Public Comment Summary for 2024-2027 TIP Subregional Share (Call #4) Applications:
Boulder County Subregion

Sponsor	Project	Track	Total Comments	% Support	% Concerned	% Opposed
Boulder	30th St. Multimodal Improvements - Colorado Ave. to Baseline Rd.	AQ/MM	3	100%	0%	0%
Boulder	Colorado Ave. Complete Streets Improvements: Folsom St. to Regent Dr.	AQ/MM	1	100%	0%	0%
Boulder	Folsom St. Multimodal Study: Pine St. to Colorado Ave.	AQ/MM	4	100%	0%	0%
Boulder County	Boulder County Vision Zero Safe Routes to School Action Plan	STBG	9	100%	0%	0%
Boulder County	Boulder Countywide Strategic Transit Plan	STBG	4	100%	0%	0%
Boulder County	Lafayette-Louisville-Boulder Protected Bikeway Feasibility Study	AQ/MM	13	100%	0%	0%
Boulder County	Longmont to Boulder (LOBO) Trail - Jay Road Connection Multimodal Improvements	STBG	11	100%	0%	0%
Boulder County	SH-119 Bikeway: Airport Rd. to Hover St.	STBG	10	80%	10%	10%
Boulder County	SH-119 Bikeway: Foothills Pkwy. to Jay Rd.	STBG	10	90%	10%	0%
Boulder County	SH-119 Bikeway: Niwot Rd. to Airport Rd.	STBG	9	89%	11%	0%
Boulder County	SH-93 Bikeway Feasibility Study: SH-170 to Jefferson County Line	AQ/MM	13	100%	0%	0%
Boulder County	South Boulder Rd. BRT Study: SH-7 & 119th St. to Broadway & Table Mesa Dr.	STBG	7	86%	14%	0%
Boulder County	Southeast Boulder County SuperFlex Demand Response Transit Service	AQ/MM	16	100%	0%	0%
Erie	Erie FlexRide Service	AQ/MM	5	40%	60%	0%
Longmont	SH-119 BAT Lanes: Nelson Rd. to Pratt Pkwy. - Design	AQ/MM	3	100%	0%	0%
Longmont	SH-66 Multi-use Path: Hover St. to Main St./US-287	AQ/MM	3	100%	0%	0%
Longmont	US-287 & 21st Ave. Bike/Ped Underpass	AQ/MM	5	80%	0%	20%
Louisville	SH-42 & South St. Bike/Ped Underpass	STBG	4	25%	75%	0%
Louisville	Via Appia Way Multimodal Improvements: South Boulder Rd. to McCaslin Blvd.	AQ/MM	8	25%	0%	75%
Superior	McCaslin Multi-Use Underpass north of Rock Creek Pkwy	AQ/MM	72	86%	8%	6%
		Total:	**210**			

TIP Application Comments as of 2/22/2023 - Boulder County Subregional Forum				
Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder - 30th St. Multimodal Improvements - Colorado Ave. to Baseline Rd.				
Comment Map	Ash Tribble		I support this project.	I heavily agree with improving the multimodal abilities of this section of 30th street because it's a major connector of local medium to high density housing, such as the University's William's Village, to CU Boulder. As of right now, it's difficult to be a pedestrian/bicyclist on this street due to the narrow sidewalks, and lack of protection on the bike lanes. If enough funding is available, I would also recommend adding protected bicycle lanes to Aurora Ave from the underpass to 30th street.
Comment Map	Karen Doyle	resident	I support this project.	Very busy corridor, these would be helpful improvements.
Comment Map			I support this project.	

Public Comment Summary for 2024-2027 TIP Subregional Share (Call #4) Applications:
Boulder County Subregion

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder - Colorado Ave. Complete Streets Improvements: Folsom St. to Regent Dr.				
Comment Map	Ash Tribble		I support this project.	In its current state, the section is vastly car oriented and dangerous to ride a bike through. While the south end of the road has a wide sidewalk, the north end has a thin sidewalk, and a painted bike lane. The Folsom/Colorado intersection is especially poorly designed and dangerous, with the painted bike lane on the north end having to move through a car lane just to stop at the light. This project will greatly improve a student's ability to get to the University of Colorado campus from the northeast.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder - Folsom St. Multimodal Study: Pine St. to Colorado Ave.				
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	This would be a great improvement to connect the university to all of the neighborhoods on the North.
Comment Map	Andrew Nawrocki		I support this project.	This is a much needed improvement to bicycle facilities on Folsom. The existing painted "bike lanes" are extremely narrow and vehicles travel quite fast through this stretch. I'd like to see current excessive vehicle traffic on Folsom redirected to 28th to make this a calm street befitting the mixed use nature of the area.
Comment Map	Ash Tribble		I support this project.	Improving the multimodal situation for Folsom street would lead to a much safer connection between the University and its nearing businesses and residential areas. The stretch of Folsom from Pine to Arapahoe especially needs attention, as there's only a thin painted line separating a thin bike lane from car traffic.
Comment Map	Ryan Larocque		I support this project.	This stretch of Folsom would benefit greatly from improved bike infrastructure. Protected bike lanes would make biking in Folsom more safe and more comfortable.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - Boulder County Vision Zero Safe Routes to School Action Plan				
Comment Map	Aishwarya Krishnamoorthy		I support this project.	Walking to school is a healthy, environmentally-friendly, and energizing option for many children and families, and I support working to make this option safer and more feasible for more children.
Email	Alexey Davies	Community Cycles Advocacy Committee	I support this project.	Our youth are the biggest demographic in Boulder County and an effective method to fund youth transportation projects is needed. This Vision Zero Safe Routes To School Plan will be important so goals are set and a strategy developed to achieve those goals for our youth. The data gained will allow the highest prioritized schools to identify specific infrastructure projects or programs to improve safety.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Great to see giving kids a safe choice to bike and walk to school.
Email	Cathy Lauderbaugh		I support this project.	I would like to see the Vision Zero Safe Routes project funded. The area around Centennial Middle School on Norwood Avenue is extremely dangerous. Here are some examples of what is happening: - parents have no where to pick up their children and are therefore forced to stop in the middle of the street. This blocks the street for about 5-8 city blocks. - the result of the blocked street is that parents then park in the neighboring driveways, which is dangerous to the families who live there (small children hit by a car on their own property). - further complications include: parents texting while driving on the WRONG side of the street. - no flashers at the main crosswalks, causing cars not to see children on bikes. I have witnessed multiple children almost hit by a car, within inches.
Comment Map	Dave Pomeroy		I support this project.	Please look at feasibility of easement to create path west of MacIntosh Lake, that would connect to Hygiene Elementary.
Email	Laurie Jundt Donlon		I support this project.	I live across the street from Centennial Middle School and am a daily neighborhood walker/runner. I have spoken with the city about the 19th street project with some success and I believe that the full funding of the Vision Zero project is an additional piece of this puzzle. The parents and students that need safe access to both Centennial and CrestView as well as the neighbors surrounding this area are committed to seeing a safer neighborhood community. Pick up and drop off at both schools are, in a word, scary. I have almost been hit three times in front of Centennial as well as walking across 19th at Norwood, Oak and Orchard Avenues.
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Generally, C4C supports Boulder County's leading Transportation Master Plan due to its network, multi-modal approach that addresses our greatest challenges.
Comment Map	Mike Francis	Self	I support this project.	I support safe routes to school, especially for bicycles. Please look at the route to Monarch High School along 88th. It should have a complete street with sidewalks at minimum.
Comment Map	Tillie Fields		I support this project.	By encouraging our kids to have safe options to walk and bike to school we teach them the value of transportation options beyond cars. Let's build a comfortable network to get our children to school safely and sustainably

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - Boulder Countywide Strategic Transit Plan				
Comment Map	Aishwarya Krishnamoorthy		I support this project.	Transit is a major solution as the area increases in population and traffic, and especially in the more rural areas of the county, transit can be an essential solution for people to get around.
Comment Map	Briana Sikerica Czarnecki	Participate in Center for People with Disabilities	I support this project.	It is beyond frustrating getting transportation throughout the county. I take the access a ride bus and it can up to 2 hours to get any where and this is very stressful for a disabled person.
Comment Map	Lusa Ciandro	Resident of Josephine Commons in Lafayette	I support this project.	More transportation availability from Josephine Commons to shopping areas or doctors offices is very much needed.
