

**Prospect Corridor Design Survey – November/December 2014***Key Themes – Open-Ended Comments***Q5. Do you have any comments on the Prospect Corridor Vision?**

- General support for the vision statements as presented
- Support for safety as a top priority
- Support for improving vehicle traffic flow
- Concern about the impact of a new on-campus stadium on the vision
- Support for improved accommodations for pedestrians and bicycles

**Q7. How well does the design for Prospect Road serve each mode of travel?**

- **Car:** Majority of respondents felt that it serves car travel well or very well (74.8%)
- **Bicycle:** Majority of respondents felt that it serves bicycle travel well or very well (59.4%)
- **Walking:** Majority of respondents felt that it serves pedestrian travel well or very well (70.2%)
- **Transit (Bus):** People generally felt that transit is well-served by the design, though about one-third of respondents selected “not sure.” More information was needed for some to feel comfortable answering the question.
- **Comments:**
  - Need for more north-south crossings
  - Interest in bus pullouts to reduce traffic stoppages
  - Interest in traffic calming to slow vehicle speeds
  - Concern that design does not extend to the west and east along Prospect
  - Concerns about bikes and pedestrians sharing a path, both for efficiency of bike travel and safety of pedestrians; suggestions that this needs to be well-marked and separating bikes and pedestrians should be considered
  - Concern that shared path is only on north side of road, and concerns about the visibility and safety of eastbound bicyclists on the north side of the street
  - Support for tree lawn
  - Support for bike/ped underpass at Centre Ave to improve crossing safety
  - Interest in an overpass or underpass at the railroad crossing, or other solutions to reduce congestion between the Mason Corridor and College Ave
  - Concern that the design may not function well with the traffic that would be generated by an on-campus stadium
  - Concern about amount of right-of-way (ROW) needs shown in some areas
  - Desire for left turn arrows at the intersection of Centre and Prospect
  - Interest in dedicated, on-street bike lane instead of a shared path
  - Concern that medians will increase traffic congestion
  - Concern about median at Bay Road restricting access to Hilton and Colorado Parks & Wildlife
  - Concern about the ability of 10' lanes to accommodate large trucks

**Q8. How well does the design for Prospect Road meet the vision statements?**

- **P1 – Safe and Comfortable corridor for all modes of travel:** Majority of respondents felt that it supports this vision statement well or very well (66.3%)
- **P2 - Safe crossings:** Majority of respondents felt that it supports this vision statement well or very well (59.5%)
- **P3 – Attractive gateway to campus, downtown, and midtown:** Majority of respondents felt that it supports this vision statement well or very well (74.8%)
- **P4 – Seamless connection to MAX:** Majority of respondents felt that it supports this vision statement well or very well (52.5%), though many responded that they were not sure (28.6%)
- **Comments:**
  - Preference for separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities
  - Concern about impact of an on-campus stadium on the ability to meet the vision
  - Concern that design does not significantly improve connectivity to MAX for pedestrians and drivers
  - Comments that a bus route along this stretch of Prospect would be the best improvement for connecting to MAX
  - Concerns about the amount of right-of-way needed for the design
  - Comments that safe crossings can only be achieved by reducing travel speeds
  - Requests for more details about how the design would be implemented
  - Support for underpasses for bikes and pedestrians across Prospect, and for vehicles at the railroad crossing
  - Concern about the safety of mid-block crossings

**Q9. How well does the design for Lake Street serve each mode of travel?**

- **Car:** Majority of respondents felt that it serves car travel well or very well (71.3%)
- **Bicycle:** Majority of respondents felt that it serves bicycle travel well or very well (89.5%)
- **Walking:** Majority of respondents felt that it serves pedestrian travel well or very well (91.5%)
- **Transit (Bus):** People generally felt that transit is well-served by the design (47.4%), though more than one-third of respondents selected “not sure” (37.2%)
- **Comments:**
  - Requests for more information about how buses would use the corridor
  - Interest in removing on-street parking
  - Support for separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities
  - Support for the raised planted buffer protecting the bike lane
  - Interest in additional crossings, particularly between Shields and Whitcomb
  - Concern about amount of right-of-way needed for the design
  - Concern that parked cars and planted buffers could create visual barriers for bikes and cars trying to make turns
  - Interest in removing tree lawns on the south side or both sides
  - Comments related to the need for wayfinding and signage for all users

- Concern that Lake isn't an ideal bicycle corridor because it doesn't continue to the east of College or west of Shields
- Concern about safety of bicyclists at intersections, and visibility at driveways due to parked cars
- Concern that the design may not fit with plans for an on-campus stadium
- Concern about maintenance and snow removal for the protected bike lanes
- Concern about emergency access and sufficient fire lane widths

**Q10. How well does the design for Lake Street meet the vision statements?**

- **P1 – Safe and Comfortable corridor for all modes of travel:** Majority of respondents felt that it supports this vision statement well or very well (80.3%)
- **P2 - Safe crossings:** Majority of respondents felt that it supports this vision statement well or very well (70.3%)
- **P3 – Attractive gateway to campus, downtown, and midtown:** Majority of respondents felt that it supports this vision statement well or very well (83.8%)
- **P4 – Seamless connection to MAX:** Majority of respondents felt that it supports this vision statement well or very well (56.7%), though many responded that they were not sure (30.6%)
- **Comments:**
  - Comments that crossings and transit connections are not clear in the designs
  - Concern that buildings would have to be demolished to implement the design
  - Suggestions that CSU should fund improvements and/or maintain Lake Street
  - Question about improvements that would be made from Prospect to Lake on Shields
  - Suggestion for 45-degree angled parking
  - Suggestion for a roundabout at Lake and Center

**Q1. Do you have any additional comments related to the Prospect Road or Lake Street designs?**

- Support for encouraging bicycle traffic to use Lake rather than Prospect
- Suggestion to place a crossing guard at the mid-block crossing of Prospect to help children safely get to Bennett Elementary School
- Concerns about the timing of pedestrian crossing signals, and the impact of changing signals on traffic flows
- Concern about impacts to the properties directly on Prospect
- Concern about the cost of planted medians
- Concern about visibility issues related to tree lawns
- Need for clarification about whether the designs are being proposed together or as separate options
- Suggestion for emergency call boxes and water fountains along the corridor
- Concern about lighting and safety at existing underpasses
- Support for xeriscape treatments in tree lawns and medians
- Preference for prioritizing functional improvements over aesthetic enhancements