a transit plan along Co 7. Would not want it to go on Baseline in Lafayette until at least 119th st or more east than that.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Approve all of Boulder County's applications
<b>Boulder County - SH-7 Transit Operations: Boulder to Brighton</b>				
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	I support new transit services. 30 minute headways is pretty infrequent, but I assume those will improve with time
Comment Map	Mike McQueeney		I support this project.	I feel this will help more riders go east safely as well as bike commuters
Email	Nathan Dykhuis		I support this project.	As a weekly commuter on the current JUMP bus between Lafayette and Boulder, I'd like to express my interest and support for the CO 7 transit project. The JUMP is my primary method of transit to work in Boulder from near 111th and Arapahoe in Lafayette, enabling me to avoid taking a single-occupancy gasoline vehicle which I would need to drive and park in central Boulder. It's also a safer and more comfortable option during snowy or icy winter months. However, the current JUMP is frequently fairly crowded, and not always on time. In addition, I've heard that RTD plans to cut the current JUMP service to Lafayette and add a less-convenient new line, with a different route down 287 instead of the more residential 111th street, which would be much less functional or possibly not feasible for me. When I heard about the proposal to add transit service to CO 7 from Boulder to Brighton, I was immediately interested, as it sounds like it would help me and my family commute to Boulder, and avoid car trips. I would greatly appreciate and frequently utilize this service, and given the current ridership on the existing JUMP route, it would probably benefit a number of other riders also.
Comment Map	Nels Beckman		I support this project.	There is basically no transit service covering this direction today
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	yes to multimodal and bus projects
Email	Patrick Egan		I support this project.	We live in Lafayette (near 95th and Arapahoe) and have been here over 20 years. CO 7 is one of the main East/West arteries into Boulder and very heavily travelled. Given the ongoing development for the area (affordable apartments/townhomes) that are planned to be built along this corridor, the need for a transit alternative to single driver cars is increasing. Right now, if one wants to take a bus along the corridor, there are very few actual safe bus stops. This means standing by a posted sign on a very busy road and is just not feasible - especially as there is a Senior Center (PACE and the 55+ Cottages at Forest Park) and a YWCA nearby. If this route is enhanced, it would make it more usable for all if bus stops shelters were spread along the roadway. We whole-heartedly support the transportation improvements - our only concern is to make these changes even sooner.
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project creates new transit service
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This project proves a good new link in our transit system to service new & expanded development in the North Metro area.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project creates new transit service.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	I love mass transit.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Robby Mann		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Russell Chandler	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	This project will make cycling between East Boulder County and Boulder safer and encourage more people to leave their cars home.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I support this project.	
Email	Sarah Craig		I support this project.	Connecting Boulder to other cities (mainly Denver) via public transportation is extremely vital to reduce cars on the road and change our current transportation system to fulfill climate justice needs.
Email	Stacie Johnson		I support this project.	In support of public transportation funding for the corridor to reduce auto traffic and to make it easier for people without a car to get to employment, services, and retail in a more easier and reliable manner. The corridor currently does offer grocery, retail, and apartment options along the way.
Comment Map	Steve B		I support this project.	This is very positive for these communities and necessary
Comment Map	Steven Kurland	Self	I support this project.	
<b>Boulder County - SH-7 Transit Operations: Boulder to Brighton</b>				
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I support this project.	More service and more frequency will improve mobility and offer alternatives to car trips. Even more frequent than 30 minutes would be great
Comment Map	Travis Madsen	Southwest Energy Efficiency Project	I support this project.	Investing in more and better transit service is good for the region. It will improve access to opportunity, equity and mobility and help reduce car dependency and pollution.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
<b>Broomfield - SH-7 Corridor Multimodal Improvements - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I support this project.	Improve safety, and get people out of their cars.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Great to see safety and transit improvements. Having been here recently to use the hospital, I can't imagine trying to walk or bike on this road. It's great to see DRCOG giving the community options besides driving.
Comment Map	Andrew Alger		I support this project.	If this project is going to make SH-7 safer for pedestrians and cyclists I am in support of it. This is a dangerous highway that travels through several populated areas. The segment along Lafayette is not meant for pedestrians. Trying to cross that highway is difficult. Walking along it is scary and trying to ride a bike in that section feels deadly.
Comment Map	Andy O'Brien		I support this project.	Please make this road safer for people outside of cars
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I support this project.	biking improves everyones health
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	I support better safer bike routes.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Keep the focus and priority on walking / biking, to plan for a livable future
Comment Map	Daniel Florez		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Eric Long	Wednesday Morning Velo	I support this project.	
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	Yes to safer streets for pedestrians and bicyclists.
Comment Map	Jacque McIntyre		I support this project.	
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	This project will enhance transit operations and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Joseph Vigil	Self	I support this project.	Safety, safety and more safety!
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	I support better bike & pedestrian safety.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	Improves safety and provides non-car transportation options? Love it!
Comment Map	Mike McQueeney		I support this project.	Bike safety is critical.....
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	Multimodal yes
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project will enhance transit operations and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project will enhance transit operations and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	Like, yeah.
Comment Map	Robby Mann		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Steven Kurland		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I support this project.	multimodal improvements help improve transportation for all and create a better metro community!
Comment Map			I support this project.	This would be a high priority for me. Turning off of foothills is a nightmare right now on a bike.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I have concerns about this project.	I do not support the addition of more than 2 general purpose travel lanes in each direction as part of this project.
<b>Castle Rock - I-25 &amp; Crystal Valley Pkwy. Interchange</b>				
Comment Map	Amanda Lontine	Citizen	I support this project.	This is a much needed interchange in a growing area. There is limited access to the highway from the growing neighborhoods which makes the frontage roads and Plum Creek Parkway areas more dangerous.
Comment Map	Amy		I support this project.	This interchange is essential to all the residents living in the southern part of Castle Rock. The Town is getting bigger and the traffic congestion is becoming hazardous. The signage, road markings, and turn signals continue to be modified to adapt to the increased traffic, as a temporary fix. The Crystal Valley Interchange is important to the community and I strongly support this project.
Comment Map	Andrew Focht		I support this project.	This project vital to the region and the local community. Federal and state support for the proposed Crystal Valley Interchange with I-25 in the form of financial grant assistance is warranted. The interchange results in a connected multimodal region by: relieving unsafe/unreliable conditions at the existing Plum Creek Parkway/I-25 interchange and creating pedestrian facility connections that everyone can enjoy. Please
Comment Map	Andrius P		I support this project.	This project will greatly help the present traffic issues southern Castle Rock faces, not to mention when families begin to move into the Dawson Trails development. Plum Creek Parkway (Exit 181) already suffers from a low level of service that has proven to have a high potential for crash reduction. Furthermore, this interchange will have a chance to connect both bicycles and pedestrians from either side of I25. The interchange has the potential to be a great example of safe, accessible, equitable, and confidence inspiring bike and pedestrian infrastructure.
Comment Map	Becky Hernandez	Castle Rock Police Department and resident of Crystal Valley Ranch	I support this project.	Castle Rock needs this project to add an additional on/off ramp for the thousands living on the south edge of town and to assist in alleviating the traffic, especially at Plum Creek and interstate 25. This will provide easier access to future businesses and a faster route to our hospital. Please consider funding this important project. Thank you.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Brian		I support this project.	This is an important and much needed project. It will relieve congestion at the Plum Creek Parkway interchange and provide relief to I25 and local users.
Comment Map	Brittany		I support this project.	The proposed Crystal Valley interchange project provides solutions for traffic congestion, accessibility to large neighborhoods, as well as decreased travel times for commuters and those accessing emergency services, among other things. The interchange will positively benefit the residents of the region, as well as local businesses that stand to benefit from increased foot traffic as a result of easier access. Please consider funding this important project!
Comment Map	Carol		I support this project.	More access points to I-25 are always better.
Comment Map	Cat J.		I support this project.	Yes, please do what you can to make this project happen.
Comment Map	Chris Sobie	Town of Castle Rock	I support this project.	The Town of Castle Rock has experienced significant growth recently, especially in areas served by Crystal Valley Parkway. Currently, these residents must travel north to Plum Creek Parkway in order to access I-25 and other areas of Town. This interchange is instrumental in ensuring Castle Rock grows in a sustainable fashion. Not only will this interchange serve the existing Crystal Valley community by providing increased access and mobility, it will serve the existing Castle Rock community as a whole by relieving congested roadways and providing new opportunities to cross I-25 by walking and biking. This interchange also increases the safety of Castle Rock citizens by reducing the amount of vehicles on Plum Creek Parkway, which includes a school zone, and reducing the vehicle conflicts at Plum Creek Parkway and I-25. Lastly, this interchange will have a positive impact on our environment by reducing vehicles emissions and increasing walking and cycling. Much needed!
Comment Map	Dan		I support this project.	This is such a necessary project for a growing state. I25 is the backbone of the State's economy. As I drive I25 every weekday, it's obvious that the segment near the existing Plum Creek Pkwy interchange is becoming a safety concern. When accidents occur in high volume stretches of I25 (like this stretch) there is so much cost to the population: from increased gas and pollution due to unneeded idling, to major time delays and costs associated with accidents themselves. This project is a no brainer for the State to prioritize.
Comment Map	Don		I support this project.	This interchange is needed. Please provide funding.
<b>Castle Rock - I-25 &amp; Crystal Valley Pkwy. Interchange</b>				
Comment Map	Ellen Staton		I support this project.	I strongly support this project. I agree with a previous writer who has had to travel the west frontage rd from Crystal Valley to Tomah frequently as I have. This interchange will make the trip to CO Springs much easier and safer. I also agree with several other responders that the south end of Castle Rock has been experiencing great growth with more to come once the Dawson project gets going. The Plum Creek exit is busy, congested, and unsafe with so many vehicles getting on and off 25 there. This project would eliminate a lot of that. My 1 wish is that the trees that were planted when the CV bridge was constructed can be saved. I realize that would probably mean moving them, but they are beautiful & mature trees that it would be great to save. Maybe move them to a park.
Comment Map	Jacob		I support this project.	Please fund this project! It is critical to a fast growing part of the region which has had long term plans to construct it. Now is the time to act and complete it, for: safety, access, GHGE, and relieve other near capacity infrastructure in the area. Thanks!
Comment Map	Jenn J		I support this project.	As a daily driver of the dangerous west bound frontage road between Plum Creek Pkwy and Tomah, I highly endorse this project, especially with the Dawson Trails project bringing additional traffic to the area. The GAP project forced guard rails along the frontage road, leading to hazardous driving conditions in inclement weather, and distracted drivers weaving into oncoming traffic. Please consider helping to fund this critical intersection, as a matter of public safety in addition to managing extra traffic.
Comment Map	Kevin W		I support this project.	Needed to facilitate inevitable development
Comment Map	Kristin		I support this project.	Please provide funds toward this project - thank you!

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Matt O		I support this project.	The current and only interchange (Plum Creek) is failing and pushing traffic backups directly into the flowing traffic of I-25. The community continues to grow, and the Town has focused on obtaining funds from voters and other means. This is not only a local but also a county and state problem that needs to be addressed.
Comment Map	Melinda P.		I support this project.	I strongly support this project! This is a high growth area, and this transportation project is needed to ensure public safety. This area has also become a tourist destination, with P.S. Miller Park and it's attractions nearby, great shopping in downtown Castle Rock, and Jellystone Park just to the south. This project will especially be needed with the upcoming Dawson Trails Development. Many years ago my son and I nearly lost our lives in a head-on collision with a careless driver on a Douglas County road. Given this experience, I am very supportive of projects such as this that will improve safety. Also, this project is badly needed to relieve present and future road congestion. This will greatly enhance the recent I-25 GAP Project. The west Frontage Road between Tomah and Plum Creek Parkway also needs to be moved or widened (and speed limit reduced until it is). The changes made to the Frontage Road as a result of the GAP Project have significantly decreased safety!
Comment Map	Michelle P.		I support this project.	As someone who has commuted back and forth from Downtown Castle Rock to Tomah Road via the i-25 Frontage Road, I can't emphasize enough how important this interchange is to our community. Not only will it allow better access to the new developments, it will save lives. Frontage Road's high traffic is a 2-lane road that has seen multiple head-on collisions, many fatal. The Crystal Valley Parkway Interchange is a must!
Comment Map	Mike Williams		I support this project.	Absolutely important project for the GAP project success and for overall safety. So many needless traffic deaths in this area of I-25.
Comment Map	Ryan		I support this project.	Much needed to help traffic flow on the south side of town. I'll be able to see this construction from my back yard and am more than willing to deal with that and the tax dollars required to better cover the growth and expansion of our town. The amount of cars in the area won't change, this just means they'll be using Crystal Valley and not Plum Creek.
Comment Map	Sandi Sandman		I support this project.	I am a resident in Douglas County and travel in Castle Rock and south. This would be a great addition to the gap project that still gets congestion. Traveling during rush hour and on weekends have extremely long lines at intersections throughout this area. This is not only a town need, but county and state road safety need. I-25 needs all the help it can get!
<b>Castle Rock - I-25 &amp; Crystal Valley Pkwy. Interchange</b>				
Comment Map	Shauna		I support this project.	I strongly support this project. I agree with several other previous writers who have had to travel the west frontage rd from Crystal Valley to Tomah frequently. This interchange will make the trip to CO Springs much easier and safer and give better access to southern Castle Rock. The Plum Creek exit is extremely busy, congested, and generally unsafe with so many vehicles getting on and off 25 there. This project would eliminate a lot of that.
Comment Map	Stacie	Resident of Castle Rock	I support this project.	This interchange is needed to help people in southern Castle Rock have better access
Comment Map	Sydney		I support this project.	Hello, I support this project. An interchange at Crystal Valley Parkway is badly needed.
Comment Map	Xavier Lastra		I support this project.	I support this project. The interchange is very much needed in that area of Castle Rock.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	I support this.
Comment Map			I support this project.	This project is essential to address safety and congestion concerns for I-25, frontages roads and Plum Creek.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I have concerns about this project.	I like the bike path improvements and making it safer for bikes and pedestrians but disagree the cost to serve cars .
Comment Map	D Forbes		I have concerns about this project.	Increasing vehicle infrastructure will also increase the traffic to uncomfortable levels in the future.
Comment Map	Jay Marx	Resident	I have concerns about this project.	For those who complain about "air pollution" are not up to current EPA Laws. Gas powered vehicles are the most cleanest they have been in the last 10-20years. This will have no effect on "climate change." The widening aspect is for the crystal valley parkway road to have it as two lanes each way, very beneficial for traffic. I am honestly fine with a new interchange at Crystal Valley Parkway. For those who complain about it, trying to leave crystal valley is a nightmare to head north to go on I25 to head north or south. This part of Castle Rock urgently needs it. The issue I have is the roundabout. There have been more accidents in Castle Rock from roundabouts than traffic lights. It confuses the elderly on driving them and they stop in the roundabout. Also PLEASE for all that is good make a bike path separate of pedestrian traffic. Bicyclists have nowhere to ride. They get chased from riding on paths by pedestrians or can't ride in the road because of how people drive. Castle Rock needs a solely bike path free from pedestrians. Like what is next to C470 from the I25 interchange all the way to Golden. Too many bicyclists have been hit riding the roads and too many have been ticketed on nature paths. The other thing too is please don't lie to us residents like what was done at the gap.
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I have concerns about this project.	I am not in support of adding extra lanes to Crystal Valley Parkway. as part of this project. The bridge(s) over the BNSF mainline west of I-25 need to accommodate 4 tracks passing under to allow for future rail expansion.
Comment Map	Alejandra X. Castañeda	Mothers Against More Car Lanes	I am opposed to this project.	Any new transportation project that makes it easier for single-occupancy vehicles to move about the state will only increase SOV use and vehicle miles traveled, with more green house emissions that will hurt our air quality. As a commenter already said, "the project should be redesigned to better meet its goals before additional regional funding is approved." In 2022, we should be investing all our public funds into mobility options that increase the health & well-being of our communities, like better pedestrian, bike and public transportation infrastructure. Infrastructure that centers the private automobile has already received too many of our dollars and has proven to worsen our health outcomes, and the healthful/independent mobility of all community members. Thank you.
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I am opposed to this project.	We should not be implementing solutions that only help cars. Save the money for adding alternate forms of transportation instead. Bus, bike or rail!
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I am opposed to this project.	This project will increase VMT, air pollution, and GHG. It will accelerate climate change and will increase PM2.5 air pollution for the region as a whole.
Comment Map	Asher David		I am opposed to this project.	This is exactly what not to spend money on. This will only encourage more traffic and Sprawl.
<b>Castle Rock - I-25 &amp; Crystal Valley Pkwy. Interchange</b>				
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I am opposed to this project.	This project benefits a small group of upper income people. 78 million dollars for 2,479 households, of which less than 1% (23 per the application) are low-income. It is not worth the price tag to increase congestion and increases our reliance on cars. I do not see how this benefits the region's multi-modal transportation.
Comment Map	Carla B		I am opposed to this project.	Road widening encourages more car traffic.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I am opposed to this project.	I oppose highway widening, but support the bike improvements separately.
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I am opposed to this project.	I support the bike routes, but NOT interchange and increased motor vehicle traffic accommodation
Comment Map	David		I am opposed to this project.	This project will support increase vehicle miles travelled, will lead to increased pollution, and will encourage car-mandatory suburban development. This is a wasted opportunity with funds that can be better spend elsewhere.
Comment Map	David W		I am opposed to this project.	Invest in public transportation, not more infrastructure for single-occupant vehicles.



Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Fritz Clauson		I am opposed to this project.	Public money should be subsidizing Castle Rock sprawl developments
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I am opposed to this project.	I'm against making more/bigger lanes for cars. We need to be going the other way. If there is traffic it's because too many people are encouraged/forced to use cars to travel. Lets work on making alternatives safer and easier.
Comment Map	Greg		I am opposed to this project.	This will increase SOVs and spend too much money benefiting too few people.
Comment Map	Hamilton Reed	self	I am opposed to this project.	While I like the bike & pedestrian improvements, I am wholly opposed to any road widening projects. We need to make things easier for non-automobiles if we're going to change people's habits and fight climate change.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I am opposed to this project.	I'm saying no to an expensive highway expansion project that will cause even more congestions in the long term because of induce demand.
Comment Map	Jacob S	Citizen	I am opposed to this project.	I oppose this project as it support single occupancy vehicles and enables more sprawl. Castle Rock did a horrible job designing they're city, as it only accommodates cars and has no public transportation. This project worsens the situation at everyone else's expense.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I am opposed to this project.	This money could be better spent improving transit and multimodal transportation. This project prioritizes the marginal convenience of single-occupancy-vehicles over the health and safety of both people and the environment
Comment Map	John H.	Broomfield Bikes transportation advocacy group	I am opposed to this project.	This project has a price tag of \$78,000,000. Given that we are in a climate emergency, there is undoubtedly a better use for this money. Adding interchanges and widening roads does not solve traffic congestion any more than loosening your belt solves being overweight. We need dramatic overhauls in our transportation system, not business-as-usual blindly making more room for cars, widening roads, and wasting away what little capital still remains.
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I am opposed to this project.	This is an expensive project that, by the application's own admission, will increase SOV use, increase VMT, has not had its Environmental Assessment revised since 2004, and has not been re-assessed in line with the CDOT 1601 process. While the application claims that its primary regional impact is to improve freight reliability and emergency vehicle access, a better design could accommodate those needs via dedicated freight lanes (instead of providing additional non-freight SOV access). Additionally, it claims that reducing congestion will improve "safety", but does not specify the distinction between safety of property and safety of passengers. Increasing LOS (thus increasing vehicular speeds) is likely to significantly worsen fatality and SBI rates due to increased high-speed collisions. This means that this design will likely decrease passenger safety. The project should be redesigned to better meet its goals before additional regional funding is approved.
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I am opposed to this project.	This is just a road widening project.
Comment Map	Kyle Plastino		I am opposed to this project.	Induced demand by widening this road will cause traffic congestion to increase. Please consider allocating these funds to multi-modal transportation projects (walking, biking, public transportation), that if effectively implemented can permanently reduce traffic congestion in the area.
Comment Map	M Koch		I am opposed to this project.	This is a road widening project and would only encourage further sprawl
<b>Castle Rock - I-25 &amp; Crystal Valley Pkwy. Interchange</b>				
Comment Map	Mat T		I am opposed to this project.	78 million dollars is a waste of money to marginally improve convenience for drivers. This money would be better spent on projects that improve conditions for people walking, biking, and taking transit whose needs have largely been ignored in favor of car infrastructure.
Comment Map	MD		I am opposed to this project.	For \$80 million dollars ?? I think the money could be used elsewhere and spread further. Just seems like a whole lot of money.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I am opposed to this project.	This money could be better spent improving transit and multimodal transportation. This project prioritizes the marginal convenience of single-occupancy-vehicles over the health and safety of both people and the environment
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I am opposed to this project.	I like the bike path improvements and making it safer for bikes and pedestrians but not the cost to serve cars .
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I am opposed to this project.	This is a road widening project. We support investing in bike and pedestrian facilities to improve connections with the Front Range Trail as its own project.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I am opposed to this project.	This is a road widening project. I support investing in bike and pedestrian facilities to improve connections with the Front Range Trail as its own project.
Comment Map	Rob P		I am opposed to this project.	Smaller cars, fewer roads.
Comment Map	Robert L		I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I am opposed to this project.	Too much money for roads/cars
Comment Map	Will B		I am opposed to this project.	Adding more lanes does not fix traffic.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	This is a road widening project. I prefer investing in bike and pedestrian facilities to improve connections with the Front Range Trail as its own project.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	The track record of widening roadways shows that it only adds to sprawl and congestion.
<b>CDOT - Federal Blvd. BRT - Englewood Station to Wagon Rd. Park-n-Ride - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Alejandra X. Castañeda	Mothers Against More Car Lanes	I support this project.	This BRT project can't come soon enough! Federal Blvd is one of our most dangerous arterials for ALL road users. I live 1.5 blocks from it in North Denver and see it on a daily basis. Investing in this project that will enhance not only transit infrastructure (stops, lanes, signals) but also pedestrian infrastructure (sidewalks!) would be a game changer for the health & well-being of our communities. Thank you.
Comment Map	Alex		I support this project.	Federal has so much potential to be a cultural and economic hub for the city, made impossible by the horrible sidewalks and transit options here. It is unsafe, loud, and uninviting. A BRT would go a long way to making this area a desirable destination, and to discourage some car trips in favor of transit.
Comment Map	Alex Parks		I support this project.	BRT on federal would be amazing
Comment Map	Alex St. Angelo		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I support this project.	Federal needs major overhauls to improve safety, and this would help.
Comment Map	Alexander smith		I support this project.	Transit system improvements are needed. Frequency and average speed of busses should be a priority. But top speeds should be limited through neighborhoods and pedestrian crossings need shorter wait times
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Federal Blvd is the one of the busiest transit corridors in the entire metro region and serves many neighborhoods that are high on the equity index. Many of the transit riders along this corridor rely on transit as their only means of transportation. A bus full of dozens of riders deserves the dignity to not have to wait in traffic behind single occupancy vehicles. This project is not only good from an equity standpoint, but it is also good from a climate friendly standpoint.
Comment Map	Andrew Alger		I support this project.	This is one of the more dangerous roads in Denver. It lacks sidewalks in many places. It has a heavily used RTD bus line. Please add BRT! Please add more safe pedestrian space! Please add protected bike infrastructure!
Comment Map	Andrew Sullivan		I support this project.	This Project would serve the community well. It is much needed before development along Federal makes building new transit in the corridor next to impossible and even more expensive.
Comment Map	Andy O'Brien		I support this project.	Please proceed with this project to improve connectivity and safety on this corridor. True brt requires bus-only lanes, and automated enforcement to be truly effective

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Bret Taber		I support this project.	Please support this project. We need greatly improve safety on Federal Blvd and one way of doing that is giving people a safe, reliable transit option.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	This project would serve the community in innumerable ways. It would be truly amazing and help improve the quality of life of everyone.
Comment Map	Brian Rowland		I support this project.	I live at 29th and Clay, 3 blocks from Federal. I am mostly a bike/pedestrian commuter however this would greatly improve my safety. have also ridden BRT in other cities and love it. This would be wonderful for Federal blvd for reasons tntm. Please accelerate this project.
Comment Map	Bruce Perry		I support this project.	This project is amazing and is long over due. It should be accelerated as much as possible. The Federal Blvd corridor traverses many underserved communities that would benefit both from the improved transit service and the reduction in emissions from cars on the corridor. I also really like that this is NOT a spoke route connecting only into downtown, but rather a true crosstown connection that can be the basis for a more complete grid-based transit network that serves more types of trips than just commutes downtown. And if there are connections to the W, G, and B lines it will still allow for very easy trips for those headed downtown.
Comment Map	Bryce Bradley		I support this project.	BRT is an easy win and the Federal corridor is essential to connect the region as one of the longest non-highway N/S streets. Would connect so many communities and we are sorely lacking reliable and fast N/S transit.
Comment Map	Calvin Ryan		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	I strongly support this project. I hope all 10 BRT projects will be funded as soon as possible.
<b>CDOT - Federal Blvd. BRT - Englewood Station to Wagon Rd. Park-n-Ride - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	D. Chen		I support this project.	Please implement this ASAP and create a design that truly prioritizes transit. The section that does not provide a dedicated lane will reduce the impact of this intervention and should be reconsidered.
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Federal needs a lot of work, with significant focus on pedestrian and cycling infrastructure to prepare for the future
Comment Map	Daniel Birdsell		I support this project.	I'm happy to see the Front Range starting to embrace BRT. It has all the benefits of rail - namely, it doesn't get caught in traffic and can move more people than a lane dedicated to private automobiles - at only a small fraction of the cost of rail. Good bus service is in line with Colorado's goals of reducing GHG emissions and improving air quality. It can also bolster the economy and increase equity by increasing the number of jobs that someone without a car can access.
Comment Map	Daniel Florez		I support this project.	
Comment Map	David Nye		I support this project.	I love it. Take lanes from cars and give them over to transit!
Comment Map	Elizabeth Morales		I support this project.	Enhanced safety and more transit options are needed on federal
Comment Map	Evelyn Burr	Self	I support this project.	I strongly support this project for its potential to improve fast and efficient transit north and south through the city.
Comment Map	Francisco Partida		I support this project.	BRT is much needed in this corridor
Comment Map	Fritz Clauson		I support this project.	Build BRT and better sidewalks!
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Greg		I support this project.	The need for this project is so obviously huge. Federal is in horrible shape right now. Sidewalks missing or in disrepair. It's got huge bus ridership and this project would dramatically increase that ridership. Absolutely worth funding.
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I support this project.	To improve uptake in transit ridership, transit needs to be a more attractive option than driving. Support BRT lanes so transit riders can reach their destination as fast or faster than drivers.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Hamilton Reed	self	I support this project.	I live near Federal Boulevard, it would be great to have more buses running down it, especially if they get their own dedicated lane!
Comment Map	Heather Gregg		I support this project.	BRT along Federal would fill a huge gap and create more equitable transit options for underserved neighborhoods on the West Side. BRT would have direct links to existing transit connections at US36, I70, Colfax and 6th Ave and improve N/S commutes along the West Side between the northern and southern metro area. This one project would vastly address existing inequities and have an immediate positive impact on the lives of Denver Metro residents living west of I-25.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	We need more and better transit so drivers have incentives to make less unnecessary car trips.
Comment Map	Ian Frasch		I support this project.	Great project that is desperately needed to improve Federal Blvd, improve speed/reliability for bus riders, induce higher ridership and modal shifts from car->transit, reduce GHG emissions, and increase safety and save lives. Please make sure it's done correctly. Dedicated bus only lanes with protection from car encroachment is essential. Every stoplight must have transit signal priority so buses are not stuck at red lights. Stops should be spaced farther apart than a typical city bus route for faster travel times. It should be easier and quicker than it is now to cross the street to access a bus stop. So many people rely on this route, but currently are punished with poor mixed-traffic service, and are counting down the days until they can afford a car so they can contribute to the traffic/pollution/safety problem. BRT would flip the script, and actively get people out of cars and onto transit as they see the bus flying by them.
Comment Map	James W		I support this project.	Yes very much support this
Comment Map	James Warren		I support this project.	Seems cool, BRT is great! Definitely don't love Federal as is, and I think this brings us closer to a solid design.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	This should be among DRCOG's top priorities. Federal is currently very unsafe and unpleasant for anyone not inside a car, and these improvements would change this area for the better. Just make it happen, already.
Comment Map	John		I support this project.	Even if I might not benefit from this specific project, I see it has great potential to help a lot of people that rely on public transportation, and even increase ridership. Drivers have to remember that any investments in public transportation will also benefit drivers, as there will be less cars on the road.
<b>CDOT - Federal Blvd. BRT - Englewood Station to Wagon Rd. Park-n-Ride - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	John DiMattia		I support this project.	Very much in support of BRT on Federal
Comment Map	John H.	Broomfield Bikes transportation advocacy group	I support this project.	I support projects that invest in more sustainable multi-modal transportation such as biking and bus mass transit. Federal is a deadly corridor for pedestrians, and the entire street needs to be redesigned and rebuilt. BRT will be a good intermediate step towards improving Federal.
Comment Map	John M		I support this project.	Strongly endorse BRT along Federal. Blvd enhancements have already been a boon to the area but transit has been lacking. Connects spokes of lightrail, connects suburbs and neighborhoods to Broncos and new developments along the S Platte.
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I support this project.	Although this is an expensive project, the development of BRT along Federal is long overdue, and has a higher likelihood of high transit ridership than many of the other proposals in this call.
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I support this project.	I think this project could go farther in reducing the car sewer feel of Federal. Why not add space for a protected bike lane as well? There are currently no safe north-south connections through Denver, and this is a great opportunity to add mass transit and bike transit in one project.
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I support this project.	Highly support this project! I am excited to see more transit options to travel in a safer and more convenient manner. BRT is excellent!
Comment Map	Joseph Blessett		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	I support new transit service.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	KC McFerson	Self	I support this project.	Fabulous project! Thank you. You should take money from the Pena expansion and fund more of this. Denver deserves a world class BRT system. Make it great!
Comment Map	Ken Schroepfel		I support this project.	I strongly support this project as a critical BRT corridor through the Denver region to reduce automobile dependency, increase transit efficiency and ridership, improve safety, and reduce air pollution.
Comment Map	Layton Hill		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Leighton Moreland		I support this project.	This project would benefit the area greatly and allow for greater connectivity from the G line
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Mat T		I support this project.	BRT and dedicated bus lanes on every arterial should be the standard if we are serious about dealing with climate change, air pollution, traffic violence, and equitable access to jobs, services, and quality of life for our residents.
Comment Map	Natasha T Koermer		I support this project.	I live very close to Federal and drive it multiple times per week. Federal is a very busy/dangerous road with tons of potholes and narrow/nonexistent shoulders. I support making this road smoother, safer, and more conducive to alternative transportation (i.e., not just single person cars).
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	A safe place and well thought out bus/transit station is needed . More buses on the road please
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project will introduce new transit service.
Comment Map	Philip Taylor		I support this project.	A great step to reducing auto emissions and making Denver more accessible.
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This project must include improvements to Westminster Station Drive to facilitate all Federal BRT buses to serve Westminster Station & allow seamless Downtown to North Federal connections.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project will introduce new transit service.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	Mass transit improves my life.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Ryan Frazer		I support this project.	Really excited for a project to actually make Federal safer and better for non-drivers.
Comment Map	Sam Brown		I support this project.	This BRT project along Federal Blvd will enhance not only transit infrastructure (stops, lanes, signals) but also pedestrian infrastructure.
Comment Map	Sam Long		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Scott Sanderson		I support this project.	BRT seems interesting. Let's try it
Comment Map	Seth Newby		I support this project.	Much needed infrastructure along Federal
Comment Map	Steve B		I support this project.	A bus rapid transit system will greatly improve public transportation options on Federal and put a focus on improving the aging and dangerous infrastructure of the area
<b>CDOT - Federal Blvd. BRT - Englewood Station to Wagon Rd. Park-n-Ride - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Tolann		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I support this project.	BRT lanes encourage use of buses and transit and make it easier for people to get around without a car, without negatively affecting those who do. Build even more!
Comment Map	Travis Madsen	Southwest Energy Efficiency Project	I support this project.	Investing in better transit service will give more area residents access to opportunity, increase mobility, reduce pollution and improve equity. This BRT project (and the other proposed ones) are in the public interest.
Comment Map	Zuben Bastani		I support this project.	Yes, create more transit options!
Comment Map			I support this project.	A much needed improvement to a vital transit corridor.
Comment Map			I support this project.	This is a great value project to serve the under-represented, non-automobile users along the corridor.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map			I support this project.	I support building out Bus Rapid Transit along Federal Boulevard, which is currently a High Injury Network road. Using a Complete Streets model with dedicated bus lanes and safer, more accessible sidewalks and multi-modal paths for active transportation will go a long way in making this a safer corridor. Faster and more frequent transit choices will also decrease vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	BRT and sidewalk improvements on Federal would be great
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	This should be among DRCOG's top priorities. Federal is currently very unsafe and unpleasant for anyone not inside a car, and these improvements would change this area for the better. I for one can't wait to use this new BRT!
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I have concerns about this project.	BRT is a good step in the right direction. Two concerns: 1. This covers a lot of very low density land, and seems like an unwise investment. A subsection of this would probably be much better than this entire section. 2. I see no reason why we would opt for BRT on this corridor when we could go with a tram. The upfront cost would be higher, but it would be the much more financially responsible choice in the long run. While some people make the case that BRT is a good first step, and trams can be an upgrade down the road there have been no notable cases of that happening, and trying to refactor a BRT to slowly interface with a tram plus the upfront cost of a tram (that we currently are unwilling to invest in, and probably will down the road as well) make it even more challenging down the road to justify switching to the much more effective tram down the road. If this project happens, it will be a net positive, but could be implemented in a much more fiscally responsible manner.
Comment Map	Fred Beck		I have concerns about this project.	Allocating this space for bus lanes rather than car lanes is a no brainer. I only wish they would go farther in improving safety, mobility, and capacity. This redesign opportunity could be used to take this 6 lane street and eliminate conflicts caused by driveways opening directly onto the street while providing space for car through traffic, BRT, bikes, parking, and more pleasant sidewalks. This could all be accomplished within the existing right of way by constructing narrow one way streets on either side that provide access to and parking for businesses along the corridor, and provide a safe low speed shared space for bicycles to travel in. These side streets would connect to the main road only at intersections which could be converted to roundabouts for additional safety and enhanced flow of traffic or left as signals if the traffic engineers insist. The main road could consist of separate car and bus lanes, one in each direction as multiple lanes for passing only create conflict.
<b>Denver - Alameda Ave. Underpass Improvements: Kalamath St. to Cherokee St. - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Alex Parks		I support this project.	I used to commute by bike on this daily and it was always the least safe part of my ride. this project NEEDS to happen asap! super unsafe for peds/cyclists as traffic turning on/off Alameda never looks for you and rarely yields. have almost been in multiple ped on cyclist crashes with the narrow walkway that is always full of trash, broken glass, and tumbleweeds
Comment Map	Alex St. Angelo		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I support this project.	Please fund this project. this will help safety, and a MUCH needed east/west connection. Please consider making the same change on other east/west roads south of denver, so we can have a connected community.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	This is a horrible section of road to try to walk or bike through. So happy to see it on the list of projects to be improved. When I've had to bike through here, it's very uncomfortable.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Andy Cushen	N/A	I support this project.	More and more people are living by the Alameda LRT station, and in order to improve their lives and the daily connectivity b/w the neighborhoods across I-25, the ped and bike accommodations on the underpass need to be improved.
Comment Map	Andy O'Brien		I support this project.	This is a critical connection across highway and rail infrastructure. Please make it safe and welcoming at a human scale, so bike riders and pedestrians are encouraged to use this connection
Comment Map	Anne Tully		I support this project.	This is an especially challenging section whether on bike or foot. The bus stops there which adds to the need for multimodal improvements
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I support this project.	this will make the path safer for cyclists and runners
Comment Map	Bret Taber		I support this project.	This is a very dangerous intersection for bikers and people on foot. There needs to be a safe route from the South Platte trail to connect to the Washington Park neighborhoods. This is currently not a good option.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	This will improve public safety and promote multi-modal transportation.
Comment Map	Brittany Spinner		I support this project.	This is great and much needed.
Comment Map	Bryce Bradley		I support this project.	Residents east of this area should have safe passage to the Platte River Trail.
Comment Map	C.J. Whelan		I support this project.	This is a long overdue project for improving the safety and connectivity of multi-modal transportation in this area.
Comment Map	Calvin Ryan		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	I'm happy to know that this project is being considered. I make this crossing frequently.
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I support this project.	Would love to see this expanded across 25 as well to connect all the way to the other side, as well as the platte creek trail.
Comment Map	Casey Roberts	none	I support this project.	I use this section of Alameda to access the SPR trail from my house east of Broadway -- it feels super unsafe and sketchy now -- would love to see these improvements so that I would feel safe biking through there with my son (especially to Johnson Habitat Park!)
Comment Map	Charlotte A.		I support this project.	This underpass is a very needed improvement for mobility in the east/west direction, for which there currently are few options.
Comment Map	Cody Sehl		I support this project.	I ride along here quite frequently and would love to see this area improved.
Comment Map	D. Chen		I support this project.	I don't even feel entirely safe in a car through this underpass. Please connect it with the other bike/ped infrastructure that has gone in recently. We need more ways to cross from the west side of town by not-a-car.
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Safety improvements for cyclists and pedestrians!
Comment Map	Dave Hawkins		I support this project.	This is a really questionable crossing currently. Making it safe (and even pleasant?) for those outside of vehicles will go a long way to connecting our city.
<b>Denver - Alameda Ave. Underpass Improvements: Kalamath St. to Cherokee St. - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	David W		I support this project.	I was already painfully aware of the cycling and pedestrian deficiencies of this area, but learning about the structural and drainage issues makes the decision to continue to fund and make progress on these improvements even more obvious.
Comment Map	Elizabeth Morales		I support this project.	This is a key connection and its currently very uncomfortable for non car drivers despite the protected nature of the pedestrian area
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Greg		I support this project.	I drive this area regularly and walk it occasionally. It's in desperate need of improvements this project should achieve.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I support this project.	Pedestrian and cycling facilities at this location are extremely dangerous and unwelcoming. It is a major missing link in the pedestrian and cycling network for connecting existing facilities. Needs massive improvement to add connectivity and usefulness to the region's cycling and pedestrian networks.
Comment Map	Hamilton Reed	self	I support this project.	This is one of the most unpleasant & dangerous parts of the Denver bike network, I would love for more space and safety as a rider here.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	Absolutely yes to improving streets for pedestrians and bicyclists.
Comment Map	James Warren		I support this project.	I like this, particularly the multi use path!
Comment Map	Jeff Walters		I support this project.	The current configuration of the underpass is quite dangerous and an uninviting as a pedestrian/cyclist connector between the existing neighborhood and recreational access to the South Platte corridor.
Comment Map	Jill Lewis		I support this project.	This is a severely needed safety improvement. I have avoided this area for years, even though it would be very useful to me, because it is so dangerous for cyclists as it exists right now.
Comment Map	Jim Abraham	Baker Gardens	I support this project.	If we want to talk about equity, I think this project ranks above nearly all others. Across a river, railroad track, and highway are the neighborhoods of Barnum, Valverde, Sun Valley, and Athmar Park, some of the most historically marginalized and neglected areas of the city. And between those neighborhoods and the economically attended to and developed areas to which they'd benefit being connected are 4 streets, nearly none of them safe to cross on a bike or by foot. Creating a way to get across here that is safe, inviting and dignified would connect these areas in a more seamless way, and pay dividends as everyday citizens could begin to benefit from the economic growth seen by the rest of the city.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	This is a very dangerous intersection for bikers and people on foot. There needs to be a safe route from the South Platte trail to connect to the Washington Park neighborhoods. This is currently not a good option.
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I support this project.	This is a very difficult pathway to use as a biker or pedestrian today, and I consider it a key connection for my family to travel between the East and West side of the city. The preferred alternative (12) in the Connect Alameda study (in the application) would be an immense improvement for ped/bike access, while improving core safety for vehicular travelers by repairing drainage issues and allowing for BRT access in the future.
Comment Map	Jonny Rotheram	Athmar Park resident	I support this project.	This is a significant barrier to connectivity between the east and west side, between Baker/S Broadway and Valverde/Athmar Park. This project will lead to more people walking and biking.
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I support this project.	This would be a massive improvement to what could be a great multi modal connection between the Platte river trail and Broadway.
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I support this project.	This is a key connection and its currently very uncomfortable for non car drivers. Improving it will make a huge difference
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	This improves safety.
Comment Map	Ken Schroepfel		I support this project.	Long overdue improvement for pedestrians and bicycles and preparing for expanded rail transit above.
Comment Map	Kevin Williams		I support this project.	This is crucial to making this part of Denver safer for all road users.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Mat T		I support this project.	This is desperately needed. The current conditions are dangerous and are a barrier to travel on foot or bike.
Comment Map	Matt		I support this project.	Please please please. This is a really rough connection between a very well biked neighborhood and the S Platte trail. Please! I want to be able bike this with my kids!
<b>Denver - Alameda Ave. Underpass Improvements: Kalamath St. to Cherokee St. - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Matt S		I support this project.	This is an important safety improvement.
Comment Map	Max Nardo		I support this project.	This is a tough and scary crossing on bike. I've been biking across here to get to work in Cap Hill and there really aren't any good east-west connections between like Florida and 8th or 13th - a several mile stretch. And getting north to those isn't great either where the trail is right next to the freeway, which would be addressed by another project competing for this same money.



Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	The current underpass is frankly scary to be in, whether you're driving, biking or walking. This spot desperately needs improvements
Comment Map	Michelle Van Engen		I support this project.	I support building separated multi-use paths and enhancing pedestrian safety with wider sidewalks on Alameda, since it is a high-injury network road. Its location near a rail station is another reason for improving mobility options along this route.
Comment Map	Morgan Stanley		I support this project.	This project would go a long way to help link Denver's south west side to downtown. The current underpass is intimidating, full of debris, and difficult to access by bike or by foot. There should also be pedestrian improvements along the Alameda to the west of the underpass, as this area is also very hazardous due to car traffic.
Comment Map	Olaf Wyberneit	pvt	I support this project.	this will make the path safer for cyclists and runners
Comment Map	Patricia	Denver resident	I support this project.	Alameda needs improvement. Multimodal is what I think is great
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project will improve safety for people walking, riding a bike, and connecting with transit.
Comment Map	Peter Warner		I support this project.	Fully support this as it's a very narrow and dangerous intersection for bikers and pedestrians. Would love a better route to get to the South Platte trail
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This project will improve safety for people walking, riding a bike, and provide future rail capacity improvements.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project will improve safety for people walking, riding a bike, and connecting with transit.
Comment Map	Rob Osterburg	Self	I support this project.	This project is a critical piece of connecting pedestrians and cyclists from the west and east sides of Denver. At over 100 years old this underpass is a picture of concrete fatigue and needs to be replaced.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	Dig it.
Comment Map	Robert L		I support this project.	Rail lines divide cities and create large dead zones. Navigating to one of the few crossings can be a large hurdle for pedestrians and a point of congestion for motorists. To minimize barriers for people wanting to access LRT stations or retail on the other side, every crossing should be treated as a scarce opportunity and leveraged to it's full potential to support a connected and accessible city.
Comment Map	Russ Shaw	self	I support this project.	This confluence of so many roads and paths has always seemed to be a very unpleasant, unwelcoming and ultimately unsafe area for all users. I tend to avoid it whether driving or cycling. Improvements here will be especially helpful for pedestrians, cyclists and users of mobility devices.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Ryan Frazer		I support this project.	This intersection is terrible for non-drivers yet it is also one of the few important connections over the South Platte River and under I-25 and the railroad tracks. This project would help a lot.
Comment Map	Sam Parks		I support this project.	This project is long overdue. The narrow and unlit sidewalk is dangerous for bikes and peds and the intersection is a ped/bike accident waiting to happen with vehicles. This is one of the worst sections of infrastructure for bikes/peds in the city in my experience.
Comment Map	Scott Sanderson		I support this project.	Being a pedestrian around here is rough. Any improvements would be great.
Comment Map	Sean Walsh		I support this project.	I am very supportive of this project especially for cyclists and pedestrians.
Comment Map	Seth Newby		I support this project.	Very dangerous underpass to pretty much everyone (including cars). Need to prioritize bike and pedestrian options
Comment Map	Steve B		I support this project.	This are necessary improvements for safety
Comment Map	t roby		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I support this project.	This underpass and intersection is particularly hostile to pedestrians and cyclists, even though it is in an incredibly useful location. Improvements to the pedestrian, cycling, and train infrastructure would drastically improve the ability of people to move through this area. Much needed project!
<b>Denver - Alameda Ave. Underpass Improvements: Kalamath St. to Cherokee St. - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Tsinnijinnie Russell		I support this project.	A project that's long overdue, I actively avoid this section of road because it's unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. Would love this to be more usable so I can use it daily!

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Wendy Vonhof		I support this project.	I have been almost killed at this intersection many times and fear for my life every time I bike through it, despite it being a designated bike route. The best option for everyone's safety, including drivers, would be to make this intersection and route safe with a fully protected intersection with dedicated pedestrian/bike crossing intervals and signals, really obvious fully painted crosswalks, no right turn on red signs, etc. Please make this safe for those not in vehicles before I die here.
Comment Map	Zuben Bastani		I support this project.	Absolutely! Terrifying to cross this area.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	David Nye		I have concerns about this project.	The bulk of funds for this projects must be primarily allocated to pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure and transit improvements. The overpass road should not create additional car connections, but should be opened for pedestrians.
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I have concerns about this project.	Alameda in general, and especially the stretch between the river and Broadway, can use any love it can get in terms of material improvements. I support many of the points in the proposal, especially as regards passenger rail & BRT, pedestrian improvements (eg. more grade-separated options), etc. I was particularly pleased to see accommodation for the possible Front Range Passenger Rail. My question/concern is whether there is more to come in a meaningful way, or if this is it. While this segment appears to be a shift in the right direction within the project area, the fact is it will still be bracketed by antagonistic design to both the east and west. If this is one of several projects on this corridor, I support the effort (though I reserve the right to pick on details). If this is it, I will be most unhappy.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	William M		I support this project.	I fully support this project. Pena Blvd expansion isn't the typical road widening project. This is much needed to support the massive growth at DEN as well as the rapidly expanding Gateway and GVR areas.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I have concerns about this project.	but in the bike lanes but do not widen the highway
Comment Map	Cody Hedges		I have concerns about this project.	The lo my discussed multimodal path along Peña needs uncoupled from the managed lane project. Less people will drive if you give people safer options to not drive. People can take the bus or the commuter rail to airport, and a multi use trail will, hopefully, push better options for bicycle storage at the airport. I'm opposed to the manager lanes project and in favor of the multi-use trails portions of this project.
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I have concerns about this project.	I forgot to put my name on my other comment (one has no name, sorry). Wanted to also add that I do support running a multi-use trail to the airport, and would suggest adding spurs that would connect that multi-use trail to the Arsenal trails, First Creek, Gaylord Hotel & High Line Canal, and any other trails I may have missed. Even if relatively few people walk/roll to the airport for travel, I think a great many would do it as a commute (if they work at the airport), to meet friends/family on a layover, to eat/drink/etc, or just to plane watch or for other recreational purposes. There is no such thing as too many multi-use trails in a metro area the size of Denver.
Comment Map	Kevin Cowperthwaite		I have concerns about this project.	I support the addition of a pedestrian/bike path adjacent to Piñon Boulevard this would add options for many people to get to the airport, whether they are workers or travelers. The addition of managed lanes to Peña Boulevard is too expensive at this time.
Comment Map	Noah Cowperthwaite		I have concerns about this project.	I strongly oppose the addition of a managed lane as part of this project. We should focus on the further development of the A-Line (increased frequency) and on multi use paths.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I have concerns about this project.	I support the multiuse trail and study but oppose the managed lanes. Adding more lanes will do nothing to improve traffic and only increase demand.
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	I do not support additional lanes on Pena, but do support the implementation of multiuser paths and studying active and shared mobility options.
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	Seems like this project will undermine the convenience and effectiveness of the A-Line. Active traffic management is a step in the right direction, but Managed Lanes (dynamic "disincentive" toll lane pricing) to establish a consistent and reliable travel time to the airport? What else provides a reliable travel time along this corridor??? THE A-LINE! This project is coddling to drivers and will keep them firmly in their comfort zone (inside their car!) for longer. Promote A-line ridership by funding more transit options to/from A-Line stations. Less cars on the corridor will reduce congestion, not adding more lanes...
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	The bottleneck with vehicles and the airport is not capacity on Pena Blvd. The bottleneck is in short/long-term parking and in the pickup and drop-off zones. Adding vehicle capacity to the highway may well make things worse - (1) by encouraging more vehicle trips to an area with (2) an area already at or beyond the capacity to receive those vehicles. If we want to address traffic problems related to the airport, add parking structures along the A-line and bus/rail service to them. We can triple or quintuple train volume with the relatively small cost of the purchase of more rolling stock and recruitment of operators; and if need be can lay more rail should longer trains and more frequent headways be insufficient. Encouraging more people to drive to a destination that is unable to receive those vehicles is not the solution, never mind the pollution and other vehicle-related concerns.
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	I oppose lane expansion, but support addition of multi-use trail alongside Pena to provide alternative transportation route. Improve the A line experience to the airport will be more important.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	A. Handler		I am opposed to this project.	I would much prefer to see an expansion of the A line then yet another highway lane. A line trains are great but service is infrequent and often delayed. I ride the A line a lot and would much prefer to see money spent on a better A line than another road lane.
Comment Map	Aaron Hackl		I am opposed to this project.	The notion that this will lower GHG emissions is completely ludicrous and the methodology is highly suspect. The application says the managed lane will shift people to HOV or transit, but the primary mode of transit to the airport is the A line which won't be improved by this. Also, given the parking costs at the airport if you are going to carpool there you are doing it already. It also says that lane will "relieve" congestion and that will reduce emissions, but for how long? Generally it takes a few years and congestion and GHG emissions are even worse. By adding these lanes and relieving congestion how many more people in the future would now drive on Pena instead of the train? If it induces people to switch from the train to driving every supposed benefit of this project evaporates. This whole project seems poorly thought out and should be reevaluated. Please reject this application.
Comment Map	Alejandra X. Castañeda	Moms Against More Car Lanes	I am opposed to this project.	Hello there, adding multiuse trails along this corridor sounds great, but not if they must come attached to expanding Peña Blvd to the airport. As other commenters that oppose this project have already said, adding more lanes will only induce more motor vehicle traffic, increasing harmful emissions & the likelihood of crashes. Invest that money in active, healthful mobility options instead, like improving the A-Line service to DIA, making the fare more accessible, and adding bus service to stations along this route. Thank you.
Comment Map	Alex Parks		I am opposed to this project.	Why bother widening the lanes when we have a train?
Comment Map	Alex Roth		I am opposed to this project.	Expanding will only bring more car use. We need to expand the train options and bicycle lanes instead.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I am opposed to this project.	Focus on improving the commuter rail line instead. Alternate forms of transportation are better for the environment, and capacity needs. The extra lane costs an insane amount, for something that will be at capacity in a few years at best. This is not helping our climate. Stop trying to add lanes- it won't work.
Comment Map	Alexander smith		I am opposed to this project.	This is madness and undermines the a line investment
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I am opposed to this project.	This project will increase VMT and GHG for our region. It will also increase air pollution in a community of color since we know that induced demand will lead to more vehicles on the corridor, and similar congestion after a few years (similar to what happened with the TREX project). We have one of the best transit lines in the entire country that serves the airport. This is an incredible opportunity to build on that service instead of widening a highway.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Email	Amanda Roberts		I am opposed to this project.	<p>As a resident of Denver, I am writing DRCOG to express my concerns regarding the Pena Boulevard I-70 to E-470 TIP request. Given the many unfunded transit and bicycle projects in the city of Denver, I believe that prioritizing roadway expansion for TIP funding undermines the region's multimodal and climate goals. Here are my reasons:</p> <p>Even with managed lanes, increasing the overall capacity of Pena Boulevard will induce demand for vehicle trips, and as a result, compete with ridership along the adjacent A-line. In a region with air quality problems and increasing traffic crashes, undermining transit will not address those serious issues.</p> <p>It is premature to fund and design the expansion of Pena Boulevard before DEN has completed its mobility study, which just began this spring. While it is laudable that DEN is including a traffic demand management plan in its proposal, beginning with the supposition that Pena Boulevard must be expanded, before the mobility study is complete, undermines the goal of reducing single occupancy vehicle trips and will just guarantee the roadway will need to be expanded once again in the future. Before DRCOG and DEN fund Pena Boulevard expansion designs, it should be required that the mobility study and traffic demand management plans are completed to determine if alternative investments such as double tracking the A-line or subsidizing fares would better meet our goals of reducing congestion, greenhouse gas emissions, traffic crashes, and SOV trips.</p> <p>Lastly, it should be noted that for the first time in the history of Denver's Subregional Forum, the board members did not unanimously support this proposal. There is far from consensus that expanding Pena Boulevard is the best path forward for DEN and the city of Denver, and residents deserve a pause on this project with such clear disagreement.</p> <p>I am requesting that DRCOG not fund the Pena Boulevard lane expansion in this TIP request. Instead, please direct TIP funds to a larger number of smaller projects with a primary focus of increasing transit and bicycle trips—with the ultimate goal of improving the quality of life for people who live in Denver, not just those driving to and from the airport.</p>
Comment Map	Andrew	none	I am opposed to this project.	I am opposed to widening Peña Blvd. The multi use trail might be nice to do as a separate project.
Comment Map/ Email	Andrew Alger		I am opposed to this project.	Please do not fund a highway expansion before the DIA mobility study is complete. There is not one example of expanding a highway leading to the results you are looking for. More lanes means more cars. Induced demand. Spend the money to make the airport train free. Encourage people to take alternative transportation. It helps meet our climate goals, it creates a healthier city. Adding more lanes only adds more cars. That increases car crashes. That increases the cost to tax payers. Please please do not fund this road expansion. The money should be spent on making the airport train free.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Andrew Sullivan		I am opposed to this project.	These funds should be used to provide better public transit options to reach the airport, such as better A-Line service. Make the A-Line more accessible to greater portions and communities of Denver to alleviate private car traffic on Pena Blvd.
Comment Map/ Email	Andy O'Brien		I am opposed to this project.	<p>Please don't add another car lane to this road. There is a parallel train line. Adding more room for cars is in opposition to our stated climate and city goals. This money would be better spent elsewhere</p> <p>Looking at the various comments on the TIP feedback page for this project, 12/12 comments are in opposition to adding another car lane to Peña. One of the comments is mine, and it's clear the community is in agreement. This project is unnecessary, and money could be much better spent elsewhere. It is rare to see such consistent opinions, so please honor them.</p> <p>Peña has a train line running parallel, and I'd encourage your organization to consider ways to promote that much more sustainable transportation mode. Please don't spend any money on more room for cars. Cars are dangerous to pedestrians, bikes, and drivers, and their pollution is destroying ecosystems and causing illness in our people. Please don't add another lane to Peña, which would exacerbate these problems.</p>
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Email	Anna Johnson		I am opposed to this project.	Please consider investing this money instead into public transportation and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. Studies have shown that adding lanes does not reduce traffic congestion and it is well documented that cars pose a significant environmental and safety risk for our communities. Prioritize our communities over private vehicles. Show that Denver is better than this.
Email	Anne Dirkse		I am opposed to this project.	<p>I have been reading up on the proposed expansion to Peña Blvd and wanted to write to you with my concerns. As a frequent traveller from DIA and resident of Loveland, I strongly oppose these measures. There is already plenty of highway capacity to service DIA, and Denver needs to be a city that leads on fighting climate change rather than wasting more and more taxpayer money on highway expansions. I would much rather see the city allocate additional resources toward expanding service on the A Line and connecting routes to communities like mine. As we've seen with the i-25 expansions in Northern Colorado, these expansion projects end up causing more traffic, more delays and ultimately far more pollution than we'd otherwise have without the endless construction. Furthermore, I feel that Denver has, and should take, the opportunity to lead in climate-friendly airport transit.</p> <p>Finally, as a traveller I have met people from all over the world traveling in and out of DIA including colleagues from abroad and out of state. Everyone I speak to hates driving to DIA and much prefer taking the train, however the limited connections outside of Downtown Denver often make that impossible. For myself, in Northern Colorado, it is difficult to impossible to take public transit to the airport. We must do better, and wasting our tax dollars on another lane isn't the solution. It is a long drive to DIA from anywhere, and drivers travel at dangerous speeds already without significant enforcement. The reason people drive at all is the difficulty of finding connections out of Downtown Denver. Further widening Peña Blvd will only exacerbate these concerns, increase congestion and fail to solve systemic problems.</p> <p>While I support expanded bike and pedestrian facilities, I feel that the proposed expansion of the road is an absolute waste of taxpayer dollars which could be allocated toward public transportation - a far better solution for Denver-area residents but also tourists looking to explore our beautiful state. Denver, as well as our mountain and front range communities should be accessible to visitors without rental cars or expensive ride share services. We should focus on keeping our beautiful state accessible and support transit projects rather than pouring more taxpayer money into another unnecessary highway expansion that only increases traffic. I hope that you will go back to the drawing board and find a way to use our money more wisely.</p>