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Generally, C4C supports Boulder County's leading Transportation Master Plan due to its network, multi-modal approach that addresses our greatest challenges.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - Lafayette-Louisville-Boulder Protected Bikeway Feasibility Study				
Comment Map	Aljoana Gilmore		I support this project.	This is a much much needed project
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	There are very few high comfort connections between our cities. This would be a welcome improvement.
Comment Map	Barb Parnell		I support this project.	Baseline seems to make the most sense. Arapahoe is already problematic in terms of an insufficient shoulder. S. Boulder Rd is very busy. Baseline feeds directly into the East Boulder bike path, from there you can pick up the rest of the bike infrastructure in Boulder.
Comment Map	Charles Danforth		I support this project.	Riding on Arapaho is one of the scariest things I've ever done on a bike. Very narrow/non-existant shoulders, high speed traffic, lots of blind intersections... a dedicated bike lane there between 75th and US287 would be a game-changer. South Boulder Road and Baseline aren't too bad as a cyclist/commuter (though could always be improved).
Comment Map	David Blankinship		I support this project.	I am greatly in support of this project. Although I think that the bike shoulders on Baseline Rd. and South Boulder Rd. are sufficient for many riders, many younger and newer riders in Boulder County are not comfortable riding next to traffic without a protected bike lane or bike path. It would amazing if we could find a way to follow especially the Baseline Rd. corridor (as it already tends to get the majority of the bikers because of the slower speeds and more peaceful setting). If possible, we should look at leveraging any public land along the route (especially if it is ends up following a more northerly corridor near the South Teller Farm trailhead). Also, if possible, it would be great to have a narrow soft surface trail along the path for running. Quite simply, I see this as a great way to support commuting alternatives and bringing the communities of Boulder, Louisville, and Lafayette closer together. I would strongly recommend that Arapahoe Rd. between Teller Farm and 95th St. be included for bikeway improvements even if it isn't the primary means of getting from Boulder to Lafayette and Louisville. The Teller Farm trail is a wonderful gravel trail and unfortunately getting there from the south and east involves riding west on Arapahoe for about 1.5 miles where there is no shoulder. Also, another thing that would be great to see if a north/south connector from Baseline to Arapahoe to connect to Teller Farm from the south.
Comment Map	Donovan Forbes		I support this project.	Better bikeways make cycling a viable transport option and can reduce VMT.
Comment Map	Joshua Brown		I support this project.	This is a much needed improvement to connect our cities for cyclists who prefer a high-comfort, protected bike route.
Comment Map	Lara Van Matre		I support this project.	I vote for Baseline or S. Boulder Rd as Arapahoe is the longest continous E-W corridor, and already the least safe and comfortable. The project could deflect car traffic to Arapahoe and slow traffic along Baseline or S. Boulder Rd, which already have some stretches of comfortable safe bike throughfare.
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	C4C has committed to contribute to Boulder County $5000 to this project. Such facilities will reduce serious injuries and deaths among cyclists to effectively zero and they will preserve or improve livability in Boulder County.
Comment Map	Mike Francis	Self	I support this project.	I support this project!
Comment Map	Rachel Plessing		I support this project.	The high speeds and volumes of traffic make Araphoe, South Boulder, and (certain parts) of Baseline make the roads feel unfriendly for traveling by bicycle. While the shoulders on Baseline and South Boulder in undeveloped areas feel safer, the speed of traffic is always a factor. I've had a handful of close calls with cars drifting onto the shoulder (whether intentionally or inadvertently) on South Boulder Road west of McCaslin, an area that I consider the safest section of South Boulder. Additionally further protection/infrastruction connecting these roatds in the north/south direction in the area of 95th would be appreciated.
Comment Map	Veronica Martinez		I support this project.	Improving bike connections between these cities would be a wonderful improvement. There aren’t many safe options currently.
Comment Map	Will silvia		I support this project.	

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - Longmont to Boulder (LOBO) Trail - Jay Road Connection Multimodal Improvements				
Email	Alexey Davies	Community Cycles Advocacy Committee	I support this project.	Community Cycles believes this improvement to Jay Rd. in particular is desperately needed for one of the last existing gaps of the LoBo Trail. Many people want to ride from Gunbarrel to central Boulder and this is the primary route. It also is a crucial connection for Longmont to Boulder bicycling. But Jay Road is quite busy and has high speeds. We were all devastated by the death of cyclists hit on Jay Road not long ago. So we very much need a safe off-street separated path along this stretch. This is perhaps the most important road improvement currently proposed by the county. The enhanced intersection at Jay and Spine is critical as well. The ADA improvements to five transit stops along Jay Road and Spine Road plus the Pedestrian/bicycle safety and accessibility improvements to the intersection of Jay Road and Spine Road support active transportation.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Having spent some time biking on Jay road, this would be a much safer and comfortable experience and a great connection to these neighborhoods.
Comment Map	Astrid Maute		I support this project.	I used to commute by bike to my workplace in Boulder. However I have not done it for years. Jay Rd during rush hour is too busy and cars are too close for my comfort. It is stressful. I also do not allow my kids to bike to Boulder because of this missing piece in the LoBo trail. Years ago, the community was asked for input and like many we went to the meeting at Celestial seasoning. The only measure which came out of this was a slightly wider bike lane and a crossing to cottontail trail but nothing else to warn cars they cross into the bike lane. I hope this time it will be different.
Comment Map	Conor Canaday		I support this project.	This section of the LoBo trail is by far the weakest as far as encouraging commuters to travel by bike. I generally feel safe biking on roads and this stretch still feels intimidating to me. I support this effort for its small scope and high ROI.
Comment Map	David Blankinship		I support this project.	This trail connector would help complete the LoBo trail by filling in an obvious gap between Boulder and Longmont. There are some alternative gravel routes along the railroad right now, but this would be a much more formalized trail that would be accessible to more users.
Comment Map	Elaine C. Erb		I support this project.	As a regular bike commuter along the LoBo path between Niwot and Boulder, this area is the most stressful section of the commute. These enhancements will improve the comfort, safety, and appeal to other cyclists for this travel option
Comment Map	Evan Kalina		I support this project.	I ride Jay Road every day to commute to/from work on my bike. It is the most dangerous part of my 8-mile bike commute. A colleague told me that "[she] doesn't ride her bike to work because Jay Road is a death trap." The speed and volume of traffic on this road are simply too great for the on-street bike lanes to be safe. Also, in the winter, snow is plowed into the bike lanes and persists for weeks, turning them into narrow, icy, high-consequence fall zones if a rider were to fall alongside traffic. The south part of Spine Road, which I also ride every day, isn't much better and suffers from many of the same problems that Jay does, albeit with a lighter traffic volume. This project means a lot to me because it would allow me to get off of these dangerous sections of road and onto much safer multi-use paths and trails. I truly believe it would make cycling between Boulder and Gunbarrel much more approachable for new riders. Please help us stay safe out there by funding this project.
Comment Map	Jan Borstein		I support this project.	The proposed work would add a much needed section of the LOBO trail, providing a safer, smoother connection between Gunbarrel and Boulder. I live near 75th and Jay so frequently cycle on Jay Rd. and the LOBO trail. I use my bike to run errands and for recreation. A dedicated bike path would make riding along Jay Rd. safer and encourage more riders. Many of my neighbors say they won't ride on Jay Road because of the volume and speed of traffic. The proposed improvement for turning left from Jay onto Spine would also make that interscetion safer. Thank you.
Comment Map	Karen Doyle	resident	I support this project.	This will greatly improve cyclists and ped safety and help to get more active transportation.
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	C4C has committed to contribute to Boulder County $5000 to this project. Such facilities will reduce serious injuries and deaths among cyclists to effectively zero and they will preserve or improve livability in Boulder County.
Comment Map	R.K.		I support this project.	I ride LoBo a lot and this area is always the place I'm afraid I'll get hit. This would significantly improve a big safety problem on LoBo.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - SH-119 Bikeway: Airport Rd. to Hover St.				
Email	Alexey Davies	Community Cycles Advocacy Committee	I support this project.	It is called "The Diagonal" for good reason. No other route connects these communities so effectively. We are happy and proud that our local and state governments have prioritized the addition of a separated and thus protected route for bicycling and pedestrian travel in the corridor that will be maintained for year-round use. Good plans have been developed! Specifically, this project's proposal of a separated bike facility and the infrastructure required to safely and directly travel from Airport Road to Street where it will connect into the City of Longmont's multiuse path system.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Connecting Boulder to Longmont via safe bikeways would be a great project to increase regional connectivity.
Comment Map	Conor Canaday		I support this project.	I support this effort in addition to the BRT effort. This area may experience increased growth and commuter traffic over the coming years and having infrastructure to keep cyclists off of 119 is a benefit to all.
