**Open House #2 Summary**

**Date:** Wednesday, March 8, 2017  
**Time:** 5:30-7:30 PM  
**Location:** Four Mile Historic Park (715 S. Forest St, Denver, CO 80246)

**Introduction and Executive Summary**

**Overview**
The *Go Speer Leetsdale Mobility Study* is exploring potential improvement options for multimodal travel along the Speer Leetsdale Corridor, running approximately from Broadway and Speer southeast to Mississippi Avenue and Leetsdale (also SH 83).

The study's second Open House was held at Four Mile Historic Park to provide the public with an update and gather feedback on the concept package of preliminarily recommended improvements for the corridor. Approximately 60 community members were in attendance. A brief presentation provided an overview of the concept package followed by Q&A. The open house format allowed for one-on-one discussions with members of the project team, and a survey station was set up to gather input on the recommended concepts.

**Stations & Displays**
The Open House incorporated opportunities for attendees to engage with the project team at various informational stations that displayed existing conditions and recommendations. Stations included: (1) Study Overview (2) Vehicular/Transit with Complementary Recommendations (3) Bike/Pedestrian (4) Other Projects in the study area, and (5) a comment/survey table.

**Presentation**
A short presentation followed by a question and answer period started at 6:00 PM. The presentation reflected the content of the station boards and is available on the study website. Topic themes from the question and answer period included:

- **Implementation and Next Steps** – Community members requested information on next steps, including the timeline for implementation as well as Council review and approval. Some noted that additional modeling would need to be done to refine travel time and capacity estimates.

- **Concern for Vehicular Impacts** – Residents in the area expressed concern related to potential cut-through traffic and increased vehicular congestion along the corridor. Skepticism that the recommended concept will drive vehicle commuters to use alternative modes of transportation exists.

- **Support for Bike and Pedestrian Improvements** – Meeting attendees, particularly those who commute via bike or walking, were in strong favor of the recommended improvements for these travel modes, citing the need for enhanced capacity and connections. Some suggested delineating areas for bike and pedestrian traffic along the trail.

- **Support for Transit-Focused Improvements** – A number of community members believe the concept improvements could be transformational for the corridor. Some emphasized the need
for operational adjustments, such as improved buses and attention to transit long First Avenue and North of Alameda on Leetsdale. Others raised broader questions on how the recommendation might overlap with Glendale 180 and how autonomous vehicles might work within this system.

- **Additional Information on Managed Transit Lanes** – Several commenters noted that additional information is desired for how vehicular, bike and pedestrian travel will interact with the managed transit lanes. Additionally, there is uncertainty on bus station operations and median use. Without additional information, there is concern for safety and the effectiveness of daily operations.

**Survey & General Comment Themes**

Open House attendees, as well as the broader community, were encouraged to take an online survey to provide input on the recommended package of improvements for the Speer/Leetsdale corridor. The survey was promoted through study and partner communications, as well and by news and social media, and closed on March 15, a week following the Open House. Approximately 84 community members completed the survey. Community members also emailed or submitted hard copy comments.

The following high-level themes emerged from the compilation of both survey and email comments. Raw survey and email comments received from the public are included at the end of the summary.

- **Impacts to Surrounding Residential Areas** – Many respondents were concerned with potential impacts to residential areas in and surrounding the corridor. Cut-through traffic, context-sensitive wayfinding, and air quality impacts were particular topics of concern. Cut-through traffic was highlighted as the main concern for residents in the Country Club and Cherry Creek neighborhoods.

- **Support for Alternative Transportation Modes** – Many community members supported improvements for time travel savings, connectivity and infrastructure for alternative modes of transportation including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and bike/pedestrian travel. There is especially strong support for enhancing bike/pedestrian access given lacking north and south connections. Areas of strong interest for bike/pedestrian improvements include the Cherry Creek Trail north of the Denver Country Club, and the areas around Cherry Creek Mall, along University from Speer to Alameda, and Cherry Creek Drive South.

- **Additional Information on Concept Operations, Safety and Potential Benefits** – Respondents stressed uncertainty on how other travelers would interact with the managed transit lanes. Many emphasized safety considerations at crosswalks, turn signals and middle lane transit access points. Some wanted to see a crossing enhancement at Kearney and Leetsdale as well as Holly and Leetsdale. Additionally, a handful felt there is a lack of data to show whether the recommended package and its corresponding improvements will be effective.

- **Specific Intersection Impacts** – A number of respondents were concerned about reducing vehicle right-of-way throughout the corridor and the potential of increased congestion. Many identified specific intersections for concern:
  - Leetsdale/Monaco
  - Alameda/Holly
  - Leetsdale/Cherry
Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Snapshot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ranking of Full Concept Package</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(On a scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly oppose and 5 being strongly support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ranking of Bike/Ped Recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(On a scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly oppose and 5 being strongly support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Benefit for Managed Transit Lane Concept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Concern for Managed Transit Lane Concept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Bike/Ped Recommended Improvement</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graphic below identifies the zip codes associated with the 84 community members who took the survey followed by responses to survey questions.

Q1. How do you feel about the overall recommended package of improvements for the Speer/Leetsdale corridor as shown above? (On a scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly oppose and 5 being strongly support)

- The average score was 2.87, indicating a balanced mix of concern and support for the recommended preliminary concept.
Q2. Why? Please be as specific as possible. **Qualitative comments included at the end of the summary.**

Q3. Please identify what you feel are the most positive benefits of the managed transit lane concept on Speer from Broadway to Bayaud.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Response Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May move more people through the corridor, especially on transit</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transit travel-time and reliability</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity with other transit services or bike/pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specified in raw qualitative comments below)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential economic development opportunities</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved streetscape and way-finding</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents: 70**

Q4. Please identify potential concerns you have about the managed transit lane concept on Speer from Broadway to Bayaud.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Response Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversion of traffic to side streets</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle traffic delays</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle and/or bike/pedestrian interaction with managed bus lane</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specified in raw qualitative comments below)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital, operations or maintenance costs</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity with other transit services or bike/pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents: 80**
Q5. Please identify what you feel are the most positive benefits of the reversible managed transit lane concept on Leetsdale from Bayaud and along Alameda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Response Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May move more people through the corridor, especially on transit</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transit travel-time and reliability</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specified in raw qualitative comments below)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity with other transit services or bike/pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved streetscape and way-finding</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential economic development opportunities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents: 67</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Please identify potential concerns you have about the reversible managed transit lane concept on Leetsdale from Bayaud and along Alameda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Response Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversion of vehicular traffic to side streets</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle and/or bike/pedestrian interaction with reversible managed bus lane</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle travel delays</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional right-of-way needed</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specified in raw qualitative comments below)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital, operations and/or maintenance costs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity with other transit services or bike/pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents: 75</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. How do you feel about the overall recommendations for bike and pedestrian improvements in the corridor? (On a scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly oppose and 5 being strongly support)

- The average score was 3.5, indicating general support for the recommended bike/pedestrian improvements.

Q8. Why? Please be as specific as possible. Qualitative comments included at the end of the summary.
Q9. Please identify up to three (3) of the most important recommended improvements for bike and pedestrian connectivity in the corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Response Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street crossing improvements along the corridor to increase ease of bike/pedestrian travel</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase capacity of existing Cherry Creek Trail (from Broadway to University)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete and/or connect sidewalk networks</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New shared use path along Leetsdale between Alameda and Mississippi</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New complementary bike/pedestrian connections</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 81

Q10. How often do you use transit along Speer/Leetsdale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Response Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely/Never</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 81
Q11. How often do you bike or walk along Speer/Leetsdale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Response Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely/Never</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 81

Raw Comments

Below are raw comments submitted through the survey as well as to the project email. Comments are included as they were submitted and have not been edited for content, grammar, spelling, etc.

