

Public Comment Reconciliation and Change Log						
Page	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Outcome	Notes	
1	Denver is making hard to drive around the city Example taking 2 lanes in each direction on East Colfax down to 1 lane in each direction A other example making East Alameda from 2 lanes in each direction to 1 lane in each direction A other example is making 1 ways to 2 lanes in each direction downtown	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	DOTI will study conversion to two-way streets downtown and consider many factors	
1	Denver is already overgrown. Nobody from here has a problem with the street layout. You want to create and change the current layout, thinking it will attract more people. It won't. You want to tear down buildings and build new ones for housing? Who's moving here, and for what jobs? If Denver's population was reduced back to what it was in 1989, everything would be fine. 5 out of 95,000 people commute by bike. We have enough bike lanes and trails. We are a car and truck community, and the problem we need to solve is to stop underbuilding substandard roads that are obsolete as soon as they open. CDOT used to build great roads. We have enough parks. No more parks. Fix the Mouse Trap so we can get to our destination more fluidly through that interchange. Shutter RTD. It's awful, and just needs to go away, and let public transportation go to the private sector. Get the trains off the surface and onto overpasses. World-class cities dont make commuters wait at train crossings. Reduce permit approval times, and give real tax breaks that attract manufacturing. We don't make things in Denver. Truckers bring us goods, then drive away empty to get loads in other cities or states.	0	3	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		

1	Enough is enough. We now have every street in Denver torn up, with no attempt to finish anything that has already been started. The entire length of Colfax has been torn up and left unfinished. The public was assured that they would finish one section at a time, but instead, they have permanently blighted the entirety of Colfax. We have now placed dangerous obstacles at street corners, endangering bicyclists in favor of unlicensed motorized vehicles in the form of Ebikes. Ebike accidents are filling our emergency rooms; these things need to be licensed. I will work as hard as I can to defeat any bond issues, funding requests, and any politician running on this will have to answer for the mess that you all have made in this town. And apparently, from the disclaimer at the top of this email you already know how the people, and bicycle riders feel about the mess you all have left unfinished.	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
9	1) playgrounds need the equipment to be shaded! 2) Local businesses need to be more accepting of hiring those of us who live in this area, especially felons. We paid our dues, we became better and we deserve to work where we live. 3) most of these businesses say they're always hiring because they get a kickback from the government. Yet 90% of them are not in fact hiring. 4) we need communication between the locals that live here and the events that take place around us. Most of the time I only know what's going on because I drive by it.	4	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Plan does not dictate how private businesses are run. Also, see Policies and Programs #7.C	
20	The term "affordable" is useless. It presumes the market would ever allow UNaffordable units. Let the market decide prices to encourage development. New units tend to be pricey, but they relieve pressure on the housing market overall.	3	8	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		

21	The word 'rail' appears only six times in the entire document. 4 of those 6 times are on pg. 34-35 defining barriers to connection. At present, the plan doesn't meaningfully address rail transit in any serious way. This is disappointing as a downtown resident who participated in community outreach events for the DAP. At those events I saw firsthand the energy around transit improvements; light rail and bicycle infrastructure especially. The plan correctly notes that the current rail system is designed for long range commuters only, and does very little to facilitate car free travel between downtown and other Denver neighborhoods. I understand the city is more focused on BRT right now, but that shouldn't mean the light rail system is completely disregarded. It's pretty much a universal rule that world class cities all have a good rail system. Look at what Seattle is doing to make huge, rapid improvements to theirs. I really hope the next iteration of the plan includes serious content around light rail improvements as a key strategy to improve connection. The biggest theme I see from people who live in and around downtown is wanting central Denver to be a city for pedestrians first, bicycles and transit riders second, and cars third. The car lobby wields a lot of power, and they dominate the built environment of the city, state, and country as a whole, but we the people are relying on the city to hear its residents and allocate transportation resources accordingly. Thank you!	3	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Transit - As economic conditions evolve and RTD's capability to improve and expand passenger rail increases, CCD will monitor and respond accordingly. Until then, this plan establishes realistic actions that can be accomplished within the plan horizon.	
25	Are there also ways to encourage the creation of more affordable home ownership opportunities without explicitly controlling income-restrictions? For example, are floor-area ratios, minimum lot sizes, maximum lot coverage, and other similar standards set up in a way that make it possible to build more starter-home ownership opportunities such as rowhomes and condos, and are current codes flexible enough to allow for reasonable sub-division of existing buildings into multiple, smaller units? We have seen some progress in apartment rents decreasing, but affordable ownership opportunities must also be provided, and must be protected from being gobbled up only by investors and corporations.	0	0	No change needed - already in draft	Affordable Housing - home ownership. Address construction defect laws	