Comment Map	David Schwartz		I support this project.	A safer cycling link from Boulder to Longmont is a terrific asset.
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Generally, C4C supports Boulder County's leading Transportation Master Plan due to its network, multi-modal approach that addresses our greatest challenges.
Comment Map	Mitch Petz		I support this project.	
Comment Map	R. K.		I support this project.	Please build this!! I would bike this way far more often if a protected bike path were available.
Comment Map	Sandee		I support this project.	This bikeway is long overdue! It will give Boulder-Longmont commuters another option, along with recreational cyclists. It will be much more safe than riding on the shoulder of SH119.
Comment Map	Peter Crampton		I have concerns about this project.	The SH-119 BRT should be a higher priority than the bikeway. Will increase ridership and addresse a need for more vulnerable community groups.
Comment Map	dave hoerath/longmont	private citizen	I am opposed to this project.	Why build a trail parallel to the existing LOBO trail that goes the same places?

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - SH-119 Bikeway: Foothills Pkwy. to Jay Rd.				
Email	Alexey Davies	Community Cycles Advocacy Committee	I support this project.	This project's proposal of a separated bike facility and the infrastructure required to safely and directly travel from Boulder to Jay Road.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	This will be a great connector to help complete the bike network in NE Boulder and for folks in Longmont.
Comment Map	Andrew Nawrocki		I support this project.	I very much support this project and the rest of the Boulder/Longmont bikeway. My only concern is the southern terminus of the bikeway, which appears to just end at the Pleasant View complex. The bicycle connections here are quite poor, especially for those trying to connect to the Foothills path directly south. There should be an underpass to enable bikes and pedestrians to get across Foothills safely and efficiently given the very high vehicle speeds here. It feels like a missed opportunity to not incorporate a connection to the Foothills path.
Comment Map	Conor Canaday		I support this project.	I support this effort in addition to the BRT effort. This area may experience increased growth and commuter traffic over the coming years and having infrastructure to keep cyclists off of 119 is a benefit to all.
Comment Map	David Schwartz		I support this project.	This is an important part of the bike connection between Boulder and Longmont.
Comment Map	Elaine C. Erb		I support this project.	Being able to bike along the CO 119 would make my bike commute to Boulder shorter and faster. The corridor has become too treacherous to ride on the road leaving me with a meandering commute on soft surface trails that become inaccessible when covered in snow. This corridor serves bike commuters, recreational cyclists who may want to access roads to the north, and serves as a regional connection. We very much need this improvement! Future transit plans also call for fewer stops between Boulder and Longmont. The bikeway can help connect to areas that may not have ready transit access
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Generally, C4C supports Boulder County's leading Transportation Master Plan due to its network, multi-modal approach that addresses our greatest challenges.
Comment Map	Mitch Petz		I support this project.	
Comment Map	R.K.		I support this project.	Please build this!! I would bike this way far more often if a protected bike path were available.
Comment Map	Peter Crampton		I have concerns about this project.	The SH-119 BRT should be a higher priority than the bikeway. Will increase ridership and address a need for more vulnerable community groups.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - SH-119 Bikeway: Niwot Rd. to Airport Rd.				
Email	Alexey Davies	Community Cycles Advocacy Committee	I support this project.	This project's proposal of a separated bike facility leaving Niwot BRT and the infrastructure required to safely and directly travel from Niwot to Airport Road. This will provide great multimodal connections to and from the Niwot Road BRT station.
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	This would be a great project to better connect Boulder to Longmont via safe bikeways. It will be a very well used route.
Comment Map	Conor Canaday		I support this project.	I support this effort in addition to the BRT effort. This area may experience increased growth and commuter traffic over the coming years and having infrastructure to keep cyclists off of 119 is a benefit to all.
Comment Map	David Schwartz		I support this project.	An important link for cyclists!
Comment Map	Elaine C. Erb		I support this project.	The CO 119 bikeway is desperately needed. I ride from Niwot to Boulder as well as Niwot to Longmont. Even if I ride Niwot to Hygiene, this option helps me make a lovely loop ride. I have had to stop riding along the Diagonal due to the increased speed and aggressiveness of drivers. This is a much needed connection that helps connect our communities.
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Generally, C4C supports Boulder County's leading Transportation Master Plan due to its network, multi-modal approach that addresses our greatest challenges.
Comment Map	R. K.		I support this project.	Please build this!! I would bike this way far more often if a protected bike path were available.
Comment Map	Sandee		I support this project.	This bikeway is long overdue! It will give Boulder-Longmont commuters another option, along with recreational cyclists.
Comment Map	Peter Crampton		I have concerns about this project.	The SH-119 BRT should be a higher priority than the bikeway. Will increase ridership and addresse a need for more vulnerable community groups.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - SH-93 Bikeway Feasibility Study: SH-170 to Jefferson County Line				
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	This is a large missing gap in multimodal connectivity between cities in the region. Would be a welcome improvement as biking on the shoulder here is currently very unsafe.
Comment Map	Charles Danforth		I support this project.	Biking along CO93 has improved over the years, but it is still one of the scarier sections of roadway I use. Protecting this stretch of highway would be a great benefit for a small price.
Email	Charlie Mye	Bike Jeffco	I support this project.	•The plan for this bikeway from the Jefferson County line to Marshall Rd in Boulder County will provide the impetus for the other jurisdictions to fill in the bike routing gaps for development of a well connected regional bike route network. •Once the bikeway is extended out to reach Golden and the town of Boulder, then this will be an even more amazing regional transportation and recreational corridor serving the Front Range. •The area has examples of well designed bikeways paralleling highways such as the Genesee / El Rancho Bikeway parallel to I-70, and the 36 Bikeway which move cyclists safely to popular destinations. The SH 93 Bikeway would serve a very large population with the potential for a high level of use for commuting as well as recreation. •The potential for making important connections with other planned bikeways has the makings of a cycling network that could be showcased nationally. Other bikeways could include: the Boulder/Lyons Bikeway being planned, the popular 36 Bikeway, local bike routes and multi-use paths. •Safety: Although SH 93 does have shoulders between Golden and Boulder, it is unrideable for most cyclists given the high volume of motorized traffic reaching speeds of well over 55 mph. This bikeway along with the connections to other bikeways and routes will enhance the level of safety for cyclists. •This project is so important because it will provide the impetus for the region to really get serious about putting together a connected cycling network.
Comment Map	Conor Canaday		I support this project.	This area feels like an accident waiting to happen between cyclists and motorists. I fully support completing this feasibility study.
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I support this project.	Highway 93 is popular - and terrifying - on a bike. Heck, it is terrifying in a car. Reducing the risks of travelling this popular road in any transportation/recreation mode should be pursued.
Comment Map	Kirk McGahey		I support this project.	
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	C4C has committed to contribute to Boulder County $5000 to this project. Such facilities will reduce serious injuries and deaths among cyclists to effectively zero and they will preserve or improve livability in Boulder County.
Email	Michael Raber		I support this project.	As a League of American Bicyclists nationally certified Instructor LCI #4404 teaching safe, enjoyable, and legal bicycling. I strongly support the proposed study completion of the CO 93 bike connection from the intersection of CO 93 and CO 170 (Marshall Road) south to the Jefferson County line as it would provide a safer & more bicycle friendly connection between Boulder County and Jefferson County. The current connection requires cycling on the shoulder of Highway 93 which has become more challenging with the increase in motor vehicle traffic, speed, and weather conditions. The project is consistent with the WestConnect Coalition PEL Study, Boulder County Transportation Master Plan 2020 update, and the Denver Regional Active Transportation Plan
Comment Map	Mike Francis	Self	I support this project.	I strongly support this project! Biking this section of 93 is very dangerous as car commuters speed by. We need a carfree safe path from Golden to Boulder.
Comment Map	Rob Guinn		I support this project.	There is no alternative to SH 93 for travel along the Front Range between Boulder and Golden. SH 93 desperately needs cycling improvements, and Jefferson County should coordinate on the project. With ample land, almost zero buildings and few intersections it would be cheap, allow commuters the option to cycle to work and save lives. All the other proposals have alternative roads or some existing cycling infrastructure, and 93 improvements should be the top of the list, since there is nothing at all, apart from a glass and debris filled shoulder.
Comment Map	Stefano Prezioso		I support this project.	A protected shoulder/multi-use path would improve safety for drivers and cyclists in an already well-trafficked area by both drivers and recreationalists. I support this project.