Survey Q2/Q3. How do you feel about the overall recommended package of improvements for the Speer/Leetsdale corridor? Why? Please be as specific as possible. (78 responses)

Where will all the existing cars to go? The amount of cars, due to more people moving into the area, are not going to decrease. Some of these ideas will make traffic congestion much worse when taking away a lane, each direction for a dedicated or managed bus lane. This will become one long, slow moving, "parking lot" of cars. In that same area of Speer from Broadway to University, what the heck does "Increase capacity of Existing Facility" really mean? I do wish I could have attended the meeting on March 8th but had a prior commitment.

congestion in the neighborhoods adjacent to the planned funs

The bus lane on Speer should be exclusive all day, not just during rush hour. This will help calm traffic and reduce speeding during off hours.

The reduction of lanes on First Avenue will increase the amount of cut-through traffic and the speed of cars in our neighborhood. We live on Lafayette north of First Avenue. There is already a turn lane north off of First onto Lafayette that is causing us traffic and speed cut-through problems. There are a lot of children, pets and pedestrians in our area. All of them are under extreme risk thanks to your corridor plan. Please include plans to protect all the neighborhoods along this corridor.
In the long term, increasing car capacity never decreases traffic. The only way to decrease traffic is to provide options such as bikes or faster public transportation. Bike infrastructure is one of the main reasons I chose to live in Denver.

Reducing lanes of traffic will only make matters worse. Mass transit only works if it takes you where you need to go in a timely fashion. Making driving increasingly unpleasant by reducing lanes will not cause people to walk or bike. There is already a wonderful bike path along cherry creek and a very walkable path. Distances are too great and weather is too unpredictable. Use existing corridors to expand mass transit.

The realization that Leetsdale is a death trap for pedestrians is long overdo. I like the protected lanes and the connectivity enhancements. However, I would like to see a pedestrian bridge at Leetsdale and Cedar and then Cedar and Colorado - simple concrete design with living (green) walls. If Denver can get Federal dollars to build it, I would also strongly recommend looking at an underground train between I70 and I25. Overall nice work, this will save lives.

Strongly support because currently these corridors divide up neighborhoods and do not support connectivity for these areas to be easily accessible to cross for Pedestrians and bikers.

I am very concerned it would result in cut through traffic in my neighborhood - Country Club

Not sure how this will impact traffic - pollution from add traffic congestion. My biggest concern is how they plan to mitigate cut through traffic in my neighborhood. This would be safety and quality of life issue.

1) Pollution from ideling cars cuz Speer traffic lanes will b reduced. 2) cut through traffic in the Country Club Neighborhood.

Speer/1st between Broadway and Colorado is already too congested with traffic. Increasing traffic by 50% on 2 lanes, but taking one lane out of service for buses only with cause this corridor to become very tough for drivers to use and therefore force them through the neighborhoods. I’d be mostly concerned with 3rd and 4th avenues between Downing all the way to Steele through both Country Club and North Cherry Creek. This is significant pedestrian and bike traffic on this streets. 6th/8th avenue and then south on Colorado seem like the much better route for increased rapid transit.

I am opposed to this project because of the creation of dedicated bus lanes on Speer during rush hour. This will adversely affect the environment because cars traveling on Speer will be left idling for longer periods of time as the capacity of Speer is reduced by one-third. Additionally, the cut-through traffic that will result in our neighborhood will create a safety hazard for us. I do not believe that sufficient numbers of people will utilize the buses to justify taking away lanes on Speer during rush hour.

Project will reduce Mobility by removing capacity from the signals.
vehicular traffic impact lack of plan to deal with 'cut through' traffic

Concerned about cut-through traffic in the country club neighborhood.

These areas being locked at to reduce traffic lanes and add a designated bus lane are already extremely congested and this would further aggravate the problem.

This will create significant cut through traffic problems in the country club neighborhood, and we are already facing major increases in traffic flow due to all the development happening in the Cherry Creek area.

While I appreciate the intentions of this plan- the consequence of designating a lane for bus transit on 1st/Speer specifically along the DCC will greatly increase the cut through traffic going through the CCHN. How will the reduction to one lane affect traffic that can already be a nightmare? How many buses will now be driving down 1st? What will be the speed limit for buses? How will this affect noise levels? Is there not an option? Underground? Is there any plan to bring the light rail closer to Cherry Creek?

primarily benefits Glendale and Aurora residents at the expense of Denver neighborhoods. Designating the curb lane for buses will force cars into and through the surrounding neighborhoods.

I love the idea but please address a way to manage cut through traffic through our Country Club neighborhood streets. It is already a problem!

The cut through traffic from reduced lanes will impact our neighborhood. The cut through traffic often does not obey stop signs and creates a hazard for children in our neighborhood.

Speer Blvd from University to Downing is already extremely congested. As a home owner in the residential neighborhood that borders Speer there is considerable risk of additional cut-through traffic if lanes are reduced on either/both sides of the boulevard. There is little likelihood that additional public transportation will reduce regular vehicular traffic, so this appears to be a very problematic proposal.

The proposal is far too vague and unclear. This map only gives a very cursory overview with far few details. For example, many of the items on the Legend ought to be more clearly explained and visual examples ought to be given. The Speer section is already extremely crowded at times and this will cause more congestion. This plan lacks any addressing of cut-through traffic for vehicles avoiding increased traffic.

Losing a lane of traffic in an already overcrowded corridor would create more congestion on that corridors and neighborhood cut-throughts that would increase safety risks in the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Very concerned about cut through traffic. When traffic has been backed up on University and/or First, the speeding traffic cutting through has been very dangerous and concerning. We are a neighborhood of many
kids, and we have personally witnessed drivers speeding through stop signs and going at speeds way beyond the 25 mph, closer to 40-50.

I'm in favor as long as steps are taken to mitigate the increased passage of pass-through / cut-through traffic through the neighborhood to the north of Speer Blvd. We already see a lot of aggressive driving behavior from cut-through drivers, particularly during rush hour periods. There are a number of children and people on bicycles in the area. The wide streets, including 3rd ave, provide ample area for people to speed and drive aggressively and I would request that steps are taken to ensure that traffic through the neighborhood is local traffic and not of people merely trying to bypass traffic and stop lights along Speer. Thank you.

it will cause much more cut through traffic into the neighborhoods but creating what will become under-utilized bus lanes.

Traffic cut-through the neighborhoods along Speer will adversely effect the route beginning at Broadway and running through Cherry Creek.

I don't completely understand the plan.

As Denver continues to grow at a rapid pace, travel by car is not realistic. Multi-modal options are necessary, and options for traveling by bicycle and e-bikes, in particular, are inexpensive and improve health and support local businesses.

IT does not address the concern of traffic cutting through the Denver Country cub neighborhood north of Speer between Downing and York.

I am extremely encouraged by the plans list of bike and pedestrian improvements. Specifically, I am very interested in seeing the recommended crossing enhancement at the Kearney & Leetsdale intersection.

We need streets that support mobility options for every mode of transportation. This project can go a long way in increasing safe walking and biking corridors that reduce speeds and make Denver the urban transportation city of the future.

this plan does not address cut-through traffic that would result in the surrounding neighborhood from the reduced-lane system.

Have not seen data to understand the traffic patterns in the Denver Country Club area. Any time in the past when construction has taken place, traffic has increased substantially in the neighborhood.

Car travel is made more difficult, no mitigation for increased neighborhood cut-through traffic.