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Ben O'Connell		I am opposed to this project.	Widening this highway will encourage more car use, increase ghg emissions and further degrade the air quality in our region. We should be investing in public transit instead. This project would undermine A line ridership when we should be encouraging it. This project goes against the city's stated climate and mobility goals
Comment Map	Ben Townsend		I am opposed to this project.	As someone who lives in Northeast Denver and frequently travels to the airport, I believe that the project will only make traffic worse. It's pretty clear from my experience that intense traffic and car crashes feed into each other. Drivers speed through tight gaps because there is so much traffic when they are either trying to get home or to the airport, and that leads to a crash. In turn, the frequency of crashes causes traffic backups on a near daily basis. It's a vicious cycle. Widening the road won't fix the bottleneck of cars or prevent the reckless driving that leads to crashes. What's necessary is a toll to reduce unnecessary car trips along the road, as well as other measures to encourage flyers to take the RTD to and from the airport. Better enforcement of speeding and reckless driving laws would also help alleviate both traffic and crashes along the corridor in the short term
Comment Map	Benjamin Shpurker		I am opposed to this project.	Widening Pena will only increase vehicular use which will increase greenhouse gas emissions in the region. This undermines the climate and mobility mandates and goals that the region has set. The region should be prioritizing use of and access to the A-Line as the most financially and environmentally efficient way to get to the airport.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Bev Garcia		I am opposed to this project.	Additional lanes definitely not needed on Pena Blvd. How about a better infrastructure. How about some bike lanes along with an easy access to the light rail. Additional lanes have been added to I-70 E & W and it is a cluster mess (more people on the highway and definitely more aggressive drivers). That express lane is used for speeders and people who are in and out of traffic without even looking or thinking about the other drivers on I-70 E & W. Why make another area full of collisions and thoughtless drivers.
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I am opposed to this project.	No managed lane.
Email	Brad Hunting		I am opposed to this project.	DIA has a great transit station with trains, busses, and it's own skycap. It's honestly on par with what you'd find in most European cities. What we need is for people to use it. Dont waste transportation resources on making traffic worse. Spend it on making transit, biking, and walking infrastructure better. Especially when it comes to the airport, we need to encourage more people to skip the car rental. The best way to do that is to make transit viable.
Comment Map	Bret Taber		I am opposed to this project.	Additional lanes between I-70 and E-470 will invite increased demand for vehicle trips and competes directly with more sustainable transit alternatives. Please focus on increasing transit and bicycle routes as opposed to just always adding more lanes.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I am opposed to this project.	These resources should be spent improving the A-line. The A-line should be funded to run 24 hours a day before another lane is built. I am also skeptical that multi-use trails would be completed on time and in budget, because Denver promised them long ago with the original contract to build DIA and they were never completed.
Comment Map	Bruce Perry		I am opposed to this project.	This project is inconsistent with Denver, the region, and the state combating climate change. It doesn't make sense to expand a highway that parallels the region's best transit corridor. Instead of expanding the highway, DRCOG should look at further improving the A-line. Most of the trips through this stretch are people heading to/from DIA. These trips could drastically be reduced by expanding the park and ride at 40th/Gateway and marketing parking there as the most convenient and cost effective way to get to the airport. Further, the single tracked parts of the A-line should be converted to double track to allow frequencies to be improved, which would make parking at the base of Pena and taking the train an even more attractive option.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Bryce Bradley		I am opposed to this project.	Adding more lanes to this section of Pena is incredibly short-sighted. We should be investing in more reliable alternate means of accessing the airport. Ditch the lane expansion and focus on multi-use trails and other means of transportation. This project should not proceed as scoped.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I am opposed to this project.	Highway widening? Really?!!! Has anyone at DRCOG heard about the climate emergency? But climate aside, let's talk convenience. Everyone involved in making this decision should take a cab from OHare airport in Chicago to downtown on a weekday (3-4 lanes in both directions.) It will take you about an hour and 15 min. As you creep along at average 18 MPH, you will watch the train whiz by. It takes the train 45 min to cover the same distance. Do you seriously want to spend 18 million to widen the highway when you know what the long term results will be? Why not spend the money on improvements to the A line and building out all 10 bus rapid transit corridors? I take the A train to the airport frequently. I would like to see the money spent on improved bike and transit connections to the A line and on lowering fares. Like others on this thread, I like the enhanced bike trail, too, but it strikes me as a bit of shameless greenwashing.
Comment Map	Carol McCormick		I am opposed to this project.	Create a livable future, Denver. Support trains, buses, and active transportation. Adding another lane in both directions will increase speed and traffic, making any perceived issue worse. And finally, Partially funding an active transportation evaluation plan is less than a nod, more like a slap in the face, to addressing serious climate and transportation issues.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I am opposed to this project.	This project will drive our city into more debt as it has been proven time and time again that roads for privately owned vehicles are prohibitively expensive, and will require constant maintenance, and eventually an entire rework shortly down the road. This project is an ecological disaster that I'm surprised to see a city with elected officials that pride themselves on caring about a more eco friendly future support, and have even allowed to get to this point of discussion. Please think carefully about the most cost effective, space effective, and environmentally friendly way to increase throughput to our states number one employer. This is not the way to achieve that.
Comment Map	Chris Hamilton		I am opposed to this project.	Love the trails along Pena and want to have more options on the rail getting there without a car. Widening the highway is antithetical to the needs of this highway. Build the infrastructure to have more people go by train or bus or bike and the issue is resolved. Multimodal transportation options is what this stretch needs.
Comment Map	Chris Miller		I am opposed to this project.	This project is in direct opposition to the fiscal goals of the city of Denver by undermining usage of the A Line. We can't take advantage of the benefits of our investment in mass transit by subsidizing the competing good. In addition to being a large and ineffective use of taxpayer money, it undermines the environmental goals and adds to traffic congestion in our city.
Comment Map	D. Chen		I am opposed to this project.	This money should go to supporting the light rail. We don't even have secure bike storage at the airport or Union Station. This project undercuts transit rather than supports it and is further evidence that DRCOG has car supremacy baked into its metrics, despite the rhetoric.
Comment Map	Dan K		I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I am opposed to this project.	Increase rail and bus services! Do NOT promote additional auto traffic
Comment Map	Daniel Birdsell		I am opposed to this project.	I am opposed to the addition of car lanes in this project. It is well established that adding lanes increases the number of vehicle miles traveled and therefore greenhouse gas emissions and ozone pollution. Furthermore, DIA is only at the beginning of its mobility study and we should not fund an expensive highway expansion before the study is complete. Instead, let's make alternatives, such as the A line train to DIA, and walking, biking, and busses easier and more accessible.
Email	Daniel Grosso		I am opposed to this project.	Expanding I70 is climate arson. It is irresponsible. It will not solve traffic congestion or our poor air quality. It will only lead to more asthma for our residents, louder traffic noises, displaced homes, and more traffic.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Danny Katz	CoPIRG (Colorado Public Interest Research Group)	I am opposed to this project.	Our region must first maximize transit options before any new lanes are considered. DIA and Pena Boulevard have an outsized influence on the whole region's transportation system given the number of trips to the airport and the distance that so many people travel. Across seven editions of our Highway Boondoggles report, we've highlighted how new lanes recruit new cars. These huge highway investments don't result in promised congestion relief and do result in increased emissions at a time when our region is in "severe" nonattainment for ozone pollution health limits. The new cars recruited by new lanes on Pena Boulevard will have an outsized impact on the region's interstates and our local roads. We do not need more cars merging onto congested I-25, I-270, I-225 and I-70 to get to and from DIA or speeding down our local streets where our kids play. We must first maximize every transit option we have from the A line to existing and new bus routes before we consider new highway lanes.
Comment Map	Dave Hawkins		I am opposed to this project.	Peña Blvd does not need expansion. We already have great train service to the airport. This is irresponsible use of funding that long-term will only increase traffic, crashes, maintenance costs, and emissions. Please improve train service and reduce the fare. Peña Blvd does not need expansion. And most certainly it should not be funded until DIA completes its mobility study.
Email	David Kider		I am opposed to this project.	Climate change is real. We should not be widening roads or highways. We should be investing in more efficient modes of transportation. There's already a train to the airport. Let's invest in the train, and encourage more people to ride the train instead of drive.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map/ Email	David Mintzer		I am opposed to this project.	Given the many unfunded transit and bicycle projects in the city of Denver, using TIP dollars to fund this highway expansion undermines our region's multimodal and climate goals. Even with managed lanes, increasing the overall capacity of Pena Blvd will induce demand for vehicle trips and compete with ridership along the adjacent A-line. While it is laudable that DEN is including a traffic demand management plan in its proposal, it is premature to fund and design the expansion of Pena Blvd before their mobility study is complete ( <a href="https://www.flydenver.com/pena_plan">https://www.flydenver.com/pena_plan</a> ). DEN's mobility study and traffic demand management plan should determine if alternative investments such as double tracking the A-line or subsidizing fares would better meet our goals of reducing congestion, greenhouse gas emissions and SOV trips. Beginning with the supposition that Pena Blvd must be expanded undermines the goal of reducing car dependency. Lastly, it should be noted that for the first time in the history of Denver's Subregional Forum, the board members did not unanimously support this proposal. There is far from consensus that expanding Pena Blvd is the best path forward for DEN and the city of Denver. Many residents and city leaders are requesting that DRCOG not fund this highway expansion and instead direct TIP funds to projects whose primary focus increases transit and bicycle trips.
Comment Map	David Nye		I am opposed to this project.	This is irresponsible and undermines the A-line. More lanes on Pena should not be considered until we have two tracks for the entirety of the A-line. This will encourage the highest transportation polluters (air travelers) to take their car to the airport. This will induce demand, increase pollution, and take money from projects that will decrease both.
Comment Map	David W		I am opposed to this project.	Toll lanes are not the answer.



Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Doug Henderson		I am opposed to this project.	I travel to DIA regularly. It is crazy how many cars go to DIA to drop or pick up an airline passenger. But the airport lacks efficient public transportation. Every other developed country has far better and much more efficient public transport. The Beijing airport is serviced by a modern, efficient, high-speed train. I oppose widening Pena Blvd. More and bigger roads is the black hole option. Do Denver and the Front Range really want to continue to emulate Los Angeles with its traffic situation? The better and forward thinking solution is to improve the A-line and expand efficient public transport, such as bus rapid transit, to service the airport and the rapidly expanding corridor from Denver to DIA.
Comment Map	Drew Nesmith		I am opposed to this project.	Please do not induce more traffic to the airport. A line should be prioritized. Peña is already not operating at full capacity throughout the day or night. Stop this funding immediately.
Comment Map	Ean Tafoya	GreenLatinos CO	I am opposed to this project.	Widening Pena is oppositional to our climate goals
Comment Map	Eliot Landrum		I am opposed to this project.	In the year 2022 with all we know about climate change and induced demand... why in the world is this even on the table? We have an excellent train service that is very popular and could easily be expanded for growth without any construction. An extra lane is absolutely the worst choice possible and should not even be considered.
Comment Map	Elizabeth Bonney		I am opposed to this project.	Highway expansions are short-sighted and wasteful, especially when there are good rail and bus connections already available that could be improved and expanded. The justification for this project suggests that "reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips" is one of its goals. Adding more vehicle lanes to Peña Blvd would have the opposite effect. A taxi or TNC ride to the airport is often \$50 or more, while RTD's airport fare is currently \$10.50. Adding more lanes won't change those numbers. If you must spend millions on airport access, spend it in a more equitable way.
Email	Erika C		I am opposed to this project.	Widening is these roads never works out in the long term. When traffic gets worse, people that are reluctant to look for alternate routes will consider transit. The widening of Peña will artificially depress traffic for a bit until induced demand kicks in and the congestion levels will go back to baseline. You can only avoid that by moving people more efficiently, which means encouraging people to stop driving to DIA.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Erika Carmona		I am opposed to this project.	What is the point of expanding Peña Blvd? Congestion on Peña is usually fine, and the traffic that does build up could be better mitigated by encouraging travel on the A line instead in driving to DIA and nearby neighborhoods. The only times I've had trouble getting into DIA, or getting home from DIA, have been because 1) train service ended too early, or 2) conductor shortages resulted in our train being cancelled. The finances for the Peña expansion could be way more efficiently used by supporting the A line and connections to transit.
Comment Map	Evan Frasz		I am opposed to this project.	This money would much better spent on increasing the A line frequency to encourage less driving to the airport. This would reduce VMT and have better effect on our region-wide emissions.
Comment Map	Evelyn Burr	Self	I am opposed to this project.	I am strongly opposed to adding lanes to this stretch of road. Improvements to the commuter rail and other multi-modal connections to the airport would be much more significant and aligned with Denver's mode-shift and climate goals.
Comment Map	Francisco Partida		I am opposed to this project.	I strongly oppose the addition of a managed lane as part of this project. Trail development should be taken on as it's own project without the road widening.
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I am opposed to this project.	Don't waste the money widening the lanes. Use it to improve public transit instead. Widening lanes just encourages more cars, and faster cars, making all the problems you're trying to reduce worse.
Comment Map	George Hahn	Self	I am opposed to this project.	The A line serves this route well and could serve this route even better with moderate investment. Expanding this road is directly in opposition to achieving the city's climate goals.
Comment Map	Gerald Horner		I am opposed to this project.	It's a proven fact that widening highways only encourages more driving. We should instead invest in improving and increasing transit options.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Greg Thivierge		I am opposed to this project.	The funds for a project this scale could be better used to improve transit and multimodal use to the airport rather than passenger vehicles. I like the multiuse trail portion but am opposed to widening a highway and inducing more demand.
Comment Map	Greg Watson		I am opposed to this project.	Using TIP dollars to fund highway expansion undermines our region's multimodal and climate goals. Increasing the overall capacity of Peña Blvd will induce demand for VMTs and compete with A-Line ridership. This is a shortsighted and ineffective use for \$18,500,000 of public funding. This project will only create additional long-term maintenance obligations, pollution, and congestion for the region. Please stop subsidizing infrastructure that prioritizes the movement of private vehicles over the well being of our community.
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I am opposed to this project.	Funds should be invested in more frequent A-Line service to the airport.
Comment Map	H colwell		I am opposed to this project.	I am opposed to expanding roadways. Instead we should expand public transport to the airport so people don't have to drive there.
Comment Map	Hamilton Reed	self	I am opposed to this project.	I am wholly opposed to any road widening projects. We need to make things easier for non-automobiles if we're going to change people's habits and fight climate change. The multi use trail is cool though, I would like that as a separate project
Comment Map	Henry O'Daffer		I am opposed to this project.	This project goes against Colorado's stated goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We know that roadway expansions increase VMT and fail to reduce congestion. The \$18,500,000+ going into this project should be redirected to support a more sustainable future along the corridor. Thankfully, the A-Line already exists and expanding its service/frequency would be a much better use of resources.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I am opposed to this project.	I opposed road widening projects because widened roads motivate motorists to speed. In the long run, this increases the risk of motor collisions. It's tough enough going to the airport; no need to have more frequent collisions delaying people from getting to and from the airport.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Ian Frasch		I am opposed to this project.	Widening this highway is unnecessary climate arson and opposes everything DRCOG and Denver say they want to do. Not only will an extra lane induce additional VMT and GHG (yes, even if it's "managed"), but it will also take significant money away from potential transit improvements on the same corridor, like faster A line service and additional trackage to allow for express trains. Additionally, it will cannibalize RTD ridership, reducing fare revenue causing cuts to service, furthering the cycle of car dependency. Our livelihoods simply cannot afford to widen yet another highway, especially on a corridor already served by train. If you really want a managed lane, then just toll the left lane and call that the express lane, or just toll the entire highway with dynamic prices. RTD riders have to pay \$10.50 to access the airport, but drivers don't have to pay anything. Free driving and expensive transit does not align with this region's goals!
Comment Map	Isaac Law		I am opposed to this project.	A quarter of a billion dollars is a huge waste of money. Cars being able to drive to the airport a few seconds faster is hardly a worthwhile reason. How about investing some of that money in making the A line even better? America's traffic engineers have tried the "ever expanding road" approach to solving traffic for 70 years, and it's well past time to try other approaches.
Comment Map	Jacob Schutt		I am opposed to this project.	Resources and time should be used to reduce the A-line fares and increase frequency. More lanes will only induce more traffic.
Comment Map	Jacob Southard	Denver Citizen	I am opposed to this project.	We should invest money in the A line instead of this project. More frequency and lower fares. It makes no sense to expand car capacity to the airport, a location that you don't leave in a car...This money would be much better spent investing in multimodal projects around A line stops.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	James B Douthit	None	I am opposed to this project.	This will hurt the character of our city. Road widening is unscientific and barbaric, never doing anything to actually alleviate traffic and in fact generating more of it. How much longer do traffic engineers have to prioritize cars and fossil fuels over public transit. As an engineer myself I can clearly see the prioritization given to cars and people traveling in cars. How about a bikeway to the airport? Why couldn't this money be spent adding bike lanes around the city? What science or data justifies this action?
Comment Map	James Gomochak		I am opposed to this project.	This project is a nightmare. Invest in the A line instead.
Comment Map	James Logue	N/A	I am opposed to this project.	This project is not in alignment with the city or regional desires for moving people in ways other than SOV trips. Better use of money to support trips to DEN would be through increasing service to/on the A line.
Comment Map	James W. Rogers		I am opposed to this project.	Capacity expansion will increase the number of cars on the road which brings higher GHG emissions and undermines A-line ridership. This is contrary to the region's climate and mobility mandates.
Comment Map	James Warren	None	I am opposed to this project.	Christ almighty, please do not do this. We don't need additional lanes out to the airport, we need buses servicing more areas, including buses connecting to the A line. Colossal waste of money when thought of in terms of opportunity cost. For the love of God don't go through with this one.
Comment Map	James Wright		I am opposed to this project.	The highway expansion is not needed and goes against everything we and DRCOG are striving for. We need to put money to more efficient modes which in turn will allow the current configuration of pena to work indefinitely.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I am opposed to this project.	The funds for a project this scale could be better used to improve transit and multimodal use to the airport rather than passenger vehicles. I like the multiuse trail portion but am opposed to widening a highway and inducing more demand.
Comment Map	John		I am opposed to this project.	If we want to boost/aid airport travel, give more funding to RTD to allow greater intervals of travel so people view it as an actual alternative. Adding more lanes to highways has only ever resulted in traffic growing to fill the extra space—it is a lazy half-baked solution so the city can pretend it is doing something to help people.
Comment Map	John DiMattia		I am opposed to this project.	Resources and time should be used to improve rider experience on the A-line (i.e. reduce fares, increase frequency). Studies show that more lanes only induces more traffic and in the long term does not reduce congestion.
Comment Map	John Erhardt		I am opposed to this project.	There is no need to add lanes to Pena Blvd. Induced demand will just encourage more people to drive. That's the last thing we need during a climate emergency. Take the money that could have been spent on this to increase the frequency of A line trains, and get more busses running in general.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	John H.	Broomfield Bikes transportation advocacy group	I am opposed to this project.	This project has a price tag of \$18,500,000. Given that we are in a climate emergency, there is undoubtedly a better use for this money. Widening roads does not solve traffic congestion any more than loosening your belt solves being overweight. We need dramatic overhauls in our transportation system, not business-as-usual blindly making more room for cars, widening roads, and wasting away what little capital still remains.
Comment Map	John P		I am opposed to this project.	It has been said better than I can say it in all the other comments, but I oppose all road widening projects. I would support expanding the A-Line, improving bike infrastructure along Pena, and adding secure bike parking to DIA. How much of our beautiful city will we sacrifice to the cars?
Email	John Riecke		I am opposed to this project.	Widening Pena Blvd. goes against all city and state planning and environmental goals. It's a legacy project that ignores other modes of travel. Send money to the Platte River Trail rebuild instead.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	John W		I am opposed to this project.	<p>Widening lanes will not reduce traffic, it will encourage more. If the purpose of this project is to reduce congestion and make transportation to DIA more accessible, it strongly fails. Improving the safety, frequency, or even lowering the cost of RTD's A-line to the airport is a better option. Trains move significantly more people than cars.</p> <p>Increasing ridership on the train will both benefit the riders that choose to do so while reducing traffic for those who still choose to drive a car. Never has adding a lane to a highway positively increased people's perception or experience of transportation in their city. Improving public transportation, even in the smallest manner, has.</p> <p>Denver has the opportunity to be a leader in this country for public transportation, thereby reducing green house gases, improving access and freedom of mobility for all individuals, and most importantly making people happier through these choices. This is a step in the wrong direction.</p>
Comment Map	Jon Parrish		I am opposed to this project.	<p>As a Central Park resident I would much rather have increased A line service to and from the airport that is dependable and quick (maybe 10 minutes departures at peak times?). Often when traveling for work I want to take the train but will take an uber or taxi due to the extensive wait times at non peak times (30 minutes if I just miss the last one starting around 6:30pm). Can Pena be tolled like E-470 to reduce demand at peak times to the airport or make more south suburban travelers to use E470?</p>
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I am opposed to this project.	<p>I am strongly opposed to this project as offered. Unlike other applications, whose supporting studies are complete, the mobility study this project references is just beginning! Until DEN has completed this study, revealing the primary users that need to be served and their current (and prospective) modes of transportation, the airport does not know (by its own admission) the proportional needs it could and must serve.</p> <p>It is thus inappropriate to assume and premature to decide that Pena Blvd must be expanded with general-access managed lanes. Given that even managed lane expansions undermine the goal of reducing SOV trips, it is important that we know the problem to solve - our users and their use cases - before assuming a solution.</p> <p>Further, if the mobility study reveals that the primary need for expanded SOV access is for freight purposes, this proposal should not be for a general access managed lane, but rather a freight-only lane.</p>
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I am opposed to this project.	<p>We should be adding an additional set of rail tracks so that we can have more A line trains/hour and not adding more lanes that will induce more carbon emissions and lung choking exhaust from cars.</p>
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I am opposed to this project.	<p>Focus on improving the commuter rail line instead. Another lane won't fix the issue! Let's make other multi modal improvements. Alternate forms of transportation are better for the environment, and capacity needs. Another lane will just create more traffic. We need to improve the train that already services a lot of people and gets them to the airport</p>
Comment Map	Jose Castro		I am opposed to this project.	<p>We should not be funding lane expansion when we know that more cars cause all sorts of negative externalities, including harming our community's fiscal situation, negatively effecting our resident's health, and contributing to the destruction of our environment. Any money in this corridor should be focused on improving/fully double tracking the A line.</p>
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Joseph Blessett		I am opposed to this project.	<p>We do not need more lanes to fix the traffic problem that Peña is facing. Plenty of Colorado residents would enjoy taking public transit if it were reliable. The same could be said for the multi use trails that are considered. At both train stops along side Peña they are only accessible via vehicles. What good is the use of public transit if it can only be primarily accessed by driving to it. That defeats the purpose.</p>