Email	Stephen Selle	Monday Riders Cyclist Group	I support this project.	CO 93 is the major gap in connecting existing and planned bicycle infrastructure in Boulder County and Jefferson County. CO 93 is tier 1 CDOT high demand corridor but due to the volume and speed of motorized traffic CO 93 is essentially unrideable by all but the most fearless riders. Completing the CO 93 bike connection from the intersection of CO 93 and CO 170 (Marshall Road) south to the Jefferson County line would provide a safe and comfortable connection bicycle between Boulder County and Jefferson County. The feasibility study will identify a preferred alignment and preliminary construction cost, the first step in completing this important bicycle connection. The project is consistent with the WestConnect Coalition PEL Study, Boulder County Transportation Master Plan 2020 update, and the Denver Regional Active Transportation Plan
Comment Map	Will silvia		I support this project.	

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - South Boulder Rd. BRT Study: SH-7 & 119th St. to Broadway & Table Mesa Dr.				
Comment Map	Ash Tribble		I support this project.	I support this project because it will provide greater access, especially for those living in Lafayette and Louisville, to Boulder's job market. Many people have to commute to Boulder to go to their jobs, and helping to increase access, especially multimodal access, will lead to decreased traffic and lower injury crashes.
Comment Map	KF		I support this project.	
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	I support this project.	Generally, C4C supports Boulder County's leading Transportation Master Plan due to its network, multi-modal approach that addresses our greatest challenges.
Comment Map	Sandee		I support this project.	This will provide much needed infrastructure for people who in-commute into Boulder. It will allow more people to take BRT and bike rather than cars.
Comment Map	Shana Johnson		I support this project.	I think it's great to study potential BRT improvements to S. Boulder Rd, however, the current DASH routing through downtown Louisville is anything but BRT-like. You don't take the bus off a major arterial (S. Boulder) through a low-speed, vehicle constrained space (downtown Louisville) if your goal is to improve transit travel times. People WILL make their way to the route if the bus is more competitive with driving. There's a ton of development going along S. Boulder too, including infill the old Louisville cyclery spot, DELO, etc. If you want to combat the idea that buses are slow, you have to actually make them fast. Revolutionary!!!
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	Barb Parnell - resident		I have concerns about this project.	Since the HWY 36 project, I associate BRT with toll roads, can you please make it clear as to whether or not a given BRT project involves toll roads or not. It it does for this project, then I do not support the project. Rather our roads should remain completely publically owned and paid through via our taxes.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Boulder County - Southeast Boulder County SuperFlex Demand Response Transit Service				
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Great to see more transit flex-ride services available.
Comment Map	Amelia Groves	Boulder County HHS	I support this project.	I work with older adults who live in Louisville and transportation is a huge barrier for people to access healthcare, grocery shopping, social services, and so on. Programs like Flex Ride are wonderful but one generally can't leave that city. Lafayette, Louisville, and Erie are home to services accessed by residents of all three cities so it would be a huge benefit to make those accessible to everyone. Traditional buses are valuable but are not fully accessible due to time schedules, lack of sidewalks and safe road crossings, and the final leg of the trip from the bus stop to destination not being covered. A SuperFlex system will open up southeast Boulder County even more for a wide variety of users.
Comment Map	Connie Grosshans		I support this project.	This would be a tremendous addition to seniors like myself who have mobility issues. I would support this 100%. I would also help promote it in any way I can.
Comment Map	Ellie Carlson	Colorado Commission for Deaf, Hard-of-Hearing and Deafblind.	I support this project.	Funding this project will provide increased access to employment, medical care, education and recreation for individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing, and deafblind in Southeast Boulder County. The deafblind population in particular is at high risk for isolation; demand response transit service in combination with orientation and mobility training offers a solution.
Comment Map	Gary and Carol Cox		I support this project.	We support the expansion of these on-demand services which are so needed by so many.
Comment Map	Jenny Bux		I support this project.	I support this because I haven't had a car since 2017 and FlexRide and Ride Free have been a real help. The upgrade to the software would help the drivers and eliminate some of the confusion and the ability to see their rides. I use this service a lot for doctor's appointments in Lafayette (I live in Louisville). I like that there would be more coordination between the services.
Comment Map	Jill Bilek	TRU PACE	I support this project.	This would be a wonderful addition for the participants who live in different local communities to keep in touch and not have to worry about finding transportation outside of their individual locations.
Comment Map	Karen Haffnieter		I support this project.	Seniors in Lafayette and Louisville need reliable transportation for basic living needs (grocery shopping, doctor's appointments, etc.) Many seniors can no longer afford to keep their cars and need an alternative mode of transportation that allows them to continue to live an independent and active life.
Comment Map	Kathi Gallagher		I support this project.	I live in a Senior Housing facility in Lafayette and I use the public mass transit system and I would especially welcome a way to get from my housing to the nearest light rail connection at Eastlake and 124th! The Park and ride bus location in Lafayette, as well as locations in Lafayette, Louisville and Boulder would also be helpful.
Comment Map	Kelly Reynolds	BCHHS	I support this project.	I work with in BC Senior Housing and we have many seniors who need more transportation available in Lafayette and Louisville. Free Ride has been great, but does not begin to cover the need. Adding more buses and more flexibility would be well utilized by our seniors.
Comment Map	Lara Van Matre	Sister Carmen Community Center	I support this project.	I support this project both as a resident of SE BOCO, an employee of a family resource center serving many individuals who rely on insufficient pubic transportation, a parent of children who cannot drive and teens who shouldn't, the daughter of an older adult who soon will need ways to get around that don't depend on her driving, a citizen of the world who realizes that we cannot continue as a society to prioritize cars over public transit. Programs like superflex cover the gaps in our current impoverished public transportation service, and pave the way for acceptance of and funding for more comprehensive service in the future.
Email	Matt Muir	Cyclists 4 Community	Support	Generally, C4C supports Boulder County's leading Transportation Master Plan due to its network, multi-modal approach that addresses our greatest challenges.
Comment Map	Natalie Lydon-Eikel	Center for People with Disabilities	I support this project.	Transportation is a huge need in our community, specifically accessible and on-time services, to help those who do not have other options.
Comment Map	Patricia Rice		I support this project.	I support this very important project because it helps people to get to the places they need to go without limitations. This is wonderful for everyone, whether they have a car or not.
Comment Map	Terri Bashans		I support this project.	As a middle aged person with disabilities living on a fixed income in Lafayette, I find it extremely difficult to get around. Ride free Lafayette is wonderful but as gas prices rise, the ridership has as well making it hard to use for timed appointments. Then if dr appts are in Longmont or Boulder, one is out of luck. And the cost of using Lyft and Uber has for me been up to $44 one way to Longmont. It is imperative for a healthy community to have its lower income seniors and people with disabilities involved. We need to have a way to stay connected and active, it is vital for us as individuals and as a diverse place to live. Thank you, Yerri Bashans
Comment Map	x Jan Kariya		I support this project.	I am a disabled senior living in Lafayette. I do not have reliable transportation and have found it difficult to use the current available public transportation. We do not have a bus stop near our house and it is too far to walk for me. Any added services to the current public transportation will be helpful.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Erie - Erie FlexRide Service				
Comment Map	Allen Cowgill		I support this project.	Great to see direct funding for transit services.
Comment Map	Josh		I support this project.	Please consider pedestrian and bike safety and connectedness when considering all projects!
Comment Map	Lara		I have concerns about this project.	I support this project as we definitely need more public transit options in Erie, but want to make sure it actually satisfies constiuents needs. There are only a handful of morning and afternoon buses that go to Boulder... nothing that runs continuously or on Sundays... which is not condusive to many folks lifestyles. Also, it would be great to have a routine public transit option that goes from Erie to Lafayette... and then a bus that routinely goes to the furthest north subway stop in Thornton.
Comment Map	Heather		I have concerns about this project.	Erie needs all the roads wider; especially Highway 7 and Erie Parkway to I-25. It can take 30 minutes, to go a few miles during peak times. How about a bike trail from Erie to Boulder, as Baseline and Arapahoe Roads from Erie to Boulder are still only one lane, and traffic is a nightmare in those directions too? When all this growth happens, how come the cities never widen the roads?
Comment Map			I have concerns about this project.	Our first priority should be to widen Baseline/Highway 7. I dont see that project here. Broomfield, especially, is building in every piece of land the city oversees and nothing has been done to make 7 serviceable.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Longmont - SH-119 BAT Lanes: Nelson Rd. to Pratt Pkwy. - Design				
Comment Map	Conor Canaday		I support this project.	I support this effort.