I believe in public transportation and I like the enhanced safety at crosswalks.
I am concerned about the cut-through traffic that will subsequently affect my neighborhood and the safety of my children.

While I'm all for the general concept of public transportation having a priority, the plan does not address the traffic that will inevitably cut through the surrounding neighborhoods. Furthermore, I have an issue with the idea that this provides a great asset to those living in Aurora and commuting to Cherry Creek or downtown, but that Aurora is not helping to pay for the plan.

Worried about cut through traffic in my neighborhood (Country Club Historic) if closing down one lane in high traffic time.

I want more and better options for traveling along the Speer/Leetsdale corridor. I bicycle, take the bus, or drive a car depending on my needs for a given trip, but the way these streets are currently designed makes all of these options more unpleasant than they need to be.

I strongly support the study of this corridor, identified in STP in broad terms and specifically referenced (University to Colorado) in the Cherry Creek Area Plan.

I generally support the concept but am concerned about the effects on the country club neighbor, Cut through traffic is a major concern and i see no commitment be the City to come up with plans to eliminate or even restrict the impact. Next, speed control on first avenue has always been a problem and with the elimination of two lanes of traffic I see that it will be a growing problem with no announced mitigation.

The dedicated bus route concept might keep the busses on time, but will only bottleneck traffic even more than it is today. Taking the turn lane out of the Leetsdale corridor will do nothing but create ingress and egress problems for businesses all the way along that corridor.

BRT is so needed on this corridor, especially Glendale to downtown and Cherry Creek to downtown.

It increases the carrying capacity of the roads without widening and makes it safer to walk or bike.

I'd like to see more buses and less cars on Speer. I support making pedestrians and cyclists safer. I support modifications to the street that make drivers go slower and drive more safely.

I support enhanced mobility on this very important corridor. I believe having a successful transit option on this route is critical because this area is not served by FasTracks and has the potential for a great deal of growth. The bike/ped enhancements are also very desirable.

I like the idea of improving this corridor! I dont like shared bike and walking lanes (they dont work) and I dont like reduce car capacity.
I agree that improved transit service is needed on the Speer Leetsdale corridor, but it should be done in a way that doesn’t significantly compromise vehicle capacity and travel time as this proposal does. The model projection shows an increase of about 700 transit trips with the proposal but a decrease of 600 people in vehicles. Not a good tradeoff. A projected 12 min decline in transit time in the pm isn’t justified when vehicle travel time will increase by up to 10-15 minute increase in vehicle travel time for both am and pm. I’m also concerned about access limitations proposed on Leetsdale and the negative impact that will have on a host of small businesses located on the corridor. What outreach has been done to business owners on Leetsdale? They did not appear to be represented at the public meeting at the 4 Mile House last week. Safety of the proposed center loading transit stations is also a concern. I just don't see how this will work!

Enhancing this corridor, given the through-traffic from the SE and the need to create a, at least somewhat, express transit mode from the Glendale/Cherry Creek area to/toward downtown, is essential for Denver’s health and vitality. The multi-modal approach, improving pedestrian & cyclist mobility as well as auto and transit, is necessary and wise. The required sacrifices (of the Leetsdale/Alameda center divider and the 1st Ave./Speer curb lanes), while tough sells to the car-driving public, seem to be the most reasonable options within a tightly-constrained corridor. While I’d wish for a streetcar solution to better hurdle the bus stigma, I understand the cost and speed-of-implementation issues involved. I hope that RTD (or Denver) can "brand/badge" the line to partially mitigate that stigma concern and broaden ridership. At the end of the day, it’ll be better for all concerned if most riders can happily choose to ride as opposed to feeling miserably obligated to do so because of overwhelming congestion in the car lanes.

Favor, as long as landscaped medians are retained and sidewalks and crossings improved.

A realistic plan for increasing peak-time total person movement capacity by making transit more efficient and reliable. Would have been nice if you had a link to the boards/presentations on this page. I eventually found it.

THERE CURRENTLY ARE NOT ENOUGH LANES ON SPEER BLVD NOW

I work at CDPHE and move along this route regularly. I especially support any enhancements to biking. Crossing Leetsdale is scary in Glendale. Looks like that is being addressed. Hopefully the Cherry Creek bike path btw the mall/in front of the athletic center while it is along Alameda, will be widened?

I oppose any plan that decreases the number of car lanes. This area can not afford to lose a car lane to buses only. I am very concerned about the additional traffic congestion this proposed project will cause. The current traffic back up is bad with the current lane structure and will get much worse dedicating one lane to buses only. This will ruin the neighborhood!!! I GREATLY oppose the proposal from what I have learned. I live on Bayaud Ave and during rush hour, there are many cars going by my front door to avoid 1st, Cherry Creek N, & Alameda. How will the city avoid this from getting worse which it will when car lanes are deleted? Can they add to the proposal that only local traffic will be allowed on Bayaud? If they eliminate the dedicated bus lanes from this proposal, the additional pedestrian and bicycle improvements wold be good.
In favor of bus lanes and sidewalk improvements.

Do not care for the buses in the middle of the road; no left turns could be a major problem.

Not sure how many buses really go down Leetsdale and Speer—to close an entire lane from regular automobile traffic would be good on one hand, but with more & more people moving here, with more apts & condos going in, I'm afraid the traffic is only going to get worse--there are not any more streets being put in to accommodate this growth, so the existing ones will get LOTS more traffic. I ride my bicycle quite a bit to & from my house to work, and really appreciate the Cherry Creek bike path & the 'sharrows' along various side streets near downtown. I also drive my car down Leetsdale & Speer and worry that if lanes are closed to cars, the back-up that would cause will be way worse--which will then cause drivers to snake & speed thru neighborhood streets, trying to make better time...just don't know what the solution is--maybe have more buses going closer to where people live & work. The light rail does NOT help me get to work, yet that is the only offering RTD has made available in my area--no bus service, only the train. Thank you for inviting our input!

Improvements in the corridor, especially along Leetsdale, are badly needed, and will be transformative for the biking and walking environment, improving traffic, making people safer, and encouraging behavior change toward active transportation.

I'm weary of the middle lane on Leetsdale being for buses. When can private vehicles turn into businesses to the left? What times do the buses switch? How do the passengers get OUT of the bus in the middle of the street if/when there's high traffic and the bus driver is trying to get to the right side of the street? The other concepts, I'm interested in seeing go forward, but the leetsdale one needs more thought behind the practicality of putting buses through the middle.

timid but small steps forward

Great emphasis on public/bike/walking transportation

More emphasis on MOBILITY (transit, bikes, and walking) than "tradition" of just making more room for cars, which are too often SINGLE-OCCUPANT cars -> Thanks!

Not clear that drivers will use buses and will not just use Bayaud or another E/W street

Transportation Solutions strongly supports multi-modal infrastructure enhancements for all users along the entire corridor, including the designated bus lanes, and multi-use path. We also support the fact that safety for all users is a top priority in most of the enhancements, and the concept of mobility hubs.

Good ideas, but also time the lights. Indeed timing of lights is what people look for, especially at night when you can see the opposing colors, especially yellow. Might be a good stretch to post Timing Speeds, larger
than Speed Limits, to smooth the flow along these diagonals. Slight speed shifts are easier than stop and go. Also, Alameda still needs a bridge across Cherry Creek, in spite of rich homeowners who bought cheap and for the sake of their businesses.

This is a much needed project along the Speer/Leetsdale corridor. Why does it (i.e. bus lane) not extend to connect to downtown transit?