30	There is no need to make downtown family friendly for living, that is what the suburbs are for. Families typically want access to yards and open space attached to their homes, not a block sized park. It wastes resources creating space for an edge use case like family housing downtown. Focus on affordable commercial rent, getting workers back into buildings and driving new businesses. Everything you have done on 16th is window dressing without the businesses to make it worth visiting.	0	6	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
31	Yet again, this document discusses taking public funds, effort, time, energy and privatizing them. Why are the authors so obsessed with private business? Could we instead refocus these and other resources into public ventures with a mandate to improve our community, rather than continue to funnel power, wealth, and influence towards the top? I feel genuinely confused why there is such a strong focus on private business and private investment when this is supposed to be about improving the lives of everyone who spends time in downtown, not just 50 or 100 business owners. Yes, those businesses provide a variety of goods and services that people claim they want, but they also extract value from customers and workers in the form of insufficient wages and profit margins. That's just how a capitalist system works. The monetary value, or profit, collected by the business owner, or capitalist, is never guaranteed to be reinvested into our downtown. It's essentially lost for good once it lands in private hands. Can the authors share their rationale for the intense promotion of privatization and what other options they considered for the financial investment ideas in this project, as well as why those options weren't selected?	10	3	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Private Development	
32	One way streets are not efficient when it comes to getting to the exact entry of the building you're going to but this fails to appreciate the rate which they clear traffic as opposed to bidirectional roads that have more complex, longer stop lights, lower volume and in general increase congestion. Only one side of the coin is being shown here by the city, as usual.	3	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		

32	One-way streets are not an issue for pedestrians. This plan should not consider cars and focus exclusively on measures to enhance pedestrian safety, bicycle safety, and public transit access.	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Streets	
37	Please reconsider converting one way streets to two way operation. Moving traffic through downtown should remain a priority for those traveling into the city and those who live in the city and need to drive through. Traffic is already slow downtown and changing the streets to slow down fast drivers is not the right solution. Drivers that speed will not be deterred. The newly built bike lane infrastructure would become obsolete leading to a waste in investment pointing to irresponsible spending and planning. Please keep the one way streets so traffic can move through the city. If traffic is too slow and restricted it would discourage moving around the city and visiting.	0	7	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	DOTI Street Study	
37	Interrupting Broadway throws northbound Broadway traffic headed for Park Ave West and I 25 onto named streets, and disrupts connections to Brighton Blvd and its large residential population throwing southbound Broadway traffic onto Blake, Market and Larimer streets which can't handle it let alone if they were converted to two-way streets. Reduce the pedestrian / bike barrier aspect of Broadway by creating a real pedestrian refuge median. Changing one-way streets to two-way streets in downtown (a worthy goal) may mean keeping Broadway / Lincoln as a way for traffic to get around downtown.	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Broadway - The plan does not recommend closing Broadway north of 20th, and only considers calming or closing Broadway between 18th and 20th if the DOTI street study finds it feasible.	

38	Why? Why is larger-scale public investment not an option? What barriers are standing in the way? Why must we depend on the likelihood that a rich developer or investor deign to improve our downtown? Are Denverites not capable of doing it ourselves? "Transforming underinvested areas and downtown-wide infrastructure" decidedly does not require "targeted public investment to catalyze private development interest." In fact, I would argue that "private development interest" is a net-negative for our downtown and we shouldn't be trying to attract it. What other options for infrastructure enhancement were considered beyond putting up "targeted" (read: relatively small dollar amounts in a handful of high-priority places) public funds to "incentivize" privatization of downtown? Noting that any incentives are not a guarantee of private investment.	4	3	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Private investment - framing	
38	Is this a con? I would reframe those "barriers" as safeguards which protect Denverites and Denver's physical space from the predation of private investment and leave room for public initiatives and public spaces.	0	3	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	The plan recommends zoning and design guidelines that support design outcomes that have been requested/supported through outreach while streamlining processes to make development easier.	
38	I'm glad you've commented, Devin. I apologize that my comment came across NIMBY-ly, that wasn't my intention. I'm a large proponent of infrastructure improvement, adding housing units that people can actually live in, community-improving changes to our built environment, and more. I stand by my statement that private development interest is a net-negative for our downtown and we shouldn't be trying to attract it. Private development interest crowds out public investment because there's only so much physical space to go around, increases costs to consumers by enabling individuals to extract value from consumers in the form of profits, and makes places less inviting and conducive to lingering via those increased costs that are a product of the profit motive inherent to private development interest. These negatives are all direct results of private development interest. It's not specifically that I don't want developers making money (to be clear, I don't want developers making money), but rather that public endeavors, powered by ordinary citizens, their labor, and their tax dollars, are inherently accountable to the community. Private development is not accountable to any entity other than itself. I feel that accountability is important, especially as part of a 20-year development plan designed with the intent of invigorating the city and neighborhoods that I live in and want to live in for the next 20 years. I also respect that you feel differently, and I'd be delighted to continue this discussion. Thanks for participating!	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Private investment - Noted	
47	Can we unscramble these letters to spell "spicier" and maybe have that be a fun theme: "Let's make downtown a little S.P.I.C.I.E.R."?	2	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Fun! These are in order of how they tie to the vision in Chapter 2	