Comment Map	Peter Crampton		I support this project.	I ride the BOLT along this road frequently. Totally agree with the need for dedicated transit lanes and signal priority. Presume this is a first step for the SH-119 BRT, which is desperately needed.
Comment Map			I support this project.	

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Longmont - SH-66 Multi-use Path: Hover St. to Main St./US-287				
Comment Map	Conor Canaday		I support this project.	This area is going to see increased development and a project such as this will become gradually harder to complete. Right now, I don't know if a safe way to traverse the same geographic area as a cyclist or pedestrian.
Comment Map	David Schwartz		I support this project.	This would be an important improvement for the flow of pedestrians, cyclists, joggers, etc, through an increasingly busy area of town and improve connection in this area.
Comment Map	Karen Doyle	resident	I support this project.	This should greatly improve safety and connectivity along a busy highway and corridor to Rocky Mtn National Park, which is Colorado's premiere destination.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Longmont - US-287 & 21st Ave. Bike/Ped Underpass				
Comment Map	David Schwartz		I support this project.	I come through this area regularly and it would make a big difference in safety and ease. I am especially thinking about youth I know who depend on the paths to get around this side of town.
Comment Map	Leslie Cantu		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Rachel Moyer	N/A	I support this project.	I live right near this intersection and use it every. I am very interested in biking to work but safety is a concern for me, so I highly support this project.
Comment Map	William Singel	N/A	I support this project.	I also live near this intersection and would love to see it more accessible for walking and biking.
Comment Map	Peter Crampton		I am opposed to this project.	I live in this neighborhood, and bike & walk along 21st regularly. Safety is the least of my concerns along this stretch of road with the minimal volume of traffic involved; and certainly not enough of a concern to build an underpass. Money would be better spent on the SH-119 BRT.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Louisville - SH-42 & South St. Bike/Ped Underpass				
Comment Map	Mike Francis	Self	I support this project.	I support this project!
Comment Map	Charles Danforth		I have concerns about this project.	While I would love to see this, I am concerned about the pricetag, the relative benefit per $, and the connectivity options. There is already a stoplight and crosswalk one block north at Short Street where the connections eastward are obvious (Centaurus HS, open space, ballfields) which has been a great improvement. Rather than a very expensive underpass at South Street adjacent to functioning pedestrian infrastructure and leading nowhere, I would rather see a crosswalk/stoplight at Griffith and improved pedestrian opportunities at Pine/CO42... for a tiny fraction of the proposed $9M pricetag.
Comment Map	David Blankinship		I have concerns about this project.	In principle, this is a great project that would provide more connectivity to Old Town Louisville from the Lafayette side. However, the cost of $9 million (which is almost certainly to go higher with inflation) is very steep for this given that there is nice signaled crossing of Highway 42 there right now and the Coal Creek Trail underpass is there not far to the south. I think that the scope of the project should be refined to bring down the cost and minimize the disruption to the traffic flow on the west side of Highway 42. Voters in Louisville were rather clear in fall 2021 that they are reluctant to spend taxpayer money on underpasses and we need to be very diligent to make sure that we tackle the highest project projects and keep them streamlined if we decide to move forward with any.
Comment Map	M. christiansen		I have concerns about this project.	I have to concur with Mr, Blankinship's comments dated 2/8 and 2/12. It is vital to support the residents of Louisville who rejected the underpasses via voting. I believe it is important to shift the focus to Hwy 42 and West pine street where there are increased traffic in both bicyclists and pedestrians present. In order to promote healthy lifestyle, sustainability and environmental atmosphere, we can create trails/pathways connecting to the existing trails leading to Old town Louisville. It is most cost effectiveness and there is no need to create conveniences or laziness.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Louisville - Via Appia Way Multimodal Improvements: South Boulder Rd. to McCaslin Blvd.				
Comment Map	Kenyon Moon		I support this project.	Yes, I support this
Comment Map	Mike Francis	Self	I support this project.	I support this project!
Comment Map	Alex	N/A	I am opposed to this project.	3 million dollars to experiment with Dutch-style buffered bike lanes. This is a project for wealthy Louisville residents to pat themselves on the back about how great they are. 1. Via Appia has several protected pedestrian crossings already, each with protected pedestrian refuge islands. 2. Louisville has an incredibly well-connected paved trail system already. 3. Via Appia is a low traffic street. 4. Via Appia is a low speed street. 5. Via Appia has well maintained sidewalks on both sides for the entire length of the road. 6. Via Appia doesn't connect to any major employment centers or high density residential areas. 7. Want to make a difference in Louisville? Do this on McCaslin or S. Boulder or Hwy 42, which actually pose dangers to cyclists and connect to employment centers. 8. Drivers will be frustrated, drive faster, and make riskier decisions. This will decrease pedestrian safety. 9. Via Appia is in a high fire risk area. 4 lanes is crucial for speedy evacuations.
Email	Alex Bullen		I am opposed to this project.	I do not support the project for several reasons. 1. Pedestrian crossings, refuge islands, sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike lanes already exist on Via Appia. All are very well maintained. 2. Via Appia is an evacuation and emergency vehicle route. Reducing lanes reduces the roadway's capacity for both crucial safety functions. In the wake of the Marshall Fire rebuild, reducing the roadway capacity would be a terrible PR move. 3. Via Appia is a low speed, low volume road. Drivers on it are local and very respectful of pedestrians, moreso than most places in the area. 4. Buffered bike lanes are great and I wish we had more of them. But, a small time roadway like Via Appia is not the place to put them. There's no problem to solve. Put them on McCaslin, Hwy 42, S Boulder Road - all of which have high speeds, high volume, employment centers, high density residential, and RTD connectivity. 5. As mentioned above, Via Appia has no employment centers or high density residential. Cyclists would still have to connect on dangerous roads.
Comment Map	Amy Keuhlen		I am opposed to this project.	I live off Via Appia and it is already challenging to turn left out of my neighborhood towards South Boulder Road with two lanes of traffic. I think reducing the lanes and increasing the width of bike lanes will make it even more challenging to turn left in this crucial spot and require a Uturn somewhere else with the amount of traffic on Via Appia every day. Without installation of a 4 way stop or light at Lafayette, as well as other intersections along Via Appia, I think this can only make the congestion and flow of traffic worse.
Comment Map	Charles Danforth		I am opposed to this project.	I am a frequent cyclist around Louisville and find this stretch of Via Appia to be one of the least scary of our major roads. Bike lanes/shoulders are sufficient and comfortable. Reducing lanes and adding other traffic control measures (such as was done on Hoover and Cherry) are going to make cycling significantly less safe. Furthermore, the pricetag ($3M) is vastly out of proportion to any potential gain. That money could be much better used on other important infrastructure projects or protected bike lanes along other city or county roads (CO42 or South Boulder Road, for instance).
Comment Map	David Blankinship		I am opposed to this project.	This project is not a good use of money and is an over-reach of some of the recommendations in the City of Louisville's 2019 transportation master plan. There was a methodical public input process that went into the creation of this document and it seems to be a knock at the process to decide to implement aspects of the Via Appia rework that were not called for in the project. There were multimodal improvements recommended, but nowhere did it state in the plan that the road should be reduced from 4 lanes to 2 lanes. Other concerns I have are related to egress of fire engines at the fire station on Via Appia. Louisville residents are very sensitive to fire-related issues just over a year after the Marshall Fire and anything that would make it more difficult to fire engines to get to a fire would be ill-advised. Also, the main concern that I personally hear when it comes to Via Appia is the Pine & Via Appia intersection. Let's focus on that and, in needed, look at a roundabout there. One other aspect of this proposed project that I wanted to point out is that the stretch of Via Appia already has nice sidewalks on either side of the road that cyclists can use if they don't feel comfortable in traffic. I think that between the sidewalks and the on-street bike lanes there are opportunities for cyclists to go where they prefer based on their comfort level. Quite simply, it doesn't seem like a good use of over $3 million.
Comment Map	Steven Smith		I am opposed to this project.	This project is on a vital roadway for emergency vehicles, with both a police and fire station. It will block critical responders. It is also unnecessary-- I am not sure who the intended audience is as it does not connect services well. There are already good biking lanes, trails through the open space and walk/bike infastructure here. This would be a waste of funds in addition to making the community less safe by slowing down response times when emergency vehicles cannot get around cars.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Superior - McCaslin Multi-Use Underpass north of Rock Creek Pkwy				
Comment Map	Abby Krolick		I support this project.	This would feel a lot safer to pedestrians and bikers versus crossing McCaslin. I think it would increase foot/bike traffic as well. The average speed on McCaslin has definitely increased over the last few years - it feels like cars are drag racing either down the hill or up the hill. Additionally, the pedestrian crossings at either end of the roundabout at the bottom of the hill are terribly placed - esp given the speeds - maybe those would work on a slower road, slower roundabout, but you cannot have those crossings at either end of a highspeed road & roundabout. An underpass would help reduce risk of someone getting hit by a car.