I use this corridor every day. Five days per week, I bike commute near/across Leetsdale to Cherry Creek. Outside of commuting, I also use the Cherry Creek Trail for recreation and to get downtown. This is a critical space for me and, especially as a cyclist, I would love to see increased capacity and safer design/facilities along the routes.

improved bike connections are a positive. It’s unclear exactly how the bus lanes will work and how the lanes of traffic will be impacted along with any proposed schedule. I searched the materials and saw no further explanation of the map legend components. Makes feedback much harder when options aren’t explained somewhere easily accessible.

will simply increase congestion and push traffic onto neighborhood streets. enough with transportation fantasists

Not quite sure where the land for the Mobility Hub at 1st and University will come from.

I’m a big fan of rapid bus transit, but feel that to make it widely used, connecting buses traveling north to south must run frequently (at least ever 15 minutes) on streets such as Quebec, Monico, Holly, etc. Or, RTD needs to contract with businesses along this strip to provide parking spots for individuals who want to take the bus, but currently don’t because infrequent connecting routes cause it to not be effective in terms of time of commuting.

It's multi-modal and makes biking and busing competitive with individual car driving.

The portion of the proposal from Colorado to Broadway will substantially increase auto transit times. The only initiative (to reduce auto usage) you consultant recognizes is drivers will see busses moving and that will incent them to give up driving. The unintended consequences will be decreased business move into downtown and more suburban business growth.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT STRATEGY IS MOST REALISTIC, NEAR-TERM ACHIEVABLE ALTERNATIVE. REALLY LIKE NO ADDITIONAL WIDENING OR TAKINGS OF PROPERTY. FULLY SUPPORT NO LEFT TURNS ALONG ALAMEDA PARKWAY (EXCEPT AT SIGNALS) -- BELIEVE THERE ARE ONLY 2 IN CHERRY CREEK EAST (JACKSON AND ALAMEDA, MONROE AND ALAMEDA). ASSUME THIS ALSO MEANS RIGHT TURNS ONLY FROM JACKSON AND MONROE TO ALAMEDA.
Agree with bus options and the shared ped/bike lane.

Survey Q4. Please identify what you feel are the most positive benefits of the managed transit lane concept on Speer from Broadway to Bayaud. (22 responses to option “Other—please specify”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no benefit. Certainly not to commuters. What is the number 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complaint about the quality of life in the metro area. I don't think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is too much sunshine but the current frustration with traffic and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congestion. This will not solve that problem but limiting how many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cars can move on this roadway. Space is finite and the size of a car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is finite and thus only so many fit at one time. Removing an entire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lane exclusively for bus travel will not help. And I frequently take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the bus downtown from my home in Cherry Creek (#83L). If RTD is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned about bus travel times they need to increase the number and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency of bus service now, not when they have an exclusive lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each way. I don't see them increasing the frequency (number of buses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much even if that is the case. This really solves their issue without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having to increase the number of buses on the route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see benefit for a small subset of population and negative impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the majority and for businesses within Cherry Creek - People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will begin to avoid this area due to congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing capacity will not improve Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no benefits that I can see given the quantum and nature of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the current vehicular traffic already existing on this route and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional congestion that reduced lanes will create.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't see any positives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causes more traffic to start cutting through neighborhoods by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reducing their access to a lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The negative impacts of losing an entire lane of traffic will cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicular traffic through the neighborhoods to increase. People will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| not automatically jump out of their cars and onto public transportation just because you create a bus lane!
Lower traffic

There are no positive benefits

no benefit

This offers an opportunity for transit "pilots" without the additional cost of infrastructure on the roadway. If transit (RTD buses) and stops are updated it offers an opportunity to increase ridership.

None, unless bus service increases to 15 minute intervals.

Thinking of the 1st Ave./DCC-area bikepath, I think the bus curb lane is more compatible with the adjacent bikepath than a general use car lane.

NONE

No positives from my perspective

Really like the wide sidewalks--makes walking much better!

Yes, improved streetscape and way-finding is very much needed, but it's unclear how that will be incorporated? How are you connecting to other transit services or bike/ped facilities?

Need a bus line from 38th through to Parker, though mostly with traffic.

I never see busses in this area so I'm puzzled as to how this will lessen congestion.

No benefit

Survey Q5. Please identify potential concerns you have about the managed transit lane concept on Speer from Broadway to Bayaud. (24 responses to option “Other—please specify”) 

Increased traffic congestion
**CENTER LANE (MIDIAN) ACCESS ON ALAMEDA/LEETSDALE - SAFETY CONCERNS**

People have a very acute sense of their own opportunity cost and will seek alternate solutions in the neighborhoods via the side streets for sure.

Managed lanes should be exclusive to buses all day, not just during rush hour. This will reduce speeding and also allow for better design and enforcement.

**Increased pollution along corridor**

Wrong solution for the wrong reasons

**Cut through traffic is a real safety issue**

Pollution from idling cars

**Noise**

Side street traffic!

**The lack of amenities that provide safe travel for transit riders**

This is a project to benefit only government bureaucrats— meddling in the business of others and spend the money of others.

very concerned about diverted traffic through neighborhoods. There are children, bikes and pedestrians that will be impacted as well with additional traffic.

**Diversion may not be an issue if it works as the one on Lincoln? I think that is the one I am thinking of**

complication of turning movements as noted on Broadway and Lincoln currently with bus lanes and cycle track

Safety concerns. Negative impact on businesses due to limiting access.
Managing expectations as change occurs, until new patterns of behavior settle in

BAD IDEA

none

Need for additional service to take full advantage of transit lanes

Initial (and ongoing?) resistance by single-occupant drivers ... ?!

Ensuring that if we invest in this infrastructure improvement, that we are then encouraging people to actually use it, through the addition of enhancing bus stops, connections to and from bus stops, and TDM education and programming.

taking away the right lane from normal traffic will only further congest traffic

Property Values

Survey Q6. Please identify what you feel are the most positive benefits of the reversible managed transit lane concept on Leetsdale from Bayaud and along Alameda. (20 responses to option “Other—please specify”)

Noted improved streetscape and way-finding as not possible

I can't say that any of the above points will really improve traffic flow. It is not as though the Reversible Managed Lane is going to be used that much, certainly not as much as it is now (for turning). As shown the “perception” is that all lanes are always used but this center has very infrequent use, by comparison to the adjacent auto lanes. There are many instances where that center turn lane is used and allows the traffic flow to continue while in this case one could no longer make such currently available turns. This would also limit business revenue as the inconvenience of crossing to the other side as is done now would just have them pass on by (until and such that they were on the side where they can turn right into the business’s “parking”. This would be an improvement for cyclists on this corridor. Currently there are sidewalks on both sides, maybe missing in some section but having sidewalks on both sides is a key to functionality. I would be against having the sidewalk only be on one side for “efficiency”. Whose efficiency? Not the pedestrians.
Walking is unpleasant on Leetsdale due to the sidewalk being close to fast moving traffic. This plan makes walks more pleasant, and makes biking possible.

None

Not in support

Less vehicles

Slowing down car traffic, making it safer to cross the street

There are no benefits

no benefit

Potentially easier to cross Leetsdale in time to catch the bus.

no lost lanes

None: Only traffic delays.

Mid-block left turns from the center lane into business uses along this section of the corridor are convenient but crazy dangerous! Given the traffic volume here, those turns are an anachronism. Also, as a cyclist I've been forced to ride with traffic NW-bound from Mississippi toward Holly. Absolutely petrifying! A shared path there (sufficiently wide to avoid ped-bike conflicts) will be most welcome.