49	I do not support this recommendation. There were 4 questions in the survey about additional lighted ads and signs. Did additional lighted signs really receive public support? I would like to see the survey results, as this goes against my expectations of public results. Thank you.	6	1	No change needed - already in draft	D-TD	
49	This would lead to additional light pollution, which Denver should be working to reduce. I do not support this recommendation.	4	1	No change needed - already in draft	D-TD	
49	I would describe most "digital art" as visual clutter, not visual interest. I would rather the plan support traditional neon signs rather than modern LEDs.	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	D-TD	
49	This "master developer" needs to have a legal obligation to improve the lives of everyday Denverites living downtown (since the goal is increase downtown residential) and to a lesser extent, visiting downtown. The master developer shouldn't be a corporation whose legal obligation is to increase shareholder value. It shouldn't be the City who writes the rules. It should be some external third party made up of Denverites with an acknowledged responsibility to improve the lives of everyday Denverites, and decidedly not other responsibilities like to increase business foot traffic.	2	2	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Governance structure to be determined but likely based on existing structures with DDA/DURA	
50	What is the evidence that people find it difficult to navigate? In a world with GPS and Google Maps?	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	public comment during the plan process identified the need to improve navigation in DT.	
51	I would like to restoration of direct routes from Convention Center/Theater District RTD stop to Union Station	2	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Vision is to achieve this through BRT	
51	Will the new DDA ever help fund the 5280 trail?	2	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
51	I'm not sure what this bullet point means, so I wanted to add a suggestion: can we add more light rails to Denver, especially along major streets like Broadway/Lincoln, Colfax, and Speer?	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	RTD does not have any plans for new light rail in DT.	
53	🔗 Public-funded art tends to be self-selecting agitprop, with DIA's Blucifer being a rare exception. Spend public dollars on quality materials and good designs and decorations instead.	2	4	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Plan will not define type of art or design	

53	I personally don't think public wifi should be a high priority given the opportunity cost of doing it. How many people really need public wifi downtown. There are already places like the library that offer it. Too many other things to be done before worrying about everyone having wifi all the time.	2	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
53	I have mixed feelings about this one. I like the idea of activating parks but it raises concerns around creating additional competition for restaurant and retail spaces in the surrounding buildings (which are already struggling). With ground floor activation and vacancies a big issue right now, this needs to be balanced carefully and executed really thoughtfully.	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	This will occur over time so both can be successful	
53	Once again, I agree with Connor. I would also add...who do we want to feel safe to? There are people from the suburbs that will never feel safe in any city, no matter the statistics. Are we catering to them or are we catering to city folk?	3	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	We can do both!	
53	Additionally: who is the grant-making authority? A city agency? the DDA? How are grant applications tracked and how is success measured? Additionally, how do we ensure grants go to organizations that align with being "inclusive and representative of Denver's diverse communities"?	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
53	I'd prefer that we shut down something else other than our only transit-focused street. Shut down a car-focused street instead!	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
53	How about music as well?	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Arts - music may not be an allowable use of public arts funds, but could be a consideration for public art plan as it relates to private or other funding	
59	strike "or"	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Intention is to activate both underutilized lots and well-used lots during off-peak times	

66	Although I am in favor of converting a number of one-way streets in Downtown to two-way, I don't agree that Broadway and Lincoln should be converted to two-way. I would much rather see Broadway converted into a multi-modal street with protected bike lanes and bus lanes, and parking/loading zones for vehicles. On both Lincoln and Broadway, driving lanes should be narrowed and the street should be designed to slow traffic and minimize conflicts with pedestrians, bicycles and buses. This part of Downtown still needs adequate vehicular access to other parts of the city, and it has to happen somewhere.	1	0	No change needed - already in draft		
68	I see BRT but Welton would be a great candidate for a low floor streetcar. Cantenary infrastructure is there. Moving rail to center and then moving CBD traffic through Welton and downing to 38th and Rino. Then south to stadiums and south Denver would be transformative	5	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Vision is to improve service (mode determined by study)	
68	What analysis insights are available on how the proposed shift from rail to bus on Welton will improve regional transit connectivity? Did the plan consider a restoration of the regional service pattern to the rails, such as reconnecting the L Line to the D Line to provide regional service as far south as I-25 & Broadway or Littleton as it did before 2019?	5	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Vision is to improve service (mode determined by study)	