Comment Map	Amanda Vaughan	Superior Resident	I support this project.	I walk this area daily and would love a better way to cross there. Current underpasses in different locations in town get a lot of use.
Comment Map	Andrew Vaughan		I support this project.	I support this project. As Downtown Superior continues to build out and hundreds of new homes are added, an increasing number of new residents will want to walk and ride to the open space on the west side of McCaslin. This underpass would be safer and more convenient than crossing at the roundabout to the north or at the light with Rock Creek to the south, which is up a huge hill. The reality is that, without a safe crossing like this, people will continue to approach McCaslin from Tract H (now the "Vista Corridor Open Space") and then jaywalk across McCaslin at a place where traffic tends to be moving pretty fast down the hill.
Comment Map	Anonymous		I support this project.	Strong supporter of this project. The Boulder County Sheriff office has expressed concerns about the number of people crossing between Tract H and the OR trailhead. Given the number of homes being built in Downtown, all residents should have safe access to the huge amount of Boulder County Open Space. We should encourage safe access for pedestrians instead of telling them to "go over there to cross safely." That "cars first" mentality is why Superior has the absolute worst pedestrian crossing areas...50% of drivers totally ignore the flashing yellow lights on lower speed roads - with people doing well over 50 MPH on McCaslin (which is a 4 lane road), there is no way way that a blinkly yellow light and "cars must yield" signs are going to have any effect. Comments like that again put the onus on the pedestrian to find a safe passage rather than protect them from 5,000 lb metal machines
Comment Map	Arik Klingensmith		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Ben Miller		I support this project.	This project would provide a safe connection for the many students in Original Town/Sagamore who are zoned for the Monarch elementary/middle/high campus. The alternative is crossing a 40mph, 5-lane arterial at-grade.
Comment Map	Ben Schy		I support this project.	I have been wishing for this for years! This will make the beautiful open space much more accessible and serve as a great walk/bike corridor from Rock Creek to old town Superior.
Comment Map	Brian Shucker		I support this project.	Besides improving access to the open space to the west, this underpass creates a no-traffic-conflict route between the Rock Creek neighborhood and the entire bike path network to the north. Going from one traffic crossing to zero is a big deal; it opens things up for kids, people with pets, cyclists who avoid traffic, etc.
Comment Map	Brian Yost		I support this project.	I think this is a good idea and warranted at this location. I don't feel a crosswalk or median cut would be sufficient especially on the east side (cars going northbound) as the sight lines are not good because of the steep hill decline and people travel very fast there. Underpass would be much more safe.
Comment Map	Bruce Cecil		I support this project.	We are seniors living roughly a half mile from this crossing on mccaslin. We would love to have this underpass for walking and biking. We regularly walk our dog along the connector along the north end of tract H and we would appreciate not having to go up to rock creek and crossing mccaslin there, where we are always a little concerned that drivers ignore the traffic lights. We think the younger folks who express concerns about getting their children across mccaslin have an even more important concern. While we are a small community, the traffic on mccaslin is very often not local.
Comment Map	Chris L.		I support this project.	I am a resident of Superior and I fully support this project. I will soon relocate extremely close to this particular location of Superior and having an underpass would really make the area that much more walkable between downtown and several residential areas. There is absolutely a need for this and it fits very well within the overall vision for the new downtown area currently under development.
Comment Map	Cora Bracho-Troconis		I support this project.	Mc Caslin Bv is very busy and this pass will be great to get to the trail head wirh not risk. Now people cross the street i. The middle once they realize that the two emplacements to get across the street are too far away. I support this project!
Comment Map	Daniel Solorzano	Superior Resident	I support this project.	I support this project. Considering the high increase in population density, both pedestrian and automobile traffic will increase significantly in the coming years. It makes sense to construct safe access to the great open space area away from high-speed traffic (45MPH) on a very steep road.
Comment Map	Dann Kramer		I support this project.	This proposed underpass would be of great benefit, because the only alternative for crossing the busy Blvd. of McCaslin is a major intersection further to the south, and the intersection is very busy possibly prone to a pedestrian injury or worse. The underpass would also be very useful since it would connect a major trail system to the west with north Rock Creek and the new Downtown Superior area.
Comment Map	Dave Glynn	Resident	I support this project.	It's needed. I would use it.
Comment Map	David Baskett		I support this project.	Superior is developing a very good, safe off street trail system, but it is difficult to cross major four lane arteries. This is a needed safety project that would benefit bikes, pedestrians and vehicles on McCaslin.
Comment Map	David Blankinship		I support this project.	I know that this underpass project is strongly supported by the Superior open space advisory committee. I think that it make quite a bit of sense to facilitate the linking of the Dirty Bismarck loop on the west side of McCaslin to Downtown Superior and its new multiuse paths. As is the case of most underpasses, though, the cost is definitely of concern and we should do whatever is possible to keep the underpass as basic as possible for fiscal responsibility.
Comment Map	Debbie Jacobs		I support this project.	I have spent many years biking and riding the Superior and Rock Creek area. This underpass would provide a safe connection from one side of McCaslin to the other. Right now you have to go up to the stoplight at Rock Creek Parkway to safely cross even if you have come up neighborhood paths that do not go up to that intersection.
Comment Map	Debbie Yeats		I support this project.	Mccaslin road has become very busy and a multi use underpass is much needed for residents to safely tranverse from east to west. With all the new building west of McCaslin and the high density Downtown, a safe underpass connecting us is a high priority.
Comment Map	Emily Deardorff		I support this project.	I think this would be amazing! Yes, there are other areas for crossing, but this would keep pedestrians and cars separate and allow increased access between trails on the E and W sides of McCaslin. I would much prefer this to the crosswalk at the roundabout...that feels like an accident waiting to happen. This would allow for seamless movement across a busy street.
Comment Map	Eric Olson	Superior Resident	I support this project.	McCaslin Multi-Use Underpass north of Rock Creek Parkway is necessary for safety in our community.
Comment Map	Greg Holecek		I support this project.	I love walking my dog along this path, but McCaslin is too much of a psychological and physical barrier, so we never cross it. If you put this underpass in, we will easily venture out to the west. My dog and I would take advantage of this path on a weekly basis, as would a lot of walkers and bikers for decades to come.
Comment Map	Hollis Richardson		I support this project.	It's commonplace to see runners dashing across McCaslin in this area to get to the trails, and pedestrians and motorists alike would be much safer with an underpass at this location. An underpass is also the right solution to maintain the sight lines and vistas of the area.
Comment Map	James Merrion	Superior Resident	I support this project.	This is a fantastic idea and badly needed. The road is very steep there, making a flashing light crossing or other pedestrian cut-thru that requires traffic to stop very unfeasible. Cars in winter could not reliably stop for a pedestrian crossing at street level. As a parent, I do not allow my kids to venture over there without me currently as I am too concerned they may not cross at the light further away. With the road speeds and steep grades, this solution is the safest and best solution possible. Tying it into a location near the existing open space trails is brilliant.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Superior - McCaslin Multi-Use Underpass north of Rock Creek Pkwy				
Comment Map	Jason Fryda		I support this project.	This has potential to be a high volume crossing for both downtown and rock creek residents and I think the density of residents in the area now and in future warrants an underpass. Although I like lower dollar solutions, McCaslin Blvd design is such that it is too high speeds for A surface crossing
Comment Map	Jeff Isaacson		I support this project.	
Comment Map	Joe and Elizabeth Cirelli	Superior resident	I support this project.	McCaslin Blvd is going to see more and more traffic so an underpass would definitly make it safer for walkers and bikers to get to the open space trails west of McCaslin.
Comment Map	John Craven		I support this project.	This would be great. It would make it much easier and safer to get across McCaslin on foot/bike. I support this effort.