Excited to pilot center-running transit service in Denver

NONE

None if it decreases a vehicle lane

really like the wide sidewalk with a buffer! great!
It is unclear, from just looking at a cross section, whether or not there is connectivity with other transit services or bike/ped facilities.

where is the proof that a dedicated bus lane will decrease traffic? I don't see busses much along leetsdale.

no benefit

**Survey Q7. Please identify potential concerns you have about the reversible managed transit lane concept on Leetsdale from Bayaud and along Alameda. (18 responses to option “Other—please specify”)**

I think my above comment covers concerns. I only see cars having interaction with the reversible bus lane not bikes. I don't see this as having as much side street diversion as the Speer - Broadway to University section.

Congestion slowing down buses going opposite direction of managed lane. Traffic is usually bad in both directions.

This plan doesn't remove an entire lane of traffic for cars so would not effect the neighborhoods as much. In addition, this is a predominantly commercial area.

N/A this is great!

This will essentially reduce standard traffic down to one lane, as left-turning vehicles will block the left lane while waiting to turn.

Potentially scarier to wait in the middle of four lanes of auto traffic, especially if transit frequency isn't increased.

Initially, I had no support for the center reversible lane on the Bayaud to Colorado segment (additional comments below). After driving back and forth on the Colorado to Miss. segment, I am no longer in support of the center reversible lane on any stretch of this corridor. Managed curbside lanes allow for a major difference in cost estimates, permanent infrastructure changes, challenges to the small businesses along Leetsdale that should be maintained and increased. If managed curbside lanes were installed, the possibility for funding would, it seems, be possible sooner. The stretch of Colorado to Mississippi deserves attention asap, with the pedestrian and bicycle paths as first priority. Install those, then managed bus lanes. Re: Bayaud to Colorado segment. 100% of the northside is residential, and about 80% of the southside is residential. This segment is a designated parkway that deserves to have the northside match
the southside with detached sidewalks and tree lawns. The northside is also supposed to supply pedestrian and bicycle connectivity from Burns Park to Pulaski Park. With Burns Park as a possible Mobility Hub, it is common sense to have the sidewalk system in place to reach it safely. Managed bus lanes vs center reversible maintain the same funding sooner and also would not interfere with major stormwater drainage upgrades from CCreek across CCDrN through CCE (S Monroe or S Madison) and on up Bayaud. Major changes to transit could be accomplished with managed lanes (already in use in Denver) rather than an experiment with challenging funding. Starting at Bayaud represents a personal bias - CCABA funds a district to maintain upgraded medians that happen to end at Bayaud. CCABA suggests that there are no members along the Bayaud to Colorado segment, so no engagement, so too bad. For 10 years we have tried (thanks to work by PW and CPD on CCAP) to protect CCE's southern border.

access to transit in middle of street

Pedestrian safety when boarding bus

existing left turning movements may/will be eliminated and cause rerouting of vehicles and reduction of street grid redundancy

If you're going for additional ROW, why not add a new lane dedicated to transit vehicles, not take away the median turn lane currently in place.

I'd like to see how transit stops will work

none

not sure what the center lane is for, buses only? what about left hand turns into businesses along Leetsdale?

Potential economic degradation of establish businesses.

I'm on the SWG and I can't understand how this managed lane would work, let alone the average community member who might be taking this survey (FYI). How will people board these buses? I imagine this could cause a lot of issues. Hopefully this can be clarified at the public meeting.

When lane ends, the bottleneck re-occurs, like I-25 past Boulder Turnpike exit. No overall gain.

Confusion unless it is a walled lane with very limited exits and entrances.
Survey Q8/Q9. How do you feel about the overall recommendations for bike and pedestrian improvements in the corridor? Why? Please be as specific as possible. (50 responses)

Is this the same map as the first question? I can’t tell any difference so here is my answer again. There is no benefit for Speer, Broadway to Bayaud section. Certainly not to commuters. What is the number 1 complaint about the quality of life in the metro area. I don’t think it is too much sunshine but the current frustration with traffic and congestion. This will not solve that problem but limiting how many cars can move on this roadway. Space is finite and the size of a car is finite and thus only so many fit at one time. Removing an entire lane exclusively for bus travel will not help. And I frequently take the bus downtown from my home in Cherry Creek (#83L). If RTD is concerned about bus travel times they need to increase the number and frequency of bus service now, not when they have an exclusive lane each way. I don’t see them increasing the frequency (number of buses) much even if that is the case. This really solves their issue without having to increase the number of buses on the route. As I answered in the prior question on the Leetsdale route there could be some marginal benefit. Is it really worth the cost? Very debatable and what is the likelihood of reverting back if this proves to be a boondoggle as have been other nearby traffic "improvements" that reverted back to their original state which was and is better. Those 2 instances did not come at any significant cost to undo.

Need bicycle path on first avenue along cherry creek mall to better connect with cherry creek north.

Worry about use of 4th Avenue. You’re dumping more car traffic on it already and no one obeys the 25 mph speed limit and now you’re going to add bikes, too. ????

There is already a great bike and pedestrian path that is not nearly used to its capacity. Why do Moe people not already use it?

Strongly agree because it will help connect neighborhoods to the existing bike path much easier and safer.

Too hard to understand what’s being proposed...

The path down University from Speer to Alameda is much needed. Always in favor of increased options for people on bikes of can fit in

Need to focus on the mobility of people not just Transit pedestrian and bike modes

As a cyclist and pedestrian who lives in the area, I am happy to have more access in the area.
Fear of cut through traffic in our neighborhood... cut through traffic does not obey speed limits or stop signs. and is dangerous to our children and pedestrians and noise...

This explanation is more clear and better understood. I prefer funds to be spent on improving safety for bikers and pedestrians.

Increasing both vehicular traffic and biking and pedestrian traffic poses a safety risk

Unfamiliar

More space for bicycles improves health, social connectivity, and local business. Decreasing the number of cars is important for improving our air quality in Denver.

I am extremely encouraged by the plans list of bike and pedestrian improvements. Specifically, I am very interested in seeing the recommended crossing enhancement at the Kearney & Leetsdale intersection.

This is amazing initiative, we need more mobility options in Denver. So excited for this to keep progressing forward!

This is very much needed, as biking is an ideal way to increase movement through the corridor. Currently, it is too dangerous / scary to bike this stretch.

There are a lot of people living within a few blocks of this corridor, and a lot of businesses we want to visit. We’ve got to have safe ways to get around Leetsdale so we can buy donuts or get a haircut or whatever, without requiring a car for every single trip. The section of the Cherry Creek Trail abutting the Denver Country Club is the worst part of the trail. When biking, there's often not enough room to pass other bicyclists or pedestrians comfortably, and there's the constant feeling that if you hit a bump in the sidewalk the wrong way, you'll fly headfirst into a truck going 40 MPH. Crossing Leetsdale takes far too long, and if you miss the bus while you’re waiting for the light, you're stuck with at least 10-15 minutes waiting in the fumes and dust. Few of the stops have benches, shade, or protection from the weather.

The time and effort spent on recommendation is evident and most appreciative. I would hope that if that some recommendations could be implemented in a timely fashion without major funding, it would be worthwhile, i.e 1. peds and bicycles as priority, 2. managed bus lanes along entire corridor rather than managed and then center reversible.

Not enough detail for traversing intersections, especially busy ones.
There are still very poor north-south connections to the Cherry Creek trail while East-West are heavily favored. The safety intersection enhancements are vague.

I would like to see the plans go farther to create a better balance between cars and other modes, but this is a good first step.

I want Denver to be easier and safer to travel on foot and by bicycle. I'd like to see improvements to the Creek Path sidewalk along the Denver Country Club. There's not enough space for all the runners and bikers that share the sidewalk there. Please also make improvements around Speer north of Broadway. (In particular I see people crossing to the Creek Path at 12th without a crosswalk or light and it's dangerous).