68	Consider regional rail alternatives that leverage the existing infrastructure on Welton. There are a few things that can be done quickly within 1-2 years to make the rail more useful: (a) Extend the L Line to serve I-25 & Broadway or further south on existing tracks or recombine with the D or the H. (b) Invest in Transit Signal Priority (TSP) across a dozen intersections on Welton for trains initially and any buses that are introduced on the street (c) Increase the L's frequency to 10-minute headways (enabled by TSP) Over the next 10 years, the highest value-add for useful transit on Welton will be to restore the L Line to being a regional light rail corridor that operates on Welton as a quiet, more-accessible low-floor streetcar serving new connections in two directions: (a) Adding the low-floor vehicles will also decrease the impact and improve accessibility (b) Extension north to 38th & Blake Station as outlined and funded by taxpayers in FasTracks with connections to Denver Airport AND (c) Extension west as far as Federal Center Station in Lakewood with improved connections from Welton to MSU/CU Denver, Federal, Sheridan, and Wadsworth currently served by the W Line. The potential of expanding on the existing rail infrastructure promises far higher transit utility than moving existing local buses over by two blocks because the rails enable both local AND regional connections. An L Line that operates alongside the W Line between Federal Center Station on the Westside and 38th & Blake Station to the north will be Denver's first through-running east-west light rail connection through Downtown, and will bring enormous diversity of foot traffic to and from Welton St. GDT believes that fast, frequent, reliable, safe, and accessible transit is vital to creating vibrant urban environments with capacity for lots of people to interact with the space. Transit is an important generator of pedestrian traffic and solves	5	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Vision is to improve service (mode determined by study)
68	The carbon costs and surface disruption of demolishing large structures or high-rises can be enormous. Can you clarify the circumstances in which the city would pay to acquire and demolish an existing structure? Obsolete low-rises that do not qualify as historic structures are one thing, but we need to specify a framework where such a costly and disruptive action would make both carbon/environmental sense and economic sense, especially when so many surface parking and infill opportunities remain. In a world of excess office space, we want to allow lease costs to decrease with the market demand to the point that filling up the transit-accessible Downtown office stock becomes attractive while it is the car-dependent suburban building stock in food deserts that is obsolete be what turns over into housing or other uses first. We want our skyline-defining structures to be preserved - and the city should be the last entity spending money to tear them down.	6	0	Change made	holition is a possible outcome in certain situations, but not the first move. Plan language changed.

68	I would echo James Flattum's points regarding the L-line. - Adding the low-floor vehicles will also decrease the impact and improve accessibility - Extension north to 38th & Blake Station as outlined and funded by - Extension west as far as Federal Center Station in Lakewood with improved connections from Welton to MSU/CU Denver, Federal, Sheridan, and Wadsworth currently served by the W Line.	3	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Vision is to improve service (mode determined by study)	
68	Agree 100% here. Excellent ideas James. I'm concerned that the picture shown is of a Bus line. It would be a hugely missed opportunity to not take advantage of the existing but limited light rail that exists on Welton already. BRT is the hot transit topic right now, but a high quality rail network is what sets the A-Tier cities apart from the rest.	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Vision is to improve service (mode determined by study)	
68	Yes -- the community has been calling for a two-way Welton Street as a transit-priority corridor for years, and this is consistent with the City Council-adopted Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan recommendation. Thank you for reiterating it here! However, not sure why La Alma/Lincoln Park and the Santa Fe Arts District is necessarily identified as a specific connection destination. As a transit priority street, several services connecting through to downtown (and beyond) on Welton to multiple northeast Denver destinations/routes. Forcing a notional "connect cultural districts to each other" framing too early is how you end up with almost-unused routes like the infrequent ART bus, rather than multiple highly-used and broadly useful routes. Not saying those destinations might not be connected by one the the routes that passes through Welton, but it's just premature to assert that needs to be the focus at this high-level planning stage.	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
68	Gondola incorporates views, revenue, transportation and tourism in one.	0	2	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
68	and lots of unattractive, hard-to-maintain, above ground infrastructure.	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		

