



denver STREETS PARTNERSHIP

Denver City Council At-Large Candidate Questionnaire

Candidate Name

Alfredo Reyes

Candidate Website

www.reyesfordenver.com

What are your top mobility-related priorities as a candidate? How do you expect to implement them if elected?

I have three top priorities that are centered on one idea.

First, close the infrastructure gap between neighborhoods. I went on a bike ride on Sunday with Pedestrian Dignity and the Denver Bike Lobby, and what I kept thinking is that in our wealthiest neighborhoods, bike infrastructure, tree canopy, walkable small business, and climate-resilient design are called amenities and treated as quality of life. In the neighborhoods I come from, every one of those is an uphill fight, requested for years and funded last. Same city, two different standards. That is why the High Injury Network and our historically disinvested neighborhoods keep turning out to be the same map.

Second, treat mobility as a system rather than a set of modes. Sidewalks, shade, resilient climate infrastructure, lighting, transit, and neighborhood business are not competing line items. They either exist together or the whole thing fails. A bus stop with no sidewalk, no shelter, and no light is not a transit option.

Third, build what we have already adopted. Denver Moves: Bikes, Denver Moves: Pedestrians and Trails, the Vision Zero Action Plan, and the Safe Routes to School Action Plan are all sitting there. At current funding levels the buildout takes generations. The plans are not the problem.

Implementation runs through the council's real powers: approving the budget, approving contracts, and setting land use. I will use all three, and I will be specific about it rather than promising outcomes I do not control alone.

Do you support the city's Vision Zero commitment of eliminating traffic fatalities and serious injuries by 2030?

Yes

If yes, what actions should City officials take to reverse the current traffic-fatality trend and make meaningful progress toward Denver's Vision Zero commitment?

Ninety-three people were killed on Denver streets in 2025, a record, in a city that formally committed to zero. We should say that plainly, because a goal nobody is held to is not really a goal.

I would start by concentrating the money where people are actually dying, on the High Injury Network (HIN) and in the Safety Focus Areas, instead of spreading it evenly across the city and calling that fairness. While permanent work gets designed, use the low-cost temporary treatments that can go in within months. Lower design speeds, narrow the lanes, daylight the intersections, raise the crosswalks, convert one-ways back where it makes sense.

Then fix the signals, which is some of the cheapest safety we can buy. Ban turns on red downtown and along the High Injury Network. Get rid of the beg buttons on the HIN and move to automatic pedestrian phases with a leading interval, so whether you get to cross doesn't depend on finding a button and being able to reach it.

We also need people to enforce what we build. Rehire and fully fund right-of-way enforcement, because a protected bike lane that gets parked in is not protected. We saw a lot of this during our bike ride in RINO.

Finally, I would put it on the record every year. An annual public report to council, corridor by corridor, naming what slipped and why. Right now a missed year costs nobody anything, and that is most of the problem.

Do you think public transit (bus and train service) can play a role in helping Denver achieve its Vision Zero goals?

Yes

If yes, explain how.

Transit is probably the most undervalued safety tool we have. Every trip that moves from a car to a bus comes out of the mode that kills people, and a lot of our transit priority corridors sit directly on the High Injury Network, so money spent there does two jobs at once.

That only works if transit is a real option, though. Frequency, shelter, lighting, and safety are what make it one. Without those we are asking people to choose something we have made slow and uncomfortable, and then acting surprised when they drive.

Do you think the City should play a role in ensuring that Denverites have access to enough frequent, reliable public-transit service to make transit a practical option for daily trips?

Yes

If yes, how should the City partner with RTD to improve transit service?

I will be straight about the boundary here. RTD is a separate district and the city does not run it. That is exactly why we have to be deliberate about the things we do control, and what the budget allows us to pay for.

Denver can buy more service. We should be purchasing additional frequency from RTD on priority routes, with the goal that most Denverites live within a walk of all-day service running every fifteen minutes or better.

We can also make the buses faster without RTD spending a dollar, because transit signal priority, queue jumps, and dedicated lanes are all city right-of-way decisions. We can make the stop itself worth standing at, with seating, shelter, lighting, and shade, instead of the sign-in-the-dirt we have at thousands of them. We can build the ridership through land use, which is entirely ours.

Then there is the seat itself. When a project comes to council, somebody should be asking what it does for transit access, every single time. I would rather be a persistent, informed partner to RTD than a candidate promising to fix an agency he does not govern.

Are you willing to champion projects that prioritize street safety and multimodal access over driver convenience?

Yes

Please explain why you answered the way you did.

Convenience and someone's life are not equivalent claims, and pretending they are is how we got to ninety-three record deaths.

I say that as someone who drives. Most Denverites drive, and contempt for them is not a strategy. But when the tradeoff is a slower left turn against whether a person makes it across the street, that is not a hard call. What makes it feel hard is that the cost of the street we have now is spread thin and invisible, while the cost of changing it lands on one block, at one meeting, in front of one council member.

That is a courage problem more than an analysis problem. I am not asking for this seat in order to be comfortable in it.

How would you deal with local pushback to projects that experts agree would significantly improve street safety?

My approach to dealing with push back is to engage once, early, and well, and then decide.