This is a major bike/ped facility. Small improvements could make this corridor even more valuable.

Shared bike and walking lanes are dangerous. Denver bikers fly and dog walkers can't enjoy any peace. Separate lanes would be better.

The corridor barely considers Cherry Creek Drive south, yet a large portion of traffic moves on this corridor. Additionally, bike and pedestrian crossings along Cherry Creek Drive South are ignored and need improvement, including the addition of signals at currently un-signalized but marked ped crossings.

I've listed some bike-related comments elsewhere. My concern with the new shared path would be the same ped-bike conflict concerns as exist currently along the Cherry Creek Path where fairly high-speed recreational and commuter cyclists share a narrow ROW with pedestrians who are at a more leisurely pace and blithe to the other modes on the path. The new wider sections of path on the Platte south of the stadium are a model.

As more people walk, safety and capacity improvements are needed, especially crosswalk timing on Steele Street and East 1st Avenue.

A thoughtful package of bike/ped improvements. Wayfinding will be critical for bikes, as the upgraded routes outside of Speer -- which might be very nice -- between the Cherry Creek mall area to/from downtown in particular aren't obvious.

I DRIVE A CAR IN THE AREA

I like the buffer btw the sidewalk and the street traffic- the little patch of grass makes a difference.

Increase quality of life
In favor of bike and pedestrian improvements.

Again, do not care for the bus in the middle of Leetsdale; recommend slower speed limits now.

Any way to improve pedestrian and bike movement is very welcome (I support this as a bicyclist & walker)–making it safer from cars/traffic, makes more people want to choose to walk/bike to their destination(s).

Improvements are sorely needed to capacity on the trail along 1st Avenue, as well as to the general bike/ped realm on Leetsdale, especially with regard to crossing the street! I live off Leetsdale and there is a real "can't get there from here" issue as so much is so close but access is hindered by poor sidewalks and lack of crossing opportunities. This will make a huge difference for people living along the corridor.

Strongly needed to alleviate very poor current conditions.

I'm no fan of bike paths that are +/- sidewalks to busy roads (e.g., 1st Ave.). I like seeing more emphasis on bikes @ 4th Ave., a corridor I've been using instead of 1st since the 1990s. I'm also hopeful that streets will be easier for pees to cross through (e.g.) medians, narrower streets @ intersections, etc.

No data to show plan will work as promised.

From what I can tell in the image, there is an effort to propose a connected bike/ped path along the entire corridor, so that bike/ped travel isn't fragmented. There is also an effort to improve bike/ped connections to and from the corridor. Remember, no one will use the BRT if they cannot safely and enjoyable access every bus stop by walking or biking.

If in doubt, use multiple paths. Cedar good, also 1st, maybe Louisiana.

I feel that creating additional options and capacity for alternative transit (bus, walking, bicycling) will encourage use of these modes. I use these routes regularly and these improvements will (hopefully) lead to a direct positive impact on my experience as a user. I fully support this initiative and am excited to see the plan develop further.

Options aren't backed up by easily accessible data and information on each option. Appropriately sized turn lanes and well timed lights all help with traffic. Not sure if any of the options accommodate turn lanes and keep drivers safe in the shared center lane. Where would signage go to indicate how that lane works? Many unanswered questions - and where's the data that shows how many buses use the corridor.
and what moving them to a center lane does to traffic patterns. Has that option been simulated somehow?

what a joke

There is always a concern in the Creek when you have cars, buses, peds & bikes. There are no easy solutions other than to reduce the amount of car and bus traffic. An expanded Alameda with a bridge across the creek would help reduce the flow thru the Creek.

Sometimes I try to take the 83L from Holly and Leetsdale. I live too far from this, so I drive and park on a side street off Holly. Holly and Leetsdale do not have sidewalks at this point, making it dangerous to walk to the bus, especially in winter.

The Cherry Creek path is the highest-volume path in Denver. It’s over capacity, limiting some people from using it.

We must byfracuate bikes and pedestrian uses. Dedicated bike and pedestrian lanes.

**NEED TO BETTER UNDERSTAND -- I PERSONALLY DIDN'T FOCUS AS MUCH ATTENTION AS I DID BUS/ROAD RECOMMENDATIONS**

Gives safer access for bike/ped and allows faster commute.

---

*Additional comments submitted on hardcopy survey form or through project email. (19 comments received)*

This Email is in response to the Email you sent, titled “Multi-modal improvements recommended for Speer/Leetsdale corridor.” I tried to respond by clicking on “Online Comment Form” which was turned off, because the deadline to comment was March 15. It is up to you, whether the safety concern I am expressing is worth including in planning to make improvements of Leetsdale. (Sorry I am late.)

The right turn lane at a busy Leetsdale intersection needs to be changed, so that the turn is a 90 degree turn, which makes it easy to check for oncoming traffic before making the turn. Many expressways have a long entry lane to allow merging at expressway speeds. The proximity of Yale Avenue, prevents that for merging onto Havana.

According to my map the southwest corner of Leetsdale and Havana is in the City of Denver. The other three corners are in Aurora.
The right turn lane from southeast bound Leetsdale to south bound Havana is NOT a normal 90 degree turn. Instead, cars turn right (south) about five car lengths before merging onto south Havana. Often cars ahead of you, are stopped to await an opening in traffic to merge onto Havana. Each driver needs to turn their eyes almost 180 degrees to clearly check for an opening in traffic. An alternative is to adjust your rearview mirror to clearly see southbound traffic on Havana. But then your rearview mirror is askew for normal driving. You need to readjust it, which you should do only when your car is stopped.

It appears that this right turn lane was designed to get right turners off of Leetsdale, to reduce congestion for drivers on Leetsdale going through the intersection. However this was done by making it more difficult to SAFELY make a right turn.

Having lived on S Jersey for 30 years, it seems the solution to Leetsdale congestion is making Cheery Creek Drive South four lanes from University to Iliff.

It would relieve congestion through the Cherry Creek shopping area and provide an alternative for southeast traffic.

As a resident in CCE for 14 years, I am very concerned about the additional traffic congestion this proposed project will cause. The current traffic back up is bad with the current lane structure and will get much worse losing one lane to buses only. The neighborhood is being ruined!!! I GREATLY oppose the proposal from what I see. I live on Bayaud Ave and during rush hour, there are many cars going by my front door to avoid 1st, Cherry Creek N, & Alameda. How will the city avoid this from getting worse which it will when car lanes are deleted? Can they please add to the proposal that only local traffic will be allowed on Bayaud?

I work in the Mobile Sources (vehicle emissions program) at the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment in Glendale -> colorado.gov/cdphe/motorvehicles

While most of my colleagues focus on individual motor vehicle inspections, I am fortunate to focus more on alternative fuels (e.g., electric, natural gas, etc.) and alternative MODES (transit, bikes, car-&-ride-sharing, etc.).

I live in Morrison, and commute to Glendale by bus 2-3 days per week. I most often take the 83 bus to Leetsdale & Cherry, and then walk through King Soopers & Creekside Park to CDPHE. I usually enjoy the ride to work much more than the ride home, especially since the 83 is so unreliable due to afternoon rush-hour traffic. There have been many times when that bus was stuck on this exact corridor, I’d miss the last connecting bus to Morrison, and I’d have to find a much longer & more expensive ride home ... !

I also chair CDPHE’s (internal) Transportation Alternatives Committee, promoting modes other than single-occupant vehicles (SOVs) for commuters to CDPHE & Glendale. An October 2016 survey found that "only" 60% of CDPHE employees drive alone to work. While CDPHE could take pride in that relatively low %(?), I'd like to see it drop much more, and until deriving alone becomes its own "alternative mode" ... !