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Josh Kleitsch		I am opposed to this project.	This project would be a gross misuse of DRCOG funds. Not only is "one more lane" a fundamentally broken approach to managing congestion, but the project itself is in total opposition to the region-wide emphasis on diversifying our transportation networks to better serve people and address the worsening local pollution caused by SOV's. Looking through the application submitted by DEN, it is very clear they do not understand how transportation networks function in a system-wide context. Adding more lanes, regardless of the way in which they are added, always increase congestion long term. More lanes = more cars, every single time. The only solution to congestion is to diversify and reinforce the non-SOV transportation modes available to users. The multi-use trail plans would be fine on their own. Tying that work to a \$277 Million roadway widening project is malpractice.
Comment Map	Josh Thompson		I am opposed to this project.	"road widening" as a concept is debasing to take it seriously. road wideners are the flat earthers of the transportation world. Like kids in a corner eating playdough. Denver has horrible traffic problems because of mismanaged mobility networks. Only an appreciation of changes in land value based on an infinite number of factors unlocks the right next steps. Read this book, and try again: <a href="https://www.goodreads.com/en/book/show/39644188-order-without-design">https://www.goodreads.com/en/book/show/39644188-order-without-design</a>
Email	June Churchill		I am opposed to this project.	(See attached for full comment)
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I am opposed to this project.	Oppose road widening and managed lanes,
Comment Map	Keith Reed		I am opposed to this project.	Shutting down this very bad idea would go alone way towards showing the world Denver is serious about quality of life issues. Complete the multiuse trail, provide secure bike parking at the airport, and enhance A line dependability.
Comment Map	Ken Schroepfel		I am opposed to this project.	I am opposed to expanding Peña Boulevard's capacity for cars when all of our city's plans and policies specify that automobiles are the lowest priority transportation mode. Denver should be using this money on RTD's A line to double track rail segments and/or grade separate crossings to improve speed and reliability.
Comment Map	Kenneth LaMarca		I am opposed to this project.	I don't see the point of widening this highway that goes to one location when increasing the frequency of the A line could accomplish the same objective. Pena is a mess not because of a lack of lanes. It's a mess because of a lack of traffic enforcement. It may as well be the autobahn with how people drive on Pena. It's a terrible first impression. I tell people visiting Denver to take the A line because driving a rental on Pena is asking for an early grave.
Comment Map	Kevin Matthews	YIMBY Denver	I am opposed to this project.	Widening Pena BLVD will not fix traffic and is just throwing good money after bad. With the savings from this project, we could fund additional BRT lines that would have a significantly bigger impact on transportation priorities in the region.
Comment Map	Kevin S		I am opposed to this project.	We should not be spending money on highway expansions. This section isn't even very busy.
Comment Map	Kevin Williams		I am opposed to this project.	We should not be widening highways. It's climate arson.
Comment Map	Kyle Plastino		I am opposed to this project.	Induced demand by widening this road will cause traffic congestion to increase. Please consider allocating these funds to multi-modal transportation projects (walking, biking, public transportation), that if effectively implemented can permanently reduce traffic congestion in the area.
Comment Map	Layton Hill		I am opposed to this project.	Widening a freeway anywhere drives climate-warming emissions. Widening a freeway next to a high quality electrified rail line is climate change denial. We need to be nudging more travelers out of their cars and into trains, not the reverse.
Comment Map	Leigh Anna Johnson	N/A	I am opposed to this project.	Invest in pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure instead, PLEASE! Cars are a blight on the environment, pose significant safety risks to our community, and are vastly more expensive. Adding lanes is proven NOT to reduce traffic. Please consider reinvesting this money into pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure instead. Our community depends on it.

**Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction**

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Leighton Moreland		I am opposed to this project.	Want to move more people? Double track the A line all the way to the airport and run 5 minute intervals. Encourage transit minded development in the corridor
Comment Map	Lora Kulm		I am opposed to this project.	Sinking money into adding more lanes to this road will encourage more people to drive to the airport, and will come with the cost of maintaining an additional lane on an already wide road in the future, plus the possibility of needing more private vehicle storage with additional drivers. Multiple existing studies have shown that adding more lanes to road don't ease congestion, and it's incredibly short sighted to believe that expanding this road will do anything other than become a money and time sink when there are other viable options to invest in, such as the existing A-Line.
Comment Map	Lukas Acanfora		I am opposed to this project.	Widening this highway is unnecessary and will only induce additional driving. Improve the A line with grade separation, double tracking, or more frequent service.
Comment Map	M Koch		I am opposed to this project.	Support MUP, oppose road widening
Comment Map	Marie Venner	Small Business Alliance	I am opposed to this project.	We are strongly opposed to widening Pena Blvd and urge improving the A-line instead. CDOT also needs to support transit operations and fare free transit for the region at least Feb-Oct and preferably year round AND build out a region-wide safe/protected lane/multi-use path for people of all ages and abilities to get around.
Email	Mark Hettig		I am opposed to this project.	I oppose the widening of Peña being funded. That money should go toward improving transit. Thank you.
Email	Mark Hughes		I am opposed to this project.	I'd much prefer to see a return to serious efforts to reduce auto trips to the airport.
Comment Map	Mark Kristensson		I am opposed to this project.	Expanding Peña Blvd is madness on so many levels. The infrastructure at the airport cannot handle any more cars: the queue to get to the arrivals pickup frequently is so long it blocks access to the departures and garage ramps. DRCOG and DIA need to focus on moving people, not cars, to and from the airport. Every dollar wasted on Pena Blv dis one that cannot be spent making the A line two tracks over the entire length, which will move thousands more people. For those who aren't close the A-Line, why are there not dedicated bus lanes to/from the airport with routes that start/end in every corner of the metro area? Finally, adding a lane (or two or there) only buys a couple of years of relief from the back ups. The fact is, geometry hates cars. They are the least efficient form of (ground) transportation yet organizations like DRCOG and DIA seem hellbent on wasting hundreds of millions of our tax dollars continuing to subsidize them.
Comment Map	Mat T		I am opposed to this project.	Widening this highway will induce more car traffic, and not reduce congestion. It will increase air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. If you really want to reduce congestion, toll the road. If you want to stand by out supposed goals to reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, this project can not be allowed. Fund improvements to transit service instead. The money this project would cost would go a long way to improving walking, biking, and transit conditions which would make our air pollution, greenhouse gas, and traffic safety problems better instead of worse.
Comment Map	Max Nardo		I am opposed to this project.	We can't keep widening roads, locking us more deeply into perpetual car reliance for every trip, and the associated air pollution and traffic. Getting to the airport on the A-line is very easy.
Comment Map	Megan Hill		I am opposed to this project.	Bad for environment. Increase public transit options like more frequent trains from Denver and buses from other communities instead.
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I am opposed to this project.	Road widening is not the solution. This money would be better spent improving headways and TOD for the A line

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Michelle Van Engen		I am opposed to this project.	I strongly oppose this project. Adding more lanes for car traffic on Pena Blvd will induce demand, increase VMTs and increase pollution. This runs counter to state and regional goals to improve air quality and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. The airport is already accessible by a mass transit system, that could use additional funding to increase frequency and serve more airport visitors. Eliminate the lane expansion and focus on multi-use trails and mass transit. This project should not proceed as scoped.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Morgan H Stanley		I am opposed to this project.	Adding another lane will only yield induced demand, there's no need to expand this stretch of Peña Blvd. These funds should be allocated to improving RTD service to the east side of Denver and DIA. This plan will only exacerbate Denver's traffic and GHG issues, neither of which we can afford.
Email	Natalie Woodland		I am opposed to this project.	Expanding highways increases air pollution which is already staggering in Colorado. This mass investment into transit only benefits a select portion of the population. This money could be better spent investing in public transit which truly has the capacity to benefit any member of society. I live in Denver full time and do not own a car. Until this year I'd always had my own vehicle. Now, I commute throughout the city, to Boulder, and surrounding regions too. I know navigating our state through transit is completely possible. With more investments into this public good, our transit system could be renowned and make more people switch to it full time just like me. I encourage you to think of all members of our population and creating a truly long term solution to us having a healthy future & non-congested city when making your decision on highway projects.
Comment Map	Nolan Hahn		I am opposed to this project.	There is no need for additional lanes on Pena. This money would be better spent improving transit and biking to the airport such as a trail and secure bike storage.
Comment Map	Olivia Dorencz		I am opposed to this project.	We can't continue to endlessly expand highways in the hopes of reducing traffic. First of all, it doesn't even work, we will still have bottlenecks at endpoints as we are not expanding access at these points. But the much greater issue is that we need to reduce our car dependency by increasing access to transit and decreasing the appeal of driving. This project will take us steps backwards in our fight against the climate crisis and our fight to make Denver a better, safer, healthier city to live in.
Comment Map	Pablo Mayordomo Garcia		I am opposed to this project.	Stop adding lanes for cars. Focus on public transportation investment (more buses, more lanes, cheaper prices) and bike lanes. Fight climate change and create better cities!!! No more bla bla bla.... We will be looking at this project closely!
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I am opposed to this project.	This is a road widening project that includes a multiuse trail and partial funding to study promoting active transportation. We support the multiuse trail and study but oppose the managed lanes.
Comment Map	Piotr		I am opposed to this project.	We need more public transportation options to the airport, instead of wider roads. Expand the A-line frequency/lower cost, along with adding better connections/buses to access the airport, especially from the suburbs.
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I am opposed to this project.	The funds should be put towards double tracking the A line between 61st / Pena & Denver Airport stations & provision of a crossover north of 40th / Airport - Gateway Park station. This will allow a 7-8 min frequency service to run between 40th / Airport & the airport itself. Any expansion to parking / drop off / pick up / rideshare / car rental provision should be centered around the 40th / Airport site.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I am opposed to this project.	This is a road widening project that includes a multiuse trail and partial funding to study promoting active transportation. I support the multiuse trail and study but oppose the managed lanes.
Comment Map	Rob P		I am opposed to this project.	No road widening.
Comment Map	Rob Toftness		I am opposed to this project.	Adding lanes to a road does not lower emissions since induced demand negates any emission wins. Why would we even consider this knowing that capacity expansion projects never meet their stated goals and any congestion mitigation is temporary? Use these funds elsewhere.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Robert		I am opposed to this project.	Road widening is deeply antithetical to Vision Zero and climate goals in the Denver metro region, especially when this corridor is already serviced by a light rail line. Improving light rail service and related connections will deliver far more value long-term.
Comment Map	Robert Helmick		I am opposed to this project.	Please don't waste money expanding Peña, we should be investing this money in buses and rail initiatives to allow more people to get to DIA in a sustainable way. More lanes don't ease congestion, they just induce demand.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I am opposed to this project.	Waste of money
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Ryan Frazer		I am opposed to this project.	Investments at this scale between downtown Denver and DIA should be spent on alternatives to driving; widening Pena may provide a brief respite from traffic, but study after study and empirical data clearly show that highway widenings such as this only serve to induce demand and bring more drivers to the expanded highway. Instead, DRCOG should be investing in expanding RTD A Line capabilities, such as grade-separated crossings and double-tracking to expand capacity. That is the type of induced demand that Denver should be investing in. I will add that the multiuse trails that may be built as part of this proposed project are long overdue given the original promises of a bike route along Pena Blvd to DIA when the highway was initially constructed. It is a twisted joke that the highway was signed for bike use on the shoulder.
Comment Map	Sam Brown		I am opposed to this project.	Focus expenditures related to Pena / airport access on improving the A-Line experience and access to the A-Line at its current stops. Better / safer parking or, better yet, improved bus access (frequency / reliability) to the various A-Line stops. I would support multi-use trails along Pena.
Comment Map	Scott Sanderson		I am opposed to this project.	"one more lane will fix it" Please spend the budget on A line service instead.
Comment Map	Scott Simmons	Multiple climate organizations	I am opposed to this project.	Team We need to be more focused on providing transit alternatives -- esp those to the airport versus expanding Pena Blvd. This project will encourage (rather than discourage) people to drive themselves (often alone) to the airport. We should be actively developing approaches for expanding bus and light rail alternatives - it is cheaper for the consumers than parking at the airport while at the same time promoting a cleaner environment. Please take this massive amount of money and put it toward the future versus continuing to encourage people to pollute -- it will be a cheaper as well as a cleaner alternative for the travelers going to the airport.
Comment Map	Scott Williamson		I am opposed to this project.	Prioritizing highway expansion runs counter to goals of the City, DRCOG, and State to reduce GHG emissions and DRCOG's goal of reducing vehicle miles travelled. Please prioritize transit investments that better support these goals, such as improvements to the A line and better infrastructure for those bicycling, walking, or rolling in the region.
Comment Map	Stephanie Perez-Carrillo	Self	I am opposed to this project.	I think these dollars would be better used in adding more frequent trips on the A-line. Managed lanes do not address the issue, which is that we need more investments in existing multi-modal mixed use trail systems.
Comment Map	Stephen Bartels	Self	I am opposed to this project.	This project will not pose much if any safety improvement. They purport to have bicycle improvements, but still list 2050 usage as 0. While that wouldn't be the case, with all the development in the area, that goes to show the true focus of this project: cars. I don't understand how this encourages multimodal use or reduction of SOVs. It's adding lane miles.
Comment Map	Steve B		I am opposed to this project.	Focus should be on making public transportation to the airport more accessible and affordable, not a new traffic lane. If we only add additional traffic lanes we will find ourselves doing it all over again in a few years again, and then a few years after that, and never solving the underlying issues.



Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Taylor		I am opposed to this project.	This project moves us further from our climate goals, when we should be focused on moving in the other direction. No more adding lanes!
Comment Map	Travis Madsen	Southwest Energy Efficiency Project	I am opposed to this project.	Denver should turn one of the existing lanes into a managed lane, rather than widening the roadway. Expanding capacity will induce more traffic, cause higher levels of pollution, waste money and undermine the investments taxpayers have made into the RTD A-line, which provides a fast and frequent transit connection to the airport, which is more consistent with city, regional and state climate goals. Please modify this proposal.
Email	Tyler Johnson		I am opposed to this project.	It is in conflict with the regions climate goals and will increase local pollution.
<b>Denver - Peña Blvd. Managed Lane: I-70 to E-470 - Preconstruction</b>				
Comment Map	Wendy Vonhof		I am opposed to this project.	This project is a massively useless waste of tax money that would be 100% better used on increasing and improving infrastructure city-wide that supports and encourages people traveling outside of vehicles (walking, rolling, biking) as well as transit use. Adding more car lanes to Pena Blvd will only add more car demand, which will also compete with the super amazing and super efficient A-line RTD train that even my car-loving dad loved taking when he visited. This is a "want" project for the car lovers but why on earth would we prioritize this horrendous project that will do nothing more than undermine our existing transit system and increase vehicular traffic to DIA (thereby increasing demand for more acres of awful, wasteful parking lots) over putting this massive amount of funds to projects that will actually make a difference in the lives of people in Denver, such as protected bike lanes and transit? Including BOLLARDS AND DIVERTERS which DOTI appears allergic to.
Comment Map	Will B		I am opposed to this project.	Adding more lanes does not fix traffic.
Comment Map	William silvia		I am opposed to this project.	Vehicular traffic to the airport should not be encouraged over improvements to the a line and other transit options.
Comment Map	Zachary Burley	Myself	I am opposed to this project.	Insane, climate denial. My mom is a flight attendant. I know the value of the airport and the need to commute. But I also know the atmospheric concentrations of CO2 threaten our very existence as a civilization. I know highway widenings induce more demand and more emissions. I know this act will harm our future. You want to throw massive dollar amounts to expand lanes, here in the decade of climate action? You could just get people e-bikes and transit. Watch people change their habits once you start leading on the structures. It's not too late to change course. You don't have to drive us over this cliff. It'd save us all a lot of time and energy and money and years on our lives if you choose another path. I'll remember the people on this board who chose climate denial over climate leadership. I'll make sure that other remember your failures too.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	This has got to be the worst project proposed and is completely in opposition to all the goals DRCOG and Colorado are supposedly working towards. There is an underutilized rail line that runs 20 hours a day and yet the City is proposing to make it easier and quicker to drive instead of making it easier and encouraging use of the A-Line. Strongly against finding more lanes to the airport now or in the future
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	This undermines the A line, environmental goals, and would be a poor use of funds.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	Why would you build a nother vehicle lane when we just built the train. Please complete the Fasttracks trains before building more roads. I support building trails but not with more highway lanes.
Comment Map		N/A	I am opposed to this project.	This project is squarely against our climate goals. Adding lanes is climate denial. I would support not adding a lane and in fact rededicating an existing lane in each direction to be used only for bus travel. This project will induce more car traffic and sprawling development. It should be redirected to complete streets projects. Please give us freedom of mode choice. For the sake of our planet and children, cancel this project.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	I support the multiuse trail and study but oppose the managed lanes.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	This seems like a waste and does nothing to improve our air quality, which will cost us all more at the pump.
<b>Denver - South Platte River Trail Improvements: Bayaud Ave. to Phil Milstein Park</b>				
Comment Map	Abbey N	ERM	I support this project.	I support this project because it is such a valuable and well used path for the residents of Denver county and surrounding areas.
Comment Map	Alan Bucknam		I support this project.	This improvement would make bicyclists, pedestrians, and wheelchair users of the South Platte trail safer, subject them to less harmful noise and pollution caused by vehicular traffic on the interstate, and make the trail section consistent with more of the recently updated sections that are nearby, improving consistency of user experience.
Comment Map	Alejandra X. Castañeda	Mothers Against More Car Lanes	I support this project.	Yes! It would be a huge improvement and provide more space for people choosing to walk or roll along the trail.
Comment Map	Alex		I support this project.	This segment is highly used and in need of some love. The whole trail should be 12' wide to accommodate foot and bike traffic, but this is a good place to start.
Comment Map	Alex Parks		I support this project.	Best time to do this was 10 years ago. I would agree the whole trail should be widened, but this section in particular is unpleasant and unsafe feeling.
Comment Map	Alex St. Angelo		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I support this project.	Improving this bike trail will help thousands. Please fund this project, and any similar.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	This is the most uncomfortable section of the entire South Platte trail. Great to see it being improved.
Comment Map	allie molinda		I support this project.	The South Platte corridor is a fabulous connection of north, central and south metro Denver and is used for recreation and commuting. It serves a ton of residents! And it is helping reduce Denver's carbon output!
Comment Map	Andrew Alger		I support this project.	Safe pedestrian and bike routs are a huge step forward in meeting our climate goals and our vision 0 goals! This pairs well with all of the new e-bikes we have on our roads!
Comment Map	Andy B		I support this project.	This is an important project to help improved pedestrian and cyclist safety!
Comment Map	Andy Cushen	N/A	I support this project.	This would be a huge improvement to the SPlatte multimodal corridor. Currently, riding just alongside I-25 is the loudest, smelliest, least attractive portion of the train. And this is actually a section that is only going to grow in population density to the north and south. Let's make riding a bike, walking, or rolling the most attractive option for people moving N or S along the corridor for just a mile or two.
Comment Map	Andy O'Brien		I support this project.	Yes please! Keep investing in pedestrian and bike infrastructure - our climate depends on it! Plus, there is tons of unmet demand for these safe spaces to ride
Comment Map	Asher David		I support this project.	Yes, this trail in highly used by the greatly increased number of cyclists in Denver.
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Blaine N.		I support this project.	I support this project since it is a critical bike path not only for recreational cyclists but for the many bicycle commuters that use this daily!
Comment Map	Bob Perchonok		I support this project.	As an avid cyclist and user of the Denver bike trail system, I strongly encourage a safer trail experience by adding separation from the interstate roadways.
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I support this project.	this will make the path safer for cyclists and runners. Would love to see this happen
Comment Map	Bret Taber		I support this project.	This section of the Platte River trail needs significant improvements. Utilization would surely increase if it were safer and a more appealing trail to enjoy.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	This will encourage commuting by bike and pedestrian activity while improving safety.
Comment Map	Bri		I support this project.	Gotta love them bike trails.
Comment Map	Brian Bergeler		I support this project.	Much needed improvement for this section of trail for safety, usability and improved trail experience.
Comment Map	Bruce Baskette		I support this project.	I absolutely support this huge improvement!
Comment Map	Bryce Bradley		I support this project.	The trail adjacent to the highway feels unsafe and unhealthy. This would be a marked improvement and worthwhile investment.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Calvin Ryan		I support this project.	
<b>Denver - South Platte River Trail Improvements: Bayaud Ave. to Phil Milstein Park</b>				
Comment Map	Carla B		I support this project.	The South Platte trail is a valuable amenity and further improvement would increase its usage for transit and recreation.
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I support this project.	Excellent
Comment Map	Casey Roberts	none	I support this project.	This would be such a huge improvement to the trail and protect users from the exhaust, noise, and trash of I-25. Also, folks living or traveling to the west side would have more points of access to and from the trail, compared to where it is now.
Comment Map	Charlotte A.		I support this project.	This is an important connection to other improvements that have been made in this area. This trail is heavily used and will greatly benefit from this improvement.
Comment Map	Chris Nebenzahl		I support this project.	I support further development and of this main biking thoroughfare. As we consider the number of bikers in metro denver, it is important to offer improved transportation corridors and ease of use for cyclists.
Comment Map	Craig Aberle	None	I support this project.	Would love to see the Platte trail finished with renovation. Have not been able to ride without construction for over a year now.
Comment Map	D Forbes		I support this project.	Improvements to bike and pedestrian infrastructure are always welcome.
Comment Map	D. Chen		I support this project.	This section is pretty gnarly. The freeway traffic, collapsing embankment, steep grade, and once during a windstorm, falling trees were all quite unpleasant. I hope this project is implemented on a fast track.
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Good use of resources to improve pedestrian and bike safety, reduce unnecessary car travel
Comment Map	Daniel Florez		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dave Hawkins		I support this project.	A welcome improvement to this section of the trail.
Comment Map	Dave Landau		I support this project.	This is really needed. As others have said, vehicles could crash into this section, but trash and noise is also a major concern. Please redo this section as it is heavily traveled!
Comment Map	David W		I support this project.	Dangerous and unhealthy next to I-25. Narrow trail adds risk, especially at the blind turn at the bottom of a hill. This project should improve all those issues, and with this section being one of the busiest in the state, it's money well spent.
Comment Map	Derek Allan		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dijk	self	I support this project.	Good use of funds to improve recreational and commuting use to meet increased demand.
Comment Map	Dustin Ram		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Eliot Landrum		I support this project.	Excellent! Definitely needed for more e-bike commuters to safely commute.
Comment Map	Elizabeth Morales		I support this project.	Yes please!
Comment Map	Erik wiffin		I support this project.	This would be a huge improvement to this section of the trail. The noise and exhaust make it a very unpleasant segment of an otherwise lovely ride.
Comment Map	Fred Glick		I support this project.	Much needed!
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	George Hahn	Self	I support this project.	
Comment Map	Graham Hollis		I support this project.	Helps trail users coexist
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I support this project.	South Platte trail is dangerously narrow in many locations. It needs to be widened to provide a safer facility for all users.
Comment Map	Hamilton Reed	self	I support this project.	This is a much needed & anticipated adjustment! Make sure it's well lit though, & probably don't need the crusher fine, just pave the shoulder
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	I'm saying yes to increasing comfort for bicyclists and pedestrians. I'm also hopeful that induced demand will have more people using the South Platte River Trail.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Jacque McIntyre		I support this project.	
Comment Map	James Warren		I support this project.	Oo lala! Gimme gimme gimme! Awooga! Awooga!
<b>Denver - South Platte River Trail Improvements: Bayaud Ave. to Phil Milstein Park</b>				
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jay Merrill	Oregon State University (previously Stantec in Denver)	I support this project.	I have biked along the Platte River trail most of my life and I must say this section of the path simply needs improvement. Any help in making cycling more pleasant while minimizing visibility or noise from the highway goes a long way. This project will aid in promoting cycling both as a recreation and for commuters.
Comment Map	Jeff Walters		I support this project.	Continuous improvements of the popular South Plate trail are needed to ensure safety and provide enjoyable access for many.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	This part of the trail is in terrible shape and definitely needs improvements
Comment Map	Joe Crane		I support this project.	This is a vital link for cyclists using the Platte river trail.
Comment Map	John DiMattia		I support this project.	This is the worst part of the trail because of how close it is to the highway. Very much support moving/widening.
Comment Map	John Hart		I support this project.	It seems some people don't realize the trail will be relocated to the west side of the S Platte. This alone might be the biggest improvement on the entire trail. It's really great to also widen it to 12 ft with additional crushed stone for walking and gravel bikes. Hoping this becomes the new standard for trail improvements wherever possible. The narrower parts of trails are becoming dangerous with more users.
Comment Map	John Hess		I support this project.	Improvement of this section is greatly needed.
Comment Map	John Tinnell		I support this project.	Very much needed.
Comment Map	John W		I support this project.	I support this project because improving modes of transportation besides cars is better for people's health, the environment, happiness, and will help reduce car traffic. As someone who bikes to work every day (less than a mile) and still doesn't feel 100% safe, I support dedicated, protected, and separate from vehicular traffic bike lanes, even if I won't benefit from this one specifically.
Comment Map	jon parrish		I support this project.	This part of the trail is in terrible shape and definitely needs improvements
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I support this project.	I support this project, and would ask that the designs also include a taller barrier between the highway and the newly-constructed trail. The current low-wall design does little to protect trail users from vehicles crashing over the barrier, onto the trail, and doesn't provide adequate barriers to air pollution. A taller wall would also make the trail experience more pleasant by reducing sound and smells of the highway, likely leading to increased recreational use of the trail.
Comment Map	Jonny Rotheram	Resident of Athmar Park	I support this project.	This will be a great project to improve bike/eBike from both within Denver and also other DRCOG partner organizations to the south.
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I support this project.	Absolutely! As a commuter of the trail, this will greatly improve accessibility and usability.
Comment Map	Josh M		I support this project.	great project to meet current demand.
Comment Map	Karl Rábago	self	I support this project.	I support trail widening.
Comment Map	Ken Schroepfel		I support this project.	Needed expansion and improvement to a heavily traveled section of the Platte River Trail.
Comment Map	Kevin Williams		I support this project.	The Platte trail is a vital resource for folks trying to do their part for climate change. Please fund this project.
Comment Map	Killian Devitt		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Layton Hill		I support this project.	We should aspire to widen all of Denver's active travel superhighways! Many of them are much too narrow.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Mark Grantz		I support this project.	Very much needed
Comment Map	Matt		I support this project.	This would be a great upgrade. This currently is one of the worst parts of this trail.
Comment Map	Matt Parsons		I support this project.	This would greatly help one of the most important cycling commuting corridors. Both for pleasure and safety.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Max Nardo		I support this project.	This is a lovely trail and I enjoy riding it to work, but this segment is terrible - it is loud and has poor air quality being so close to the interstate. Most of the time I don't even use the trail because of this - I'll cross the river at Mississippi or Alameda instead, which aren't the best crossings either.
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Michael Ernst		I support this project.	I sometimes bicycle this area and improvements would be welcome.
<b>Denver - South Platte River Trail Improvements: Bayaud Ave. to Phil Milstein Park</b>				
Comment Map	Mike McQueeney		I support this project.	This will make the path safer for cyclists, runners and walkers.
Comment Map	Morgan Stanley		I support this project.	This trail is a real lifeline for bike commuters and recreational riders, and any effort to improve it is money well spent.
Comment Map	Natasha T Koermer	Ride or Die Collective (local women's cycling team)	I support this project.	
Comment Map	Nate Pitzer		I support this project.	This trail is highly used so these improvements will greatly improve safety for all the users.
Comment Map	Noah Cowperthwaite		I support this project.	I hate this section of the trail as it currently exist and support its relocation to the opposite side of the Platte.
Comment Map	Olaf Wyberneit		I support this project.	yes please make the trail safer and easier to navigate
Comment Map	P Merewether		I support this project.	This is sorely needed on this extremely popular trail.
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	Highly used therefore deserves the improvements
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project will improve safety and comfort for all trail users by widening the existing trail and adding a crusher fine extension.
Comment Map	Peter Morgan		I support this project.	This project will make the bike path safer, healthier, and more enjoyable.
Comment Map	Peter Warner		I support this project.	Heavy traffic on this trail, would see great returns for this investment
Comment Map	Piotr		I support this project.	Can't wait to not breathe exhaust fumes when biking this section!
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This project will improve safety and comfort for all trail users.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project will improve safety and comfort for all trail users by widening the existing trail and adding a crusher fine extension.
Comment Map	Richard Hansen		I support this project.	The existing trail and breakwall between I 25 and the trail is deteriorating and is unsafe for riding on the Platte River Trail. Many loose rocks on and along the trail
Comment Map	Rob Daugherty		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Rob Osterburg	Self	I support this project.	The trail along the South Platte River is a valuable transit link for commuters and a wonderful amenity for recreationists. This section is one of the oldest, and narrowest, and is right next to I-25. This project will be a welcome improvement.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	I can hardly wait!
Comment Map	Rob Toftness		I support this project.	Definitely excited about this project getting bike traffic away from the noise and exhaust of I-25 would be a huge improvement.
Comment Map	Robert L		I support this project.	Every section of the S. Platte River Trail needs to be widened to 12 feet to support the growing needs of current and future commuters. Just as I-25 is a N-S artery across the city for vehicles, this trail is also for cyclists. It is a direct link from the southern suburbs to downtown.
Comment Map	Russ Shaw	self	I support this project.	Definitely YES! Especially the trail relocation.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Ryan Frazer		I support this project.	The SPRT is one of Denver's signature bike facilities and these improvements would make the trail much safer and more comfortable for all users