I have spent my career as a community-engaged research scholar in rooms where people were angry and afraid about a project, and I know the difference between real engagement and the endless re-litigation that has become our substitute for it. Asking a community to prove its support for the same safe-streets design four separate times is not respect. It is a delay mechanism, and everybody in the room knows it.

So bring people in before the design is settled, when what they say can still change something. Be honest about what is fixed and what is open, because a fake consultation poisons the next ten projects. We need to find out what the objection actually is. "I will lose parking," "nobody asked me," and "the last thing the city built here made my life worse" all sound the same at a microphone and need completely different answers. That third one is real where I come from, and it deserves a real answer rather than a dismissal.

Listening and learning from the research is not the same as deferring. On a corridor where people are dying, the job is to carry the decision and take the heat, not to route around it and not to spend public money studying what roadway-safety professionals settled a long time ago.

Would you work to expand funding for Denver's transportation/mobility needs?

Yes

If yes, please explain how.

I would start with the money we already have and are not spending the way we promised.

The Transportation and Mobility Special Revenue Fund should be doing what it was created to do, which is finishing the Vision Zero Action Plan, Safe Routes to School, and the Denver Moves plans. The Climate Protection Fund should be putting real dollars into clean, safe, affordable ways to get around, because walking, biking, and transit are climate strategy, not a separate category.

Denver voters approved that fund and the city's own auditor has raised questions about how the spending is tracked. Watching that money is squarely council's job, and I have said so throughout my campaign.

On sidewalks specifically, we should bond against the sidewalk fee instead of building the network pay-as-you-go. At the current pace we are talking about decades, and the people waiting on those blocks should not have decades especially when they are already bearing the weight of the fees.

Beyond that, protect and grow multimodal funding in the annual budget, and go after state and federal dollars aggressively alongside CDOT, DRCOG, and RTD. Raising and stacking capital across federal, state, local, and philanthropic sources is what I have done for the last decade. It is the most transferable thing I bring to this seat.

If we eventually need a dedicated revenue measure, I would support taking it to voters with a specific published project list attached. People fund what they can see.

Do you think the City should plan, design, and deliver transportation projects in a more timely and efficient manner?

Yes

If yes, what actions should City officials take to make this happen?

Publish the pipeline with real dates and update it when those dates slip, so delay becomes visible instead of quietly absorbed. Bundle the small safety treatments into standing programs rather than running each one through a full project process.

Install protected bike and rolling facilities by default during annual resurfacing, since the cheapest moment to build one is when the street is already open. Fix the handoffs between DOTI, Parks, and Community Planning, because that is where the months disappear. Finally, give DOTI the staffing and the political cover to deliver the plans we adopted, instead of letting projects get watered down one at a time under pressure.

We should also stop spending public dollars to rip out protective infrastructure we already built, or to re-study questions that were answered years ago. That is not diligence. That is money spent to avoid making a decision.

I have run a capital project through Denver's permitting and construction process. I know what these delays cost because I paid them.

Our streets make up our largest public space, and for people experiencing unsheltered homelessness, "streets are not a means to get home but are home itself." What policies would you pursue to ensure that everyone feels safe and welcome in Denver's public spaces?

I want to take this one seriously, because it deserves better than a slogan.

The fact that reframed it for me is that people experiencing homelessness are severely overrepresented in traffic deaths. When we push people out of residential and commercial areas, we push them toward the roadways where the danger is, and then we count what happens as a traffic statistic instead of a policy outcome.

So I would lead with dignity and infrastructure rather than enforcement. Fund STAR at a level that matches what the city actually needs, so the response to someone in crisis is a clinician instead of a squad car and so it reaches the calls it was built for. Build the things we have avoided building because we worried they would make the problem visible: permanent public restrooms, water, lighting, shade, places to sit. Fund street trees and greenscape so public space is somewhere people want to be year round. In all, we need to work through community organizations and other agencies on the root causes instead of criminalizing the fact that someone exists in public.

I will also say honestly that the accessibility conflicts are real. A blocked sidewalk is a genuine barrier for someone using a wheelchair. But the answer to that is more public space and more housing, not less of both, and I am not going to pretend that clearing a sidewalk solves anything.

Do you think Denver should encourage higher densities and mixed-use development patterns to support transit-rich, walkable, and bikeable communities?

Yes

If yes, what actions should City officials take to achieve those outcomes?

Put the homes where the transit already is, and make the transit follow where we put the homes.

I also want to push on what we mean by mixed use, because we have shrunk that phrase down to apartments over a coffee shop. The real question is whether a neighborhood holds what a person needs across the lifespan. A library next to a childcare center. A gym, a clinic, a grocery, restaurants, a bike shop,

a place to sit outside that costs nothing. Those are not amenities layered on top of housing. They are the reason the housing works.

Think about who that serves. A four year old needs a childcare center a parent can reach without a car. A fourteen year old needs a library and a rec center within riding distance, and something to do that does not require a ride from an adult. A forty year old needs a grocery store and a gym on the way home. An eighty year old needs a clinic, a pharmacy, and a bench halfway there. Right now Denver is built so that almost every one of those is a car trip, and no bike lane fixes that by itself. Land use is what determines whether the quarter-mile trip is even possible.