69	The presence of unnecessary buses on this "pedestrian area" seems to me to undermine the entire premise of 16th Street. It's either a pedestrian area in which people can relax, or it isn't. Currently, we've spent a substantial amount of taxpayer funds, and it still isn't (pedestrian, that is, not really). If you have a good idea, commit to it fully in execution. The current approach is half-baked. I know for a fact that the 16th Street vision is not coming to fruition as quickly as city leaders would have hoped. Here, then, is your opportunity. Move the unnecessary bus route and commit fully to pedestrianization, embracing all the benefits that other cities have gained from it (Boulder's Pearl Street comes to mind).	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
70	What happened to Larimer being the chief candidate for a pedbike/greenway crosstown option from LoDo to RiNo? In 2021, DOTI noted it was shifting its transit, and presumably transitway, priorities from Larimer to Blake and Market. With Blake/Market as the DOTI preferred crosstown transit corridor per 2022 material, wouldn't Larimer better compliment existing pedestrian and bike infrastructure?	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
71	It would be great to see Curtis closed to cars entirely.	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
72	This would have impacts on multiple bus routes, increasing running time, increasing operating costs, and reducing network simplicity and legibility for riders. Notable route impacts include the FreeMetroRide and the FF4 to Civic Center.	0	1	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Future study would explore these challenges	
72	Is this permanent, or just construction mitigation? This pattern makes proposed bus service on North Broadway from LoDo to RiNo more difficult.	2	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Future study would explore these challenges	
72	"Reimagined transit service?" This plan should NOT advance the idea of ripping out the light rail tracks. Removing the L Line tracks would be a generational mistake, showing a complete lack of foresight or imagination for ways that service on the line could be improved, such as extending it (less than 1 mile!) north to 38th & Blake or connecting it to the W Line.	4	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
72	Why don't we get Skyline Park fixed and usable before we start taking major corridors away for Skyline Park 2.0	0	3	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Changes to Skyline Park may occur alongside street improvements	
72	Can you somehow partner with or link this in some fashion to the Downtown Denver Expeditionary School? It seems that there could be some real synergy there.	0	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		

74	I'm in support of activating this space, but given that there's so many residential buildings here, what will be done to keep the noise at a reasonable level? I live at the apartments on Park & Walnut, and the street level, traffic noise from only 1 way streets is already severe...more traffic would surely mean more noise. I'm not involved in city planning at all so I'm not sure what the steps would be, but it's important to me that it's taken into account!	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
74	Rather than increasing police officers (who are not good at stopping crime, just cataloging it), this plan should focus on extending resources to the unhoused population in the area. It would go a VERY long way towards making the area feel safer, and help the vulnerable people who also call this neighborhood home. We can't just push them aside and call it a day in the name of "comfort" for the people who are lucky enough to afford an expensive apartment.	3	3	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
74	Respectfully, your comment ignores the fact that a lot of city resources are extended to this particular community and yet the problem persists. Denver's homeless budget exceeds the entire budget for the city of Lakewood. But no one approach solves this complex of an issue, even pouring money and resources into it. People struggling need to be extended a hand for help and I'm glad Denver does that, but ultimately people who live/work/visit downtown should be able to feel safe going out in the neighborhood too, and part of that is having police officers present as a deterrent to crime and enforcing laws that are on the books- public drug use, camping, shop lifting, disorderly/anti-social behavior, etc. which are all still prevalent issues for anyone who is downtown with any regularity.	2	1	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
75	In other cities, Park Ave is a more prestigious address - and often accompanied by a park-like atmosphere. It would be nice to see Park Ave be prioritized as a tree canopy and to see intentional investment for more ground floor activation.	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		

75	We still request the bike lane here instead of steakhouse parking. Just because they blocked the lane for years without consequence should not entitle them to their own parking. The bollards should be reinstalled all over downtown as I have already seen bike lanes ignored or treated as a parking space since their removal primarily around here.	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
78	Cherry Creek bike path goes under Colfax and crosses below WB Speer 2,500 feet downstream. How is this considered a conflict?	1	1	No change needed - inconsistent with vision		
81	Commons Park also needs more shade trees in high impact areas. For such a big park there's not much shade on hot days.	0	0	Not applicable	Noted	
81	Here's a visionary proposal: What if the north RTD lines that end at Union Station were connected through to the south RTD lines that end a few blocks away? I'd love to be able to hop onto a train at Evans Station and ride it all the way out to the Airport. If you look at most major city metros, lines don't end at downtown & instead pass through back to the edges on opposite sides of the city.	1	0	No change needed - inconsistent with vision	Outside of the scope of this planning effort (regional)	