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Sam Brown		I support this project.	Yes please! That section of the S. Platt trail is awful and this would make biking that section much more enjoyable and feel safer being away from the interstate.
Comment Map	Sam Long		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Scott Cee	Individual	I support this project.	Yea! This is a long overdue improvement. This is definitely the worst part of the existing trail system. Biking within a few feet of I25 traffic is rough.
Comment Map	Scott Sanderson		I support this project.	Wow would be great to not have to ride right next to the highway traffic!
Comment Map	Sean Walsh		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Seth Newby		I support this project.	I use the south platte trail for transportation and this is much needed - hopefully this will encourage more people to use the path!
<b>Denver - South Platte River Trail Improvements: Bayaud Ave. to Phil Milstein Park</b>				
Comment Map	Simon Vakili		I support this project.	A huge improvement. Please continue developing bicycle infrastructure as a feasible transportation alternative, allowing people to go where they need to, safely.
Comment Map	Steve B		I support this project.	This is an important improvement to pedestrian safety and will make strides to reduce unnecessary short distance car travel that could be replaced with biking or walking where infrastructure is safe and easy to use.
Comment Map	Susan Larson		I support this project.	I support this project for safety of people walking, biking, dog walking, running, etc. It is a busy section of path.
Comment Map	Susie Frechter		I support this project.	
Comment Map	t roby		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Travis Madsen	Southwest Energy Efficiency Project	I support this project.	The Platte River Trail is an important bike artery for the city. Especially with all the new eBikes the city of Denver and the State are subsidizing, we should upgrade biking infrastructure across the region.
Comment Map	Tucker Bickler		I support this project.	Having routes located away from the freeway will help eliminate the health risks associated with breathing in the carcinogens from vehicle exhaust.
Comment Map	Wendy Vonhof		I support this project.	This is a critical piece of infrastructure that must be fixed and updated. The city just a few years ago opened new trail infrastructure that went under I-25 in this area but we cannot utilize this anymore due to this absurdly long closure time based on a collapsing wall that has been known for at least the 14 years that I have lived and bicycled here. Car drivers would NEVER put up with such a long timeframe to fix such a small section like this so why on earth do pedestrians and bicyclists have to wait so long? Just fix it! This does not need a study - just fix it.
Comment Map	Zuben Bastani		I support this project.	Yes! Please support the trail, its in much need of additional space and maintenance.
Comment Map			I support this project.	This project is sorely needed. This portion of the Platte River Trail needs improvements.
Comment Map			I support this project.	This section of trail next to I25 is the worst of the entire trail. Moving it to the other side of the river is a great idea. Please fund this project.
Comment Map			I support this project.	I often avoid this area of the south Platte trail because this section is narrow and unpleasant riding so close to i25. Rerouting this trail will be a huge improvement.
Comment Map			I support this project.	YES, adding more buffer between bike trail and interstate traffic would make this segment more pedestrian and bicyclists friendly
Comment Map		None	I support this project.	Good idea, this is an unpleasant part of the ride inhaling all the vehicle exhaust.
Comment Map			I support this project.	This work has long been needed!
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	Fantastic. That section of trail can definitely use some help.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	Alexander smith		I have concerns about this project.	Crusher fine is so bad. So much maintenance and herbicide. Just pave it

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I have concerns about this project.	Yes. My concern here is that it does not go far enough. Do the entire length of the trail to these standards, from the Chatfield Dam as far north as there is a trail. And build pedestrian bridges every ~1/2 trail mile that allow people across the river, connecting neighborhoods in ways that don't require people to fight traffic; the few vehicle crossings there are are rough in a vehicle, never mind without one.
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	i think this is a nice to have not a need to have
<b>Erie - SW Weld County Transit First and Last Mile Study</b>				
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Great to see Weld County working towards transit service improvements.
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	I support building multi-modal options.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Cody Hedges		I support this project.	Transit isn't very useful if you can't get to it, right?
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	We need to make advancements in connecting our bike lanes and trails with transit so that we don't have bike lanes/paths that lead to nowhere.
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	Providing infrastructure that gives people a *legitimate* transportation option other than the car is the first step toward permanently reducing traffic congestion (including for motorists), increasing local air quality, decreasing local noise pollution, increasing the safety of our roads, increasing the health/fitness of the population, and ultimately leading to a significantly higher quality of life for everyone.
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Josh Mehlem		I support this project.	Great project to reduce need on SOV
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	I support expanded transit & connections.
Comment Map	Kyle Plastino		I support this project.	Providing infrastructure that gives people a *legitimate* transportation option other than the car is the first step toward permanently reducing traffic congestion (including for motorists), increasing local air quality, decreasing local noise pollution, increasing the safety of our roads, increasing the health/fitness of the population, and ultimately leading to a significantly higher quality of life for everyone.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	Yes! People in rural areas deserve good transit and access to multimodal forms of transportation
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	Multimodal study yes
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This study will advance southwest Weld County's investments in expanding transit service and building multimodal transportation connections for bicyclists and pedestrians.
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This study will advance southwest Weld County's investments in expanding transit service and building multimodal transportation connections for bicyclists and pedestrians.
Comment Map	richard crane	Self	I support this project.	This study will advance southwest Weld County's investments in expanding transit service and building multimodal transportation connections for bicyclists and pedestrians
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	Make it easier for pedestrians and bicyclists.
Comment Map	Zuben Bastani		I support this project.	YES! More connections for bicyclists and pedestrians.
Comment Map			I support this project.	

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Email	DeWayne Drummond		I have concerns about this project.	I would think it would be common sense to start Bus service from Erie to the North light rail line that ends at Eastlake. Probably makes too much sense.
<b>Jefferson County - Peaks to Plains Trail: Central Clear Creek Canyon Segment</b>				
Comment Map	Alex		I support this project.	Finish the gap!
Comment Map	Alex St. Angelo		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	The other segments of this trail are some of the most beautiful sections of trail in the entire state of Colorado. We should continue former Gov. Hickenloopers vision and continue this trail and move towards completing it.
Comment Map	Andrew Alger		I support this project.	I support this project! This will make it safer to walk or ride here! Yes Please!
Comment Map	Andy O'Brien		I support this project.	This is a great opportunity to build a unique trail in Denver! Moving forward from car dependence is critical to meet our climate goals, and many residents in the area insist on cars to access the mountains. Please build this asap!
Comment Map	Anne Tully		I support this project.	This is a badly needed section which will improve safety. Please fund it.
Comment Map	Asher David		I support this project.	Absolutely, this is the type of project this money should be spent on.
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	I very much look forward to seeing this beautiful trail extended.
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	brandon nuechterlein		I support this project.	What a great place for a walk or a bike ride. Connecting existing trails will make using them attractive for a much wider community of users. It is amazing to be able to safely ride in the mountains without having to worry about getting killed by a distracted driver. Of all the proposals i am most in support of this one!
Comment Map	Bret Taber		I support this project.	More safe recreational options like this project need to get funded.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I support this project.	I support all of the Peaks to Plains Trail.
Comment Map	Brian Bergeler		I support this project.	Amazing project and world class opportunity to connect urban area to mountains...safely!
Comment Map	Bruce Perry		I support this project.	The existing segments of the P2P trail are individually stunning, but there utility as a multi-use recreational attraction is limited by the lack of connectivity. Fully connecting the various P2P segments could make it one of Colorado's crown jewels.
Comment Map	Bryce Bradley		I support this project.	As a new eBike user, I love the idea of being able to have car-free access to the mountains.
Comment Map	C.J. Whelan		I support this project.	Admittedly an expensive project, this is a critical connection in completing the Peaks to Plains Trail. Without it, there is no safe, continuous trail from the Front Range into the mountains.
Comment Map	Calvin Ryan		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Carla B		I support this project.	Completing this section furthers Colorado's goals of creating a connected and extensive recreation trail system.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Casey Roberts		I support this project.	YES PLEASE! We love riding the existing sections of the PtP trail, and I recommend it to all my friends who bike, use strollers or wheelchairs, etc. I'm excited that CO has the vision to build this trail and would love to see it happen as soon as possible!
Comment Map	Charlotte A.		I support this project.	The portion finished so far is great, so beautifully done, and a huge number of people are using and enjoying it.
Comment Map	Chris Lynn	Self	I support this project.	Any additions to safe biking in this state get my vote.
Comment Map	Chris McGee		I support this project.	When completed, this will be one of the most amazing non-motorized pathways in the country!!
Comment Map	Craig Aberle	just me	I support this project.	This would be a milestone for Colorado. Support it!
Comment Map	Craig Murray	Na	I support this project.	A trail along clear creek would become a critical corridor for non motorized transportation between the front range and the mountain region of Colorado
Comment Map	D Forbes		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	



Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I support this project.	Huge draw for recreation without requiring automobiles
Comment Map	Dave Landau		I support this project.	This trail is a hidden gem in the foothills. Completing it would enable a terrific ride away from traffic in one of the nicest canyons in the front range!
Comment Map	David Dungan		I support this project.	This is the sort of project that makes CO great!
Comment Map	David W		I support this project.	Getting close to a massive system of interconnected multi-use trails, and the already completed sections along Clear Creek Canyon are absolutely beautiful. Please keep up this progress.
<b>Jefferson County - Peaks to Plains Trail: Central Clear Creek Canyon Segment</b>				
Comment Map	Elaine Erb		I support this project.	It's exciting to watch this project coming together. I look forward to the ability to bike from Golden to Idaho Springs. Connections like this help our state be more bike friendly and a better draw for bike tourism
Comment Map	Eliot Landrum		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Erin Witter		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Evelyn Burr		I support this project.	This project will make this corridor much more usable for recreation and help in reducing the vehicular traffic currently accessing up canyon segment.
Comment Map	Fritz Clauson		I support this project.	Fill the gap!
Comment Map	Gary Kleeman		I support this project.	Please fund this trail project to complete the missing link in beautiful Clear Creek Canyon.
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Geneva Hooten	N/A	I support this project.	
Comment Map	George Hahn	Self	I support this project.	This will open up so many exciting possibilities!
Comment Map	Graham Hollis		I support this project.	It'll complete the work done over the last few years
Comment Map	Greg		I support this project.	Colorado needs more dedicated trails in a network. This vision would be huge for Colorado.
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Jacque McIntyre		I support this project.	
Comment Map	James Warren		I support this project.	The first part of this project (or at least the part I've done) is great! I cannot wait to see the completed project. I've taken friends to the first part and everyone things its just so fun!
Comment Map	James Widrig		I support this project.	Great to have completion of this trail system
Comment Map	Jeff Walters		I support this project.	I'd love to see some of the missing segments of the P2P trail completed to make this a one of Colorado's recreational treasures.
Comment Map	Jill Lewis		I support this project.	Only 5 miles left to go to finish an amazing project. Such a beautiful place to be!
Comment Map	Jim slavik		I support this project.	This is partially finished and already a fantastic addition to the local community. Completing this project would be a huge win for local Bikers, walkers and runners and open up a safe way to get into the mountains for golden
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I support this project.	Please fund this trail project to complete the missing link in beautiful Clear Creek Canyon.
Comment Map	Joe Crane		I support this project.	This a good project that will provide access to a lot of people.
Comment Map	John DiMattia		I support this project.	
Comment Map	John H.	Broomfield Bikes transportation advocacy group	I support this project.	I support projects that invest in more sustainable multi-modal transportation such as biking and bus mass transit.
Comment Map	John M		I support this project.	Love the existing P2P trail, bike to the end of it regularly. Extending out the trail would continue to build this asset for the region.
Comment Map	John Tinnell		I support this project.	Very excited for this trail -- it could be one of the best bike paths in the state when it's all finished.
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I support this project.	This is the final remaining segment of the trail that does not allow pedestrian or bicycle access, leading to significant amounts of short-trip SOV use in this segment of the highway that could be avoided with the construction of this project.
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I support this project.	Wholeheartedly support! Excellent project!
Comment Map	Josh M		I support this project.	great to see this vision moving forward

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Julia Collins	Boulder resident	I support this project.	
Comment Map	Karl Friedman		I support this project.	A classic forever river valley trail much like the Glenwood Canyon trail and accessible to the Denver/Boulder/Golden metropolitan area.
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	Support completion of Peaks to Plains trail.
Comment Map	Kelly Blynn		I support this project.	Please fund this project to connect the segments that have been completed, and enable more access to recreation options for Jefferson County and the rest of the metro region.
Comment Map	Killian Devitt		I support this project.	This will become a well used addition to the local trail network!
<b>Jefferson County - Peaks to Plains Trail: Central Clear Creek Canyon Segment</b>				
Comment Map	Kirk		I support this project.	This project started 8 years ago and only 4 miles have been completed! It is time to fund this project.
Comment Map	Larry C		I support this project.	I do look forward to the completion of this middle segment. I have/do bike from Golden/Morrison West bound to Idaho Springs (and beyond) (via US 40)..which has some/several serious up and down segments. This path up Clear Creek would be quite a bit less total elevation gain West bound.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Mat T		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Matt Parsons		I support this project.	This would be a fun trail and I would love it.
Comment Map	Matt S		I support this project.	This will be an excellent addition to the existing trail system
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Melinda Middleton		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Natasha T Koermer	Ride or Die Collective (local women's cycling team)	I support this project.	
Comment Map	Nate Pitzer		I support this project.	This trail needs to go all the way through.
Comment Map	Olaf Wyberneit	pvt	I support this project.	I look forward to having a connection from Golden to Idaho Springs one day that is safe for cyclists.
Comment Map	P Merewether		I support this project.	The completed sections of the Peaks to Plains trail are the only separate multi-use pathways into the mountains from the metro area removed from dangerous traffic. Completing this section is vital.
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	I am so excited to check this path out ... please finish
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project will complete the last five mile Jefferson County gap in the Peaks to Plains Trail.
Comment Map	Peter Warner		I support this project.	Makes it safer for people to bike and walk on Clear Creek Trail
Comment Map	Piotr		I support this project.	Can't wait for this section to be built - love the recently-completed P2P section near Golden!
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This project will improve safety and comfort for all trail users.
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project will complete the last five mile Jefferson County gap in the Peaks to Plains Trail.
Comment Map	Rob Osterburg	Self	I support this project.	What a great place for a walk or a bike ride. Connecting existing trails will make using them attractive for a much wider community of users.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	I like it more every time I think of it.
Comment Map	Robert L		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Russ Shaw	self	I support this project.	How exciting it will be to see this trail system completed!
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Ryan D		I support this project.	I just rode up to Idaho Springs a few weekends ago thinking that this trail was complete. Would love to see it get done.
Comment Map	Ryan Frazer		I support this project.	This will be a great help to making biking in the foothills safer.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Sam Brown		I support this project.	Please make biking the front range safer. The canyon highways are very dangerous without shoulders. This project would be great!
Comment Map	Simon Maybury	Bicycle Colorado	I support this project.	This is the major missing segment of P2P. When it is complete, it is likely to attract a large number of Colorado, national and international tourists to Golden, Idaho Springs and other communities en route.
Comment Map	Stefan Manning		I support this project.	This is a much needed connection to fill in the gap here for the P2P trail
Comment Map	Steve B		I support this project.	The completion of this project will make the trail a destination for cyclists and improve appreciation for our beautiful outdoor areas
Comment Map	Susan Larson		I support this project.	I support this.
Comment Map	Susan Reed		I support this project.	Please complete this important missing segment for this high priority trail. The Peaks to Plains Trail serves residents from across the DRCOG region as well as visitors to our beautiful state.
Comment Map	t roby		I support this project.	
<b>Jefferson County - Peaks to Plains Trail: Central Clear Creek Canyon Segment</b>				
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I support this project.	Completing the last 5 miles of gap in this trail feels like a no-brainer. Beautiful project that we should be proud of. Great for locals and visitors alike!
Comment Map	Wendy Vonhof		I support this project.	This would be a great connection.
Comment Map			I support this project.	I support this project. This is the type of regional improvements DRCOG should focus on.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	With the acceptance of (and improvement in) ebikes, this project has the potential to be a game changer for giving metro residents mountain access without using a car.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	This is wonderful to continue making bicycling something anyone can participate in. Not everyone wants to climb lookout mtn and this is a safe and accessible way to do it
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	I can't wait for the whole thing to be built!!!!
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I have concerns about this project.	This project is exorbitantly expensive. I hesitate to support this trail addition because I'd rather the funding go toward improving bikeways connectedness and adding more high comfort pedestrian pathways within more densely populated areas such as Denver proper.
<b>RTD - Light Rail Level Boarding Feasibility Study</b>				
Comment Map	Alan Blair	Individual	I support this project.	I believe that the concept of level board should definitely be considered. My wife and I are regular users of light rail. We consider the concept of pushing my wife's wheelchair up a ramp and waiting while the train driver leaves his post to deploy another ramp for us to board a bit strange. Denver may be the only city we have visited where this is the case. After using commuter rail with level boarding, our view is reinforced. There may also be a safety issue when the driver leaves his post. The access door is probably locked, but I can conceive a situation where unauthorized access to the controls for the train could be possible.
Comment Map	Alejandra X. Castañeda	Mothers Against More Car Lanes	I support this project.	As someone who has been advocating side-by-side with wheelchair users and older adults who use mobility devices, I fully support making sure all our light rail vehicles are fully accessible. Plus, funding any improvements to our RTD system, makes it more likely that ridership will increase and we will stop relying so much on single-occupancy vehicles to move around the region. Thank you.
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I support this project.	This would be beneficial to folks who have a hard time getting on public transportation today.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Making RTD trains more accessible is a great goal. Currently it can be difficult for elders and people with disabilities to climb the stairs of the light rail trains. This is a good step forward for future planning.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Andy Cushen	N/A	I support this project.	The rolling stock for RTD's light rail will eventually need to be replaced or upgraded, and a feasibility study will lay the groundwork for transitioning rolling stock that is difficult to climb aboard (even for able-bodied people) to more accessible rolling stock.
Comment Map	Cody Hedges		I support this project.	This is an important element of the light rail system that needs updated. It's important for individuals with mobility difficulties, reduce dwell times for operators having to manually drop ramps, increase boarding options for those in wheelchairs or similar (relegated to the front door only currently), and will, hopefully, open the door for a superior way to handle onboard bicycle storage.
Comment Map	D. Chen		I support this project.	Light rail is very hostile to non-ambulatory boarding, including disabled access and any bike that is not a lightweight road bike. Trying to board with a child (or children) on a bike is next to impossible and we won't attempt it again. Please design access for the growing variety of bikes and their passengers.
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Daniel Florez		I support this project.	
Comment Map	David Nye		I support this project.	Access for all is access for all. I support no-step/stair light rail infrastructure for all passenger boardings.
Comment Map	Donovan Forbes		I support this project.	Level boarding is a good improvement for modern transit systems.
Comment Map	Evelyn Burr	Self	I support this project.	The current train cars are difficult to board and alight from even for those who have no mobility constraints. Level-boarding vehicles would get our light rail system current with best practice.
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I support this project.	I strongly support this initiative. As the application notes, level boarding improves access for those that currently have difficulty, sometimes preventing their use of our trains, including cyclists and parents with strollers. My wife currently cannot use the train because she is not permitted to keep her stroller open while boarding, and is not permitted to use the high access block. She is not strong enough to carry the child and stroller up the stairs. Additionally, maintaining our current fleet of high-boarding vehicles (that are no longer regularly produced) is becoming increasingly expensive. The transition to level-boarding is inevitable, particularly given the FTA's interest, and this study will help us avoid expensive mistakes when the time comes.
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I support this project.	Yes. This is needed, and should have been the default from the start. Doesn't matter (to me) whether this is raised platforms and current trains running with the stairwells 'capped', or new rolling stock with lower floors and platforms graded to match the new height.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Mat T		I support this project.	
<b>RTD - Light Rail Level Boarding Feasibility Study</b>				
Comment Map	Matt Brady	Self	I support this project.	Really needed.
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	Study should focus on simply costing new low-flow light rail cars & station alterations to facilitate level boarding.
Comment Map	Sam Brown		I support this project.	Improving access to public transportation for all should be prioritized.
Comment Map	Tom Quinn		I support this project.	Transit accessibility is very important. The stairs on light rail are steep and I have watched riders struggle with them. My wife will not use the W-line to Union Station for connection to DIA due to the difficulty getting luggage up the stairs.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	Alex		I have concerns about this project.	While I think this is a good idea, I think there are more important projects to be considered before level boarding is implemented.
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I have concerns about this project.	Money would be better used to make trails safer.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I have concerns about this project.	Although this project includes evaluation of how to improve mobility-assisted and bicycle boardings, I prefer other projects such as planning studies that lead directly to building safe places to walk, bike and take transit.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I have concerns about this project.	It's important to make improvements to boarding the light rail, but why do you need a million and a half to study the problem?
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I have concerns about this project.	I'd like this project deprioritized to focus attention on other key areas that directly support bikability and walkability of Denver's streets. Rather than spending a lot of money leveling the light rail stations, I suggest placing guidelines to encourage transit riders to use the existing ramp toward the front of the light rail station to board if need be.
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I have concerns about this project.	I favor more direct efforts to improve safe places for walking, biking, access to transit.
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I have concerns about this project.	Yes! The current light rail cars are inaccessible. Please replace them with level boarding vehicles ASAP. My one concern is that this will be prioritized over more important things, such as increasing light rail frequency, and extending light rail into areas currently lacking in service, such as Colfax and Cherry Creek
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I have concerns about this project.	Concerned about the price. I would rather see tangible projects completed first.
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I have concerns about this project.	Although this project includes evaluation of how to improve mobility-assisted and bicycle boardings, we lean toward supporting other projects such as planning studies that lead directly to building safe places to walk, bike and take transit.
Comment Map	richard crane	Self	I have concerns about this project.	Although this project includes evaluation of how to improve mobility-assisted and bicycle boardings, I lean toward supporting other projects such as planning studies that lead directly to building safe places to walk, bike and take transit.
Comment Map	Zuben Bastani		I have concerns about this project.	Higher priorities elsewhere such as paths to walk on/ride/wheel on.
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	I fully support the move to level boarding across all of RTD's light rail lines and stations, and I would like it to occur on a faster timeline. My concern is that the project's first step of best practices, peer review and engagement is an unnecessary step. Eliminating this step could save money on the project and potentially speed up the process. Why not streamline this process where we can? It's already clear that moving to level boarding is the right choice, for accessibility, for encouraging multi-modal trips by bike, and for train maintenance. There's no reason to continue comparing low floor vs. high floor.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I am opposed to this project.	These resources should be spent on studies that result in action to make biking, walking, and riding RTD safer. I support improving access to public transportation, but I am opposed because this study won't benefit bikers. Before you board the Light Rail, you have to get to the station, which is often difficult and dangerous for bikers and pedestrians. We need safer biking and walking routes in conjunction with or before we make easier boarding.
Comment Map	Leighton Moreland		I am opposed to this project.	I love the idea of level boarding, it should have been done 25 years ago. Right now RTD has significantly greater problems in terms of operations and the still unfinished B line
<b>RTD - New Bus Maintenance Facility Planning Study</b>				
Comment Map	Elaine Erb	Niwot Resident	I support this project.	I encourage a new centralized facility that allows for new energy sources including electric and hydrogen
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I support this project.	RTD needs more buses on the road, so that people don't have to wait forever for a bus. Bus infrastructure is important
Comment Map	Peter Warner		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	RTD's bus facilities haven't had a significant upgrade in 40 years. It's time to plan for the future.
Comment Map	Rob P		I support this project.	Go for it!
Comment Map			I support this project.	Funding alternative modes of transportation will help all citizens!
Comment Map			I support this project.	