Comment Map	Kathryn Godfrey		I support this project.	As always, anything to improve auto traffic & benefit drivers, comes with a blank check. $6mil is small potatoes for a govt project, especially when $4.5mil is coming from a federal grant. That cost is worth the lives that could be saved from peds & bikes attempting to run & cycle through traffic to cross! Roundabouts are helpful for auto traffic, but drivers are navigating so much already, add bikes & peds & you have crashes waiting to happen. Flashing/APS crosswalks can be expensive, they do not separate peds & bikes from cars, which exposes them to danger & discomfort, especially crossing a busy arterial with a roundabout. I have a positive vision for this project & imagine my 8yo daughter & I riding to trails, pools, to school at Monarch, Miner's Park, the Community Center, & the regional trail system going east; easy access to between Downtown, Founder's park & the Marketplace; our Sagamore friends being able to travel by bike to join us Downtown for dinner & drinks, etc.
Comment Map	Kay Lynn Hartmann		I support this project.	Adding an underpass for McCaslin would encourage more open-space use AND be safer for biking to the main retail area (Target). It would also connect the new neighborhood to Superior pools. With the additional housing near downtown, McCaslin is getting busier so creating a safe crossing point makes a lot of sense. I oppose the yellow crossing lights in the middle of McCaslin. Either create the underpass, or encourage people to walk to the nearest stoplight/crossing area.
Comment Map	Kellie Ruse		I support this project.	Much needed to safely get from the western trails to the eastern trails.
Comment Map	Ken Lish		I support this project.	This infrastructure would provide a much safer means for pedestrians and cyclists to cross McCaslin between the Oerman Roche Trailhead and Tract H. What some comments seem to be missing is that a HAWK indicator or pedestrian refuge wouldn't be feasible in this location given the grade of the hill, the number of lanes, the volume of traffic, and the speed of traffic. The underpass seems to be the only feasible solution, despite it's cost.
Comment Map	Kevin Clinton		I support this project.	I use the Oerman-Roche trailhead extensively from Superior. This would go a long way toward increasing safety of pedestrians and riders in the area. The current road crossing is not safe or convenient. Bikes in the bike lane don't trigger the traffic light sensor, so without a car to 'escort' you across the road you need to pop 2 curbs (sometimes towing a kid), hit the pedestrian button and hope neither you nor your kids slide into traffic passing a few feet away at 50MPH while you wait. $6M seems ridiculously high, though. Did we get competitive quotes or just award to the highest bidder?
Comment Map	Libby Jones		I support this project.	I like the idea of an underpass at this location. Separates people from cars. It's a fast moving, busy area & only growing. Feel this may be the safest route to stop people vs vehicle accidents.
Comment Map	Linda Besen		I support this project.	I am a resident of Superior and would use this underpass all the time to get from my home to Purple Park. It would be safer and much more pleasant than using McCaslin to get there and back. Thank you.
Comment Map	Lindsay Boyle	N/A	I support this project.	There's no safe access today to continue on this commuter trail system, and people often run or ride across the roadway. It's dangerous, and an underpass would help tremendously!
Comment Map	Marcia Rehn		I support this project.	Above-ground crossing McCaslin is much too dangerous. Please picture in your mind a pedestrian trying to cross the steep hill in winter. The south-bound cars are gunning their engines to try to make it up the steep hill, and the north-bound cars are slipping and sliding all the way to the bottom of the hill. An underpass is the only safe solution. I'm all for fiscal responsibility, but I urge the decision-makers not to cut corners on the lighting installation in the new pedestrian/bike underpass. It is a perfect location for a colored neon light installation that this high-quality town can be proud of.
Comment Map	Mark and Nancy Berry		I support this project.	This would be a great way to link the existing trails to the east of McCaslin, within Rock Creek generally and Tract H specifically, to the Open Space trails to the west of McCaslin. At present one is required to go up the sidewalk to the light at Rock Creek Parkway, cross, then go back down to the trail head. This would be both safer and easier for hikers and bike riders.
Comment Map	Michael Taliaferro	Rock Creek Resident	I support this project.	I was walking over here just in the past couple days to scope out the proposed location of the underpass. Since there already exists drainage and flood mitigation at this spot, it should make it easier to build and connect Rock Creed to Old Town Superior better at a natural crossroads location; half way between Rock Creed and Old Town. Along with the connection to the trailhead right here it should be a win win for all but the people voicing concern over the price tag. I fully support this project and think it will be a very beneficial civil engineering project for decades to come!
Comment Map	Mike Francis	Self	I support this project.	This is the best project of all. I strongly support this project!!! Everytime I walk or bike across McCaslin in this area I feel like I'm playing a deadly game of frogger. Heading south on McCaslin, it starts from the side walk or bike lane. Then across two lanes of speeding traffic while fighting the uphilll go into the left turn lane towards Discovery Parkway. Then across two more even faster speeding lanes of traffic coming down the hill to finally get to the other side walk so that I can get to the Rock Creek underpass towards Purple Park. If anyone is coming in or out of Discovery Parkway, it's even more dangerous. This is the best $6M that can be spent!
Comment Map	Misti Gossett-Thrower		I support this project.	Great connection to other trails in Superior and Boulder County
Comment Map	Peggy Trainor		I support this project.	I run across McCaslin to get to Meadowlark Trail to run. I wholeheartedly support this as a safer means to cross!
Comment Map	Peter Ruprecht	NA	I support this project.	My family has lived in Superior west of McCaslin for 20 years. During that time we have found it very difficult to access the rest of the town on foot or bike because McCaslin is scary to cross: the only stoplights are at 4- or 6-lane-both-ways intersections and the new roundabout is suicidal for pedestrians. Especially with the new Downtown Superior amenities being built just east of McCaslin, we'd love a better way to cross that huge road without having to resort to driving all the time.
Comment Map	Rachael Bray		I support this project.	Nowhere near to cross busy McCaslin at that location. Much safer solution
Comment Map	Robert Besen		I support this project.	I am in favor of any project which encourages walking and biking and provides safe access to trails for all users, including differently abled residents. This underpass will add additional safe access between an extensive open space trail network and downtown Superior as well as the Rock Creek neighborhoods. I feel an underpass is always preferable to an at grade traffic controlled crossing.
Comment Map	Ruslan Dautkhanov		I support this project.	Would be great to move this project north somewhat though, closer to the new development area, and to the north of the Discovery Park, not south of it. Current position is too close to the lights crossing so not so valuable. It would be best if it was closer to the lower trails so you don't have to climb up to go from the open space area to the new downtown development area
Comment Map	Ryan Welch		I support this project.	The town of Superior has recently added two amenities for outdoor recreation and to move around town, he Oerman Roche trail head just west of this proposed site and Tract H (soon to be renamed) to the East. This underpass would connect these popular locations. Where there are surface connectors close by, people still cut across McCaslin near these sites today. The underpass is a great solution.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Superior - McCaslin Multi-Use Underpass north of Rock Creek Pkwy				
Comment Map	Sarah Peltier		I support this project.	This would be the only way to cross McCaslin not at surface level, creating a safe passageway for pedestrians and cyclists to connect the Rock Creek neighborhood to the Marshall Mesa open space. The traffic speeds on McCaslin regularly exceed 55mph which makes the existing level crossings pretty terrifying, and crossing at the traffic circle at the bottom of the hill is a pedestrian death wish. Lets be real - all the drivers here hate stopping for the extra time it takes pedestrians to cross at Rock Creek Parkway!
Comment Map	Shawn T. Samuelson		I support this project.	The Town of Superior has recently invested much time and money into creating a new trailhead with amenities on McCaslin Blvd across from densely populated Downtown Superior without having a safe, direct path to get to the trailhead unless you cross at the Rock Creek Pkwy traffic light, the traffic roundabout, or the Coal Creek bridge underpass which are ~0.3 miles or more from the trailhead. Direct connectivity would greatly enhance safe access to Mayhoffer Singletree Trail and Coal Creek Regional Trail, as well as potentially increase use of current and future Oerman-Roche trailhead amenities. An indirect benefit is that it would serve as a Wildlife Crossing Underpass from BoCo open space to the Tract H open space corridor in Superior. The more ways that bikes and pedestrians can access BoCo open space without having to cross over McCaslin or drive to the trailhead, the better.
Comment Map	Stacey Hartmann	Superior resident	I support this project.	This would be a wonderful link for the Rock Creek neighborhood residents to access the trailhead on the other side of the busy McCaslin Road. It also provides easier/safer access to Old Town Superior and the main shopping areas for our entire town. Please support this project.