So the tools I would use are these. Encourage mixed-use density of at least six stories downtown and near high-frequency stations, with more height available when a project includes affordable units. Support office-to-residential conversion where the building can take it. Keep reducing parking minimums and set parking maximums downtown, since required parking is a hidden tax on every unit anyone builds. Establish parking benefit districts that price demand and put the revenue back into local safety and mobility. Expand commercial zoning inside residential areas, including accessory commercial units, so a neighborhood has somewhere to walk to. We should also use Unlocking Housing Choices to legalize duplexes, triplexes, and more across the roughly two thirds of Denver's residential land where only single-unit housing is allowed today.

I would add one thing council directly controls that rarely gets talked about in a mobility conversation. We site and fund the libraries and the rec centers. Where we put them, and whether we put them near the housing and the transit, is a council decision, and it is one of the few chances we have to build the anchor rather than wait for the market to provide one.

The thing I will keep raising is that density without anti-displacement tools just changes who gets to live in the walkable neighborhood. Pair it with land trusts, ownership pathways, rental assistance and anti-eviction support, and protection for the cultural corridors that make these places worth walking in. I spent a decade building a cultural home on the westside. I have watched what happens to the people who made a place desirable in the first place.

Have you ever been a frequent public transportation user?

☒ Yes

Have you ever been a frequent bike commuter?

☐ No

How do you usually move around Denver? Please tell us more about your personal mobility experience.

Mostly by car, which I want to be honest about, and by bike for distance and for my own head.

I am an avid rider, but I ride trails almost exclusively, because I have come close to being hit on Denver streets more times than I can shrug off. That is your argument in one sentence. I am exactly the person who should be riding to work, I want to, and the network is not there yet. If our streets are not safe enough for a healthy adult who rides thousands of miles a year, ask who else they are failing. It is why I support a connected Core Network of protected lanes within a quarter mile of every household, with safe crossings at the arterials and snow actually cleared in winter, instead of the disconnected pieces we have now.

I used to ride the bus regularly. I stopped after a violent incident on a route I took daily, and I would rather name that than pretend otherwise, because it is why a lot of people stopped too. What I take from it is not that we give up on transit. It is that personal safety belongs in the same conversation as frequency and shelter and lighting, and that treating it as a separate subject is how we lose riders we already had.

Do you think Denver should transform our streets to prioritize children's safe and independent mobility?

☒ Yes

Do you think Denver should transform our streets to prioritize the safe and independent mobility of people who cannot drive a car due to a disability?

Yes

If you answered yes to one or both of the questions above, what actions should City officials take to achieve or make progress toward this transformation?

About a third of us cannot drive, whether because of age, disability, cost, or legal status, and we have built a city that treats that third as an afterthought.

For kids, fund the Safe Routes to School Action Plan as an actual capital program with a published corridor list, starting where the walk is worst. Slow the streets around every school and every park. A city where an eleven year old can get somewhere on their own is a city that works for everyone.

For people who cannot drive, finish the sidewalk network. It is our largest accessibility failure by far, and we should be prioritizing the gaps along the High Injury Network, transit routes, and NEST neighborhoods rather than the easy fills. Bond against the sidewalk fee so this happens in years instead of decades. Put curb ramps and accessible signals in at every intersection we rebuild. Maintain the network year round, including snow, which today gets enforced unevenly and leaves people stranded. Build secure parking for mobility devices, cargo bikes, and strollers near the places people actually go. And bring disabled Denverites into design review before construction rather than after the complaints.

A street designed for the eight year old and the eighty year old works for everybody in between.

Do you support the rapid implementation of a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) network in Denver?

Yes

Please explain why you do or don't support the rapid implementation of a BRT network in Denver.

BRT is the fastest ridership we can buy. BRT delivers frequency and speed on a timeline measured in years instead of decades, on corridors where the demand is already there, and most of what makes it work is right-of-way we already own.

True BRT does mean the bus gets its own lane. On Federal and Colorado that has to happen without widening the roadway, or we have spent a fortune moving the same problem a little further out. Giving the lane to the bus is the entire point.

The condition I would attach is real support for the small businesses along the corridor during construction. We have watched businesses die during long builds elsewhere in this city, from Colfax to Five Points. That support is not a delay tactic, it is part of doing this right, and skipping it hands the opposition the next fight for free. Those corridors are lined with the immigrant and family-owned businesses I have worked alongside my whole career, and I am not willing to trade them for a faster ribbon cutting.

Is there anything else you want to tell us?

I am running because Denver decides, block by block, which neighborhoods get treated like they matter, and mobility is where that decision shows up most plainly. I directed the development of a cultural home on the westside and co-authored the River Sisters framework that is now in the city's West Area Plan. Both taught me the same thing, which is that infrastructure is a statement about who belongs.

I am not going to claim I came to this work as an expert. The ride with Pedestrian Dignity and the Denver Bike Lobby changed how I talk about it, and I would like more of that, not less. What I will claim is that I know how to move capital, how to get a project through this city's process, and how to hold a position when the room gets loud.