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I have concerns about this project.	I appreciate RTD and everything they do. Most folks I know that use transit want more frequent and on time bus service, or dignified places to wait for the bus. I'm not sure this project accomplishes what folks in Denver want.
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I have concerns about this project.	I believe safe trails are more important at this time than studying alternative fuels.
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I have concerns about this project.	Although this project includes evaluation of new alternative fuels, I prefer other projects such as planning studies that lead directly to building safe places to walk, bike, and take transit.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I have concerns about this project.	Resources should be spent on studies that lead directly to building or improving places for multi-modal transportation. I would like to see specific commitment to building Hydrogen and Electric capabilities and less focus on natural gas.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I have concerns about this project.	I understand the need for the expansion of maintenance facilities, but why is further study needed? I am also concerned about making a commitment to the use of compressed natural gas, which has much lower Nox and PM, but doesn't do too much for cutting CO2.
Comment Map	Dan K		I have concerns about this project.	
Comment Map	Erin Witter		I have concerns about this project.	RTD is laughable. Union Station looks like a homeless shelter. First RTD should show that it can operate with current scope of services before getting more money thrown at it.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I have concerns about this project.	I don't find this study as necessary as other studies to improve bikability and walkability of our city streets.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I have concerns about this project.	Resources should be spent on studies that lead directly to building or improving places for multi-modal transportation. I would like to see specific commitment to building Hydrogen and Electric capabilities and less focus on natural gas
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	Self	I have concerns about this project.	I favor more direct spending on safe walking, biking, and transit access.
Comment Map	M Koch		I have concerns about this project.	
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I have concerns about this project.	I 100% agree that RTD should buy more busses and build the facilities to support those busses. But I don't think they should invest in natural gas as a fuel for those busses. Battery/electric is really the only way to go
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I have concerns about this project.	Although this project includes evaluation of new alternative fuels, we lean toward supporting other projects such as planning studies that lead directly to building safe places to walk, bike, and take transit.
Comment Map	Richard Crane		I have concerns about this project.	Although this project includes evaluation of new alternative fuels, I lean toward supporting other projects such as planning studies that lead directly to building safe places to walk, bike, and take transit.
Comment Map	Zuben Bastani		I have concerns about this project.	Focus on walking/biking projects.
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	Spend more money on proven transportation methods of walking and biking
Comment Map	Chris Lynn	Self	I am opposed to this project.	Until RTD is stabilized and functioning well as an organization I oppose any additional funding be provided.
<b>Thornton - 104th Ave. Capacity Improvements: Colorado Blvd. to South Platte River</b>				
Comment Map	James Wright		I support this project.	The multiuse paths are way overdue please ensure proper safety and connectivity of these paths.
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This project widens the road from two to four lanes.
Comment Map	Bryce Bradley		I have concerns about this project.	Pedestrian and trail improvements should be pursued separately and roadway should not be widened
Comment Map	Jordan Denning		I have concerns about this project.	I like the shared use path being added, but we shouldn't be widening roads in the year 2022, unless we're actively trying to create more carbon emissions.
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	Please don't add any more room for cars. They pollute and kill at terrible rates, and building more infrastructure for them is the wrong direction. Keep the shared use paths, scrap the rest.
Comment Map	Alex Stanton		I am opposed to this project.	Why are we still trying to add lanes to roads? It is clear that is not the solution. Fund other projects that give alternative modes of transportation a fair shot. This is embarrassing.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I am opposed to this project.	Widening a road will increase VMT and GHG. It also makes the road more dangerous by making crossing it harder, and also will encourage faster and more deadly speeds by widening it.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I am opposed to this project.	We don't need road widening projects. There are many much better uses of public money.
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I am opposed to this project.	This will decrease bike and pedestrian safety while promoting traveling by car.
Comment Map	Carla B		I am opposed to this project.	Road widening just encourages more inefficient car traffic.
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I am opposed to this project.	"Vision Zero" usually means a road diet, not a doubling of lanes.
Comment Map	Casey Kulm		I am opposed to this project.	If 2 lanes is not enough for this remote part of the state then there are more serious infrastructure issues that this amount of money could be much better spent investing in.
Comment Map	D Forbes		I am opposed to this project.	Funds should be diverted to alternative transit modes. Road widening contributes to sprawl and GHG emissions.
Comment Map	Dan K		I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map	Dan Martin	Self	I am opposed to this project.	More lanes will NOT fix anything, only makes it worse. Use the resources for better transit options instead
Comment Map	David		I am opposed to this project.	This will encourage more driving and suburban development. Funds can be better spent elsewhere to decrease pollution, increase pedestrian safety, and encourage transit ridership.
Comment Map	David W		I am opposed to this project.	I support the shared use paths but oppose the extra lanes.
Comment Map	Evelyn Burr		I am opposed to this project.	I am strongly opposed to this project. Widening roads is not in alignment with Denver's stated goals of reducing SOV trips and traffic fatalities.
Comment Map	Francisco Partida		I am opposed to this project.	Strongly oppose widening the road at this cost. Money would be better spent prioritizing different modes instead.
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I am opposed to this project.	Doubling road widths? That doesn't seem like something we should be doing. Work on providing alternatives to cars instead, please.
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I am opposed to this project.	Opposed to widening projects that foster unsafe driving speeds. DRCOG region has excessive speeding problems on all four lane roads in the region, regardless of posted speed limits. Widening this road will encourage more speeding and inattentive driving.
Comment Map	Hamilton Reed	self	I am opposed to this project.	I am wholly opposed to any road widening projects. We need to stop encouraging auto transit if we're going to change people's habits and fight climate change.
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I am opposed to this project.	No to road expansion.
Comment Map	I Johnon		I am opposed to this project.	The track record of widening roadways shows that it only adds to sprawl and congestion.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I am opposed to this project.	The track record of widening roadways shows that it only adds to sprawl and congestion. Pedestrian and trail improvements should be pursued separately and roadway should not be widened
Comment Map	John H.	Broomfield Bikes transportation advocacy group	I am opposed to this project.	This project has a price tag of \$25,000,000. Given that we are in a climate emergency, there is undoubtedly a better use for this money. Widening roads does not solve traffic congestion any more than loosening your belt solves being overweight. We need dramatic overhauls in our transportation system, not business-as-usual blindly widening roads and wasting away what little capital still remains.
<b>Thornton - 104th Ave. Capacity Improvements: Colorado Blvd. to South Platte River</b>				
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I am opposed to this project.	This is an extremely expensive project that would take most of the funds available in this call, and does not deserve that funding when the monies could be far better spent elsewhere. While the scope statement primarily focuses on the multimodal improvement elements, the primary function of this project is to widen the road and accelerate speeds of vehicles. This application is at least honest in that it states that it will not reduce VMT, but oddly, it suggests that it would reduce SOV travel. Contrary to that claim, it significantly enhances the likelihood that SOVs will use this intersection by reducing delay times for SOVs. Because it is actually likely to increase SOV use, it is more likely to reduce air quality, as the increased SOV use would do more harm than the calculated emissions reductions from reduced idling time would accommodate (particularly given those models do not account for the transitions to low-emission vehicles over the coming years).

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I am opposed to this project.	Total cost. 25 Million. We can use this to support better access to public transport and increase the reachability and frequency of such transport. Adding lanes will just create more traffic and not make the best use of this money.
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I am opposed to this project.	I oppose this lane widening.
Comment Map	Kevin Williams		I am opposed to this project.	This will not improve capacity long term and merely subsidizes suburban sprawl.
Comment Map	Kyle Plastino		I am opposed to this project.	Induced demand by widening this road will cause traffic congestion to increase. Please consider allocating these funds to multi-modal transportation projects (walking, biking, public transportation) that if effectively implemented can permanently reduce traffic congestion in the area.
Comment Map	Mat T		I am opposed to this project.	Road widening increases pollution and greenhouse gas emissions and decreases safety for people walking, biking, and driving. This money would be better spent making walking, biking, and transit improvements that would reduce air pollution, greenhouse gas, and traffic violence instead of making these problems worse.
Comment Map	Meghan McDonald		I am opposed to this project.	We need to stop prioritizing cars and sprawl
Comment Map	Nolan Hahn		I am opposed to this project.	There is no need to continue widening roads in a climate crisis. Induced demand research shows this is a short term fix that creates more problems in the long run. Stop adding lanes when we can't even maintain the ones we have.
Comment Map	Patricia	self	I am opposed to this project.	No widening projects
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I am opposed to this project.	No mention of bike lanes or sidewalks ... NO
Comment Map	richard crane	self	I am opposed to this project.	This project widens the road from two to four lanes
Comment Map	Rob P		I am opposed to this project.	This project widens the road from two to four lanes.
Comment Map	Ryan Cain		I am opposed to this project.	No more road widening. Go to your room!
Comment Map	Sam Long		I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map	Steve B		I am opposed to this project.	Widening roads never fixes the underlying situation, but instead kicks the can down a few years before necessitating the same "solution" a few years and million dollars later. Improvements should instead be focused on public transportation options that are affordable and reliable. We must be future-proofing our infrastructure, not throwing millions of dollars on temporary band-aid solutions.
Comment Map	Will B		I am opposed to this project.	Adding more lanes does not fix traffic.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	road widening is not the answer
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	We don't need any more road widening. Invest in public transit options instead.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
<b>Wheat Ridge - Ward Rd./BNSF Grade Separation: Preconstruction Activities</b>				
Comment Map	Beverly Weigel		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Brad Tucker		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Carol Friesen		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Dan K		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Gene Roseberry		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Huong Dang		I support this project.	Yes to safe streets for pedestrians.
Comment Map	Karl Rabago	self	I support this project.	Needed sidewalks for pedestrian safety.
Comment Map	Killian Devitt		I support this project.	Actual sidewalks are desperately needed in this area.
Comment Map	M Koch		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Patrick Tilley		I support this project.	This project builds sidewalks to improve safe pedestrian access to RTD's Gold Line Station .



Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Richard Bamber	Greater Denver Transit	I support this project.	This project must include provision for 2 additional commuter rail tracks to pass underneath as part of the G Line extension to Golden.
Comment Map	Richard crane	self	I support this project.	This project builds sidewalks to improve safe pedestrian access to RTD's Gold Line Station .
Comment Map	Shelley Cook		I support this project.	Weighing in as an individual. I support this project and urge that the design of the grade separation encompass to the extent realizable the possibility at some point of a G Line extension along the corridor. RTD owns fee simple the ROW into Golden.
Comment Map	Alex		I have concerns about this project.	This crossing is in severe need of safety and accessibility improvements for pedestrians and cyclists, given the new transit oriented development to the North of the intersection. Those improvements could be made at a fraction of the cost of a bridge to marginally improve traffic flow on ward road.
Comment Map	James Warren		I have concerns about this project.	I don't know too much about this, but is BNSF putting up much of the cost for this?
Comment Map	Jose Briones		I have concerns about this project.	Pedestrian improvements yes. Widening the road, no.
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I have concerns about this project.	I often find myself moving through this stretch both as a vehicle and on foot. I hate it. Ward is simultaneously a commercial corridor onto which nearly every lot has at least one driveway AND the only N/S access of substance. This creates not only congestion, but conflict as it tries to serve two distinct purposes at odds w/ each other. The freeway interchange & railroad exacerbate, but do not cause, these problems. Add to this the effectively impossible option for foot-travel, even to/from the train station (never mind the neighborhood) and you have a recipe for nonsense. Grade separation will not solve cross-traffic conflict, and congestion exists even when the tracks are clear. And a trail that must be driven to will not reduce traffic. Send it back for a rewrite to: (1) reduce cross-traffic conflicts [no lefts], and (2) reduce congestion [run the multi-use lane from Clear Creek Trail to Van Bibber Trail so people can shift local commute & errand volumes to non-vehicle modes].
Comment Map	Kevin Williams		I have concerns about this project.	Do not widen this road.
Comment Map	Tom Dijk	self	I have concerns about this project.	improving pedestrian and bicycling safety is great, widening the road is not.
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	i think this would be great if it includes an off street bikeway in addition to a sidewalk
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	Concerned about widening roadways
Comment Map	Brett Paglieri		I am opposed to this project.	This project solely benefits cars at the expense of bikes or pedestrians. There is little to no mention of bike accommodation and rerouting pedestrians half a mile to a tunnel or overpass does not fit the vision of transit-oriented development around RTD's Gold Line Station so many taxes have been spent on. Future Gold Line expansion would be killed as well. This project also fails to address the urgent need for low-stress North-South bike lane connecting Wheatridge, Arvada and the regional biking trails such as Clear Creek Trail and Ralston Creek Trail. Traffic calming measures, concrete medians, low-stress bike lanes separated from traffic, and pedestrian crossing lights are all be better and more affordable options I'd like to see implemented.
<b>Wheat Ridge - Ward Rd./BNSF Grade Separation: Preconstruction Activities</b>				
Comment Map	David		I am opposed to this project.	Grade separation funds should be allocated to transit and pedestrian grade separation--not to an underutilized railroad crossing that will increase vehicle speed and decrease pedestrian safety.
Comment Map	Gus Radcliffe		I am opposed to this project.	The project very narrowly benefits primarily drivers in the nearby neighborhoods. This should not be a regional spending priority.
Comment Map	Jody Robins		I am opposed to this project.	This crossing is in severe need of safety and accessibility improvements for pedestrians and cyclists, given the new transit oriented development to the North of the intersection. Those improvements could be made at a fraction of the cost of a bridge to marginally improve traffic flow on ward road.

Comment type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/ Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Comment Map	Jonathan Pira		I am opposed to this project.	I am opposed to this project, primarily on the basis that many of the other projects in this list have significantly more merit than this one. Additionally, while this is a multimodal project (that includes accommodation of non-SOV users), the bulk of the volume of users blocked by these freight backups are SOVs. Thus, proportionally, this project would almost wholly serve SOVs and is likely to induce additional demand for the road by SOVs.
Comment Map	Leighton Moreland		I am opposed to this project.	I live in the TOD across from the crossing and I am a civil engineer specializing in roadway design with some background experience in rail design. A grade separation here is the wrong project. Assuming a 4% grade to make 25' of vertical clearance, the grade would be starting north of Ridge Rd. This vertical causeway to alleviate 5-10 minutes of delay in an SOV commute time is the kind of design that I moved to this area to escape. I moved into this TOD based on the philosophy of human, not car, scaled design. I understand that if I need to cross a railroad track that takes hundreds of trucks off the road every day, I may be delayed a few minutes. I agree that the current pedestrian situation at the crossing is awful, but you can solve that with improved at grade facilities not a 20 million dollar bridge. My two cents is that the project that should be done here is a quiet crossing with a track extension for one track of the G line across ward to allow for future extension.
Comment Map	Steve B		I am opposed to this project.	This project needs to be rescinded and resubmitted with drastic improvements toward pedestrian safety
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	There are much more pressing issues to be addressed on this list.
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	
Comment Map			I am opposed to this project.	This project does not do enough to prioritize pedestrians and cyclists
<b>General Comment</b>				
Email	Kate French	Blue Green Alliance	N/A	(See attached for full comment)