Comment Map	Stefano Prezioso		I support this project.	Both existing crossings along McCaslin are prohibitively far for pedestrian use when trying to access the trails at Oerman-Roche Trailhead. The northern crossing at the roundabout would add ~1 mile of walking round trip. The southern crossing is an insignificant improvement at ~0.9 miles round trip. As such, without a safe crossing, pedestrians will continue to cross unsafely at grade on McCaslin Blvd because the alternatives are prohibitively far. An at-grade crossing with signs and blinking lights can work on slower-speed roads, but the four lanes of McCaslin Blvd, along with the steep and rounding hill that significantly limits visibility for northbound traffic is a risk for both pedestrians and drivers. Traffic may back up due to pedestrians crossing, which could cause a collision with stopped traffic for a distracted driver. Given the limited visibility for northbound traffic and the need for better access to OR Trailhead for the new homes in Superior, I support this project.
Comment Map	Stuart Fehr		I support this project.	An underpass at this location would be a welcomed improvement. It would link the Oerman-Roche Trailhead to the trail being developed and extended in Tract H which would improve recreation. The alternatives today are to take a 0.6 mile detour North on McCaslin to the roundabout and pass through the new neighborhood on the West side, or to cross at the light at McCaslin and Rock Creek Parkway. The light takes a very long time to cross because the timing has clearly been optimized for traffic throughput on McCaslin. This proposed underpass would also make bike commuting between most of Superior and Boulder easier. I often return home from Boulder via the sidewalk along the East side of McCaslin from the underpass at the McCaslin/36 interchange specifically to avoid the traffic light crossing at McCaslin and Rock Creek Parkway. Creating this underpass would link both sides of McCaslin to the existing underpass below Rock Creek Parkway, which would make bike commuting safer and faster.
Comment Map	Susan Johnson		I support this project.	My husband and I routinely walk to Downtown Superior and the Meadowlark Trail. We have worked out how to safely cross at the light at RockCreek or the underpass at Town Hall, but it would be much preferred to not deal with crossing McCaslin at all. The newly proposed underpass would open up many options for our daily circuits through Superior.
Comment Map	Susan Wilcox		I support this project.	We live in Downtown Superior. To access the Oerman Roche trailhead I have to dash across 4 lanes of traffic on McCaslin. I don't know why traffic moves so fast on the uphill and downhill section of the road, but it can be scary. I would love to have this connection to our great trails system. If it's decided that the project is too expensive and a crosswalk is installed instead, I think there needs to be a discussion about controlling the speeds of cars up and down the hill.
Comment Map	Terry Imel		I support this project.	So many people (and growing) on the east side of McCaslin Blvd (a very busy, divided, 4-lane "highway') and expansive popular open space trail system on the west side, behooves a safe crossing solution to avert pedestrian/auto tragedies. Personally, I do not walk to the open space trails because of the lack of safe crossing...I drive my car, instead. The ped underpass is the most logical solution, despite the fact that it is not the lowest cost solution.
Comment Map	Travis Titus		I support this project.	All for more bike/pedestrian path connections
Comment Map	Vanessa Hetzel		I support this project.	This project just makes sense! With the growth that has occurred and is continuing in Superior, more and more folks need a safe way to get from their residences to open space areas , shopping areas and to ride/run/walk within town. Ive lived in Superior for 15 years and have always thought having an underpass in this location would be a tremendous asset to the town and save lives. I am so excited there is a plan to make this project happen.
Comment Map	Victoria Pane		I support this project.	This would be a great addition to the current bike/walking paths and a safe and family-friendly way to cross McCaslin.
Comment Map	William Simmons		I support this project.	This proposed underpass is needed in order to facilitate safe access to open space and trails on the West side of McCaslin. Most of Superior resides on the East side. I reside on the West side, and still firmly believe access is needed for all. It is incorrect to imagine that a stoplight or another underpass, each 1/4 mile away, will encourage full use or safe access.
Comment Map	Zhenya Shvartsman		I support this project.	It's crazy that we can't access the Open Space area from the Downtown Superior area w/o either running across a dangerous street or hooking all the way to the circle or Rock Creek Parkway traffic light.
Comment Map		Superior resident	I support this project.	I have spent many years hiking and biking in the Superior and Rock Creek area. This underpass would provide a safe connection from one side of McCaslin to the other. A cut & crosswalk in the median is dangerous and will cause unnecessary congestion and stop lights which we are trying to avoid with all the traffic circles. The traffic light at Rock Creek and McCaslin is dangerous at all times of the day. With the added housing being built, this is the best solution.
Comment Map			I support this project.	
Comment Map	Charles Danforth		I have concerns about this project.	I would love to improve pedestrian/bike connectivity across McCaslin here, but I feel a full underpass isn't the right answer. A signed HAWK crossing would be sufficient (and a big improvement over the currently look-both-ways-and-dash system runners have to use) and at a tiny fraction of the cost. The much budget could be used a lot more profitably to improve bike infrastructure over a larger area.
Comment Map	Dale Mood	Superior Resident	I have concerns about this project.	While an underpass at this location would be nice, I believe the price tag is much too high for the amount of use it would get. There is a stop light at McCaslin and Rock Creek Pkwy, not far away from the proposed location. If an underpass is to be built, I would suggest it be located farther north, some where around the round-about where there will be much more pedestrian traffic once downtown Superior is completed.
Comment Map	Darius Baer		I have concerns about this project.	I am always in favor of safer bike and pedestrian crossings. However, there are two safe crossings within .25 mile south and .4 mile north of the proposed underpass. If this crossing warrants the need based on daily crossings, then a flashing yellow light should be installed with a safe stop in the middle of divided McCaslin. The 6 million cost could be better used for construction of more bike/pedestrian trails and paths.
Comment Map	Ian Brogden		I have concerns about this project.	Not sure if cost is warranted. There is already a bike/ped underpass at Grasso park between original Superior and east side, and an underpass near the RTD. Working out some better lighting / crossing options at the round-about and at Rock Creek parkway end might be a better use of our $$.

Comment Type	Name (optional)	Organization (optional)	Support/Oppose/Have Concerns	Reasons for Position
Superior - McCaslin Multi-Use Underpass north of Rock Creek Pkwy				
Comment Map	Joel White		I have concerns about this project.	I love the idea of underpasses as they are much safer and would be much more likely to be utilized. My concern with this project is a high price tag coupled with the fact there are two underpasses between Highway 36 and Rock Creek Parkway already, as well as an established crossing area at McCaslin and Rock Creek. Is it worth over $6 million to have a 3rd underpass?
Comment Map	Laura Skladzinski		I have concerns about this project.	I couldn't agree more that we need a safe crossing to Oerman Roche trailhead, as most pedestrian traffic is on the east side of McCaslin and currently needs to think ahead to cross at either the Main Street roundabout or the intersection of McCaslin and Rock Creek Parkway. However, I think a $6M underpass is overkill and not a good use of taxpayer funds. I would much rather see a cut in the current median to allow for a pedestrian refuge between the northbound / southbound traffic, along with a lighted / blinking / etc crosswalk at Discovery Parkway to cross McCaslin just below the trailhead. This could be done at a fraction of the cost, using existing infrastructure, and would be easier to maintain.
Comment Map	Andrew B		I am opposed to this project.	This saves pedestrians/riders roughly 1/4 mile to access more hiking/riding. There is a crosswalk 1/8 mile south and an underpass 500 ft north of the roundabout. Both of which provide easy access for people accessing the trailhead or accessing shopping. It's a nice idea but the $6M price tag doesn't make sense to me to save a 1/4 mile walk.
Comment Map		A Superior Resident	I am opposed to this project.	with a price tag of $6,000,000 dollars, this project seems quite overblown. which member of the board stands to make money with this? we already know they have their hands in the development of downtown superior. https://www.dailycamera.com/2022/09/21/superior-residents-sue-town-trustees-developer-of-controversial-town-square-project/ given the price tag, we could easily find more cost effective options ranging from the use of an existing crosswalk 100 yards from the proposed underpass, to adding an additional crosswalk, with flashing lights, similar to the many existing crosswalks throughout superior. we could also add a light, for the additional crosswalk traffic similar to the crossing light on 88th.
Comment Map		superior resident	I am opposed to this project.	HI although I agree that we need a safer way for pedestrians/bikers to get across the street, there is a light within 100 yards of the trailhead, I feel for 6 MILLION dollars we could do something that will help a broader spectrum of the community. Is it possible to put in a pedestrian crossing with flashing lights/sound similiar in boulder for crossers.
Comment Map		Superior resident	I am opposed to this project.	Huge cost. Constant disruption during construction. We have dealt with constant construction around McCaslin for years and years. Poor use of funding in a time of inflation. Spend the money in Olde Town to help the devastation there.