I write this just before your March 8 open house begins.
I look forward to that event, and also whatever comes after that.

Thanks very much, BEST of Luck, and I look forward to staying in touch

I am unable to attend tonight’s meeting, however, I wish to make a suggestion. There is currently no sidewalk on the south side of Speer from 6th Ave to Corona St. Please consider adding a sidewalk as part of the improvement plan as Speer is too wide a road to have to cross over to the north side when walking eastbound from about 6th Ave to Corona St. where the bus stop is.

Greatly appreciated your comments and efforts at the meeting. Highly recommend that you put the web site and email address (phone number, too) on every page for future meetings. We scrambled for a pen!! Also, compliment was misspelled (former English major!!). Anyway, your proposal was interesting and thought provoking. Definitely an expensive project with high hopes for federal funding. What is your projected next step? We had to leave so you may have discussed that after 7. What are your start plans for this project? Much success with this endeavor.

I wasn’t at the meeting the other night but a friend gave me one of your handouts.

Unless you live in the Cherry Creek area, you can’t imagine how much traffic there is and how is increased with all of the new development over the past several years. The proposal to take away one of the four lanes to make for a bus lane seems like a terrible idea to me and others I’ve spoke with in the neighborhood.

I understand that the city is wanting to encourage public and bike transportation so how about adding more busses along the route as opposed to taking a lane away. I think you’d find people would support that.

Thanks for hearing my thoughts.

Respectfully,

I am a daily commuter on Speer between Steele and Lincoln and find it already congested during my rush hour commutes. Removing a lane each way will make this much worse. I see no benefit to the public at large in doing this and strongly suggest this idea be scrapped right away.

Taking away a lane on each side on Speer/1st Ave is a HORRIBLE idea. Horrible. I simply don't understand the thought process of Denver’s City Traffic Engineers.

As bad as traffic ALREADY is and will only continue to get worse, how is taking away two lanes the answer?

And on that note, if the City Traffic Engineers could make some common sense decisions and redesign the flow of Colorado Blvd corridor, that would be a miraculous Godsend all on its own. They need to:

1 - get rid of 3-4 stoplights along Colo Blvd (between Exposition and 13th St)
2 - fix the timing of the lights

I've never lived in a city where the traffic flow made absolutely no sense and was this bad. Did the folks making these decisions have any schooling in this? Doesn't appear so.

If the City thinks they're going to successfully force people to take public transportation, think again. Not going to happen. Instead, you're creating an angry and unhealthy environment for our great taxpayers who support this economy and make it what it is.

I know there are thousands out there with the same opinion. Please do something.

Thanks for your consideration.

I just filled out the online questionnaire about the mobility improvements for Speer Boulevard/ East 1st Avenue/ Steele Street/ Alameda Boulevard/ Leetsdale Drive corridor. Here are some additional observations:

1. Under NO circumstances remove the landscaped medians. We don't want to turn those streets into speedways. The long-delayed plans to connect the landscaped sections of East Alameda Boulevard should be implemented.

2. Put high emphasis on pedestrian facilities. The crossing signals on Steele Street and East 1st Avenue, for example, offer too short of a protected crossing time.

3. An operational issue, but nonetheless important for Cherry Creek East, is traffic enforcement. We have problems with cars breezing through stop signs. I was recently brushed by a driver (who didn't stop) at East Ellsworth Avenue and Madison Street. Intersections need to be marked better and traffic officers periodically placed at busy intersections. This will likely become even more important as some drivers use neighborhood streets to bypass thoroughfare traffic if lanes are reduced.

4. Consider making East 1st Avenue from Steele Street to Colorado Boulevard two lanes with parking, a landscaped median, improved sidewalks where needed and bike lanes. The traffic signal at Garfield Avenue would be more suitable, especially for pedestrians, if it was moved to Madison Street (and constructed with mast arms, not the ugly wires).

5. We'd welcome improved sidewalks and bicycle lanes on East Bayaud Avenue, but the City inspectors rarely follow through on 311 calls about residents on the south (shaded) side of the street who never clear their sidewalks of snow and ice. Not a good way to encourage walking.

6. The intersection of Steele Street and East 1st Avenue is a nightmare, especially for pedestrians. Something creative needs to be done to improve traffic, bicycle and pedestrian flow.

7. The shared bicycle/pedestrian trail along Cherry Creek is too narrow. It needs to have clearly marked lanes for bikes and people, and some speed controls (bumps?) to slow down speeding cyclists.

I am writing to ask for your consideration to continue allowing cars to access all lanes in the Speer/Leetsdale corridor during rush hour times. I'm not sure if you've driven on Speer around 5pm.
during the weekdays, but it's stop and go most days. Eliminating one late for buses only would be a death blow to many of us who commute.

I understand the push for public transit, but for individuals like me, it's an unwieldy solution. The bus from Lakewood (my home) takes a long route all around downtown before it gets to Cherry Creek (my job), and it leaves too early for me to get my foster kids ready for school.

Also, because there is no major cross-town thoroughfare from east to west, all of us are spilling onto Alameda and Speer to get to 6th, so it's cramped as it is. With less lanes, it will increase our drive time dramatically, and I likely will not be able to make it to work on time.

Please contact me for more questions, but I ask that you not move forward in reducing any driving lanes on an already-impacted drive.

Tough job you have. It is clear that traditional auto traffic will have to be de-emphasized relative to other modes in order to achieve more alternative capacity. Comments.

1. Theoretical capacity does not equate to actual usage.

2. Once lanes are dedicated to busses and/or split with more bicycles, cars will experience more chokepoints.

3. As a cycler and a walker, I find too many cyclists go too fast in groups dodging in and out of other uses along the creek already. Walkers are creating new dirt paths to avoid them.

Best Regards

I attended the “Go Speer Leetsdale Mobility Study” Open House on Wednesday, March 8, 2017.

A handout distributed at the meeting contained the preliminary concept package which seemed to focus on reducing general purpose lanes on Speer and Leetsdale. The page titled “Benefits Summary” provides the following corridor-long morning west bound travel time for the year 2040:

Autos: 25 to 30 minutes without, and 35 to 40 minutes with, the recommended concept alternative.

Transit: 35 to 40 minutes without, and 25 to 30 minutes with, the recommended concept alternative.

This made me think about how the recommended concept alternative would impact travel times if it were in place currently.

On Friday, March 10, 2017, I bicycled to the corner of 1st Avenue and Gaylord (one block west of University) and counted cars, trucks, buses, bicyclists, and pedestrians traveling west for exactly 30 minutes between 7:32 a.m. and 8:02 a.m. During this 30-minute period I counted 1,212 cars/trucks, 5 buses (4 articulated and 1 regular), 36 bicyclists, and 2 pedestrians (1 in-line skater and 1 pedestrian on the sidewalk on the north side of 1st Ave.). Most cars or trucks had 1 person in them. Seats on the buses were about half occupied with no one standing. I estimate that cars/trucks had about 1,250 occupants
and the buses had about 140 occupants during this 30-minute period. This equates to about 2,500 people per hour in cars/trucks and 280 people per hour in buses.

Using the modal split and traffic volumes observed on March 10, 2017 and the corridor-long travel times shown on the benefits summary page, the following travel times were calculated:

Without improvements:

Transit Riders: 280 people per hour with the trip taking 0.625 hours (the average of 35 and 40 minutes) results in 175 hours spent by transit riders.

Auto Occupants: 2,500 people per hour with the trip taking 0.458 hours results in 1,145 hours spent by auto occupants.

Total time spent by transit riders and auto occupants: 1,320 hours.

With corridor improvements:

Transit Riders: 280 people per hour with the trip taking 0.458 hours results in 128 hours.

Auto occupants: 2,500 people per hour with the trip taking 0.625 hours results in 1,563 hours.

Total time spent by transit riders and auto occupants: 1,691 hours.

The ‘corridor improvements’ would result in a net increase in the time spent traversing the corridor. It would be wasteful to implement the major theme (eliminating general purpose travel lanes) of the recommended concept alternative.

Perhaps in the year 2040 more people will be riding the bus than are doing so today. In my neighborhood RTD has eliminated bus service over the past decade or so due to low ridership. Bus number 56, traveling north and south on Holly Street, was discontinued. Bus number 2, serving 1st Ave between Colorado Blvd and Holly Street, was discontinued.

The bus may make sense for people who travel to downtown Denver and want to avoid high parking fees. For most others the bus doesn’t make much sense.

On March 10, 2017, the same day I made the traffic observations, I also kept track of how long it took me to travel from place to place by bicycle and how long it would take using RTD (as shown on their online trip planner). My residence (at 85 Jersey Street in the Hilltop neighborhood) to the Post Office at 201 Columbine, 13 minutes by bicycle and 26 minutes by bus (which includes the time walking to/from the bus pick up/drop off locations). The Post Office to Trader Joe’s at 750 Colorado Blvd, 11 minutes by bicycle and 19 minutes by bus. Trader Joe’s to my residence, 14 minutes by bicycle and 23 minutes by bus. A car would have been faster than traveling by either bicycle or bus. With a bicycle or car you can leave whenever you want; you do not need to modify your schedule to match the bus schedule. The same inefficiencies in bus travel are likely to exist in the year 2040 as exist today.

As a final note, I bicycled more than 3,000 miles along the streets and bike paths in Denver in 2016. I would not feel comfortable traveling along a street-side bike path along Leetsdale Blvd. There are major
crossings at Alameda, Cherry, Holly, Monaco and Quebec. Crossings are scary, despite all attempts to make them safer. If built it would receive little use. I periodically travel by bicycle on the Alameda bike path from Monaco Blvd. to Clinton Street near Windsor Gardens. Riding this route round-trip I usually see no other cyclists.

Just a few questions at this time. I attended the 4 Square Mile presentation. My home is just south of Mississippi on Parker Road and I have been driving the Leetsdale at Mississippi - Speer to Broadway route for 31 years and know it extremely well.

1. If the center bus lane will be changed based on traffic, where and how will any buses going in the opposite direction drive?

2. Has there been consideration of changing the center lane direction during rush hours for cars and keeping buses using the curb lane in either direction?

3. One extremely urgent need is to cut bus stops into curb turn out lanes starting immediately. One terrible example is the eastbound bus stop at the eastern curb at Leetsdale and Quebec, just past the intersection. Cars are constantly backed up and causing gridlock at rush times from both the southbound Quebec traffic light as well as the eastbound Leetsdale intersection waiting behind the bus until it moves again. Why can't that bus stop in the turn lane on the west side of that intersection, out of eastbound traffic flow? So few cars use that turn lane that it is mostly empty even during rush hours.

4. I would be happy to give you more examples of easy to create traffic flow by having bus stops out of traffic lanes, if you are open to reviewing these possibilities.

5. Primary consideration should be for motor vehicles - not bicycles during business hours. I cannot believe that workers will commute to downtown jobs along Leetsdale or that it should be designated a recreational use road for bikers when we have such wonderful bike paths such as the Highline Canal and Cherry Creek paths going in the same direction.

Thanks for your consideration.

I live on Logan near Speer and could not be more excited about the transit only lanes and improved bicycle facilities! It is a no brainer that the corridor could use improved facilities!

Let me know how I can help!

From review of the materials on the web site I am concerned that the study is skewed in favor of transit versus single occupant vehicles. The study should focus on the mobility of people and goods (regardless of mode) versus the mobility of transit, bike and ped users. The most critical measure of effectiveness should be the likely per person travel times and safety, not potential capacity if people were to substantially shift from single occupant vehicles to transit. Please answer the following questions:

What is the likely total travel time per person trip with the build versus no build condition?
What is the cost per trip build versus no build condition (accounting for initial plus operating costs)?

The impact on signal operations by elimination of the turn lane should be accounted for using micro simulation of the network with a model such as VISSIM. The future is an uber-like driverless car world on you are pushing ancient transportation technology at huge expense to the mobility of people and goods.

I am the President of the Country Club Historic Neighborhood, Inc. which is a registered neighborhood organization in Denver. We are a historic neighborhood in Denver. The western half of our neighborhood was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1979 and the Country Club Historic District was designated as a Landmark District in 1990. I am writing on behalf of our Board of Directors to express our opposition to the Speer-Leetsdale proposal to create a dedicated bus lane on Speer Boulevard in both directions during rush hours. We have had a representative attending the stakeholder working group meetings and he has raised our concerns previously.

We do not believe that this plan will have a positive impact on our neighborhood. During rush hour, traffic on Speer Boulevard is already often at a standstill. Taking away one-third of its capacity will cause this problem to increase substantially. While this project may increase theoretical corridor capacity we don’t believe that is a good basis on which to analyze the merits of this proposal because the critical factor is how many buses will actually run and how many people will actually ride those buses. We do not believe that sufficient numbers of people will utilize the buses to justify taking lanes away on Speer during rush hour.

The Project is likely to increase air pollution due to the congestion caused by the removal of a lane; it will decrease safety by placing vehicles on local streets not designed to handle the heavy volume caused by the cut-through traffic; and it will have a significant impact on the sustainability of our historic neighborhood.

This will have a significant adverse impact on a historic district in Denver. We believe it should not be undertaken without performing the type of environmental impact study that would be consistent with those performed under the National Environmental Policy Act.

I like the plan with one suggestion. Do not reduce the number of traffic lanes dedicating one to a Managed Lane (Bus and Turn) on between Colorado and University. In that section, there are currently three lanes in each direction and I suggest that the bus traffic share the lane with cars so that cars are not reduced from three to two.

Beyond University to Lincoln, where there are currently four lanes in each direction, change one lane to a Managed Lane, I think would not significantly impede car traffic.

This would leave the concept alternative intact but with lane share for just a portion of the route. Later studies could determine if "taking" a lane in this section for bus and turn only would notably impede car traffic.
1. IF YOU ALLOW BUS MANAGED LANES TO BE USED BY MULTIPLE SHARED OPTIONS (E.G. CAR TO GO, COMMERCIAL SHUTTLE SERVICES, PERHAPS TAXIS AND UBER OF LYFT), YOU WILL LIKELY FIND LESS COMMUNITY RESISTANCE.

2. ADD ANOTHER $10 MIL OR WHATEVER IT TAKES TO TRULY FIX THE CHERRY CREEK TRAIL. COMPLETELY SEPARATE PEDESTRIANS AND BIKERS. ADDRESS THE COUNTRY CLUB/SPEER ISSUE.

3. STREETScape APPEARANCE IS INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT. IF YOU ARE LEVERAGING MEDIANS ON ALAMEDA PARKWAY, THE STREETScape BETTER BE BEAUTIFUL. THIS WILL ALSO HELP WITH COMMUNITY CONCERNS.

4. I HAVE REALLY HARD TIME IMAGINING CENTER BUS LANE (REVERSIBLE LANe) ON LEETSDALE AND ALAMEDA AS SOMETHING COMFORTABLE AND SAFE. I ASSUME NO STREET WIDENING /TAKING OF PROPERTY.