

---

**From:** Ferro, Charles  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 19, 2014 2:59 PM  
**To:** Crystal Gray; boulderplanningboard  
**Cc:** Van Schaack, Chandler  
**Subject:** RE: Foothills Parkway and Diagonal Highway

Hi Crystal:

Thanks for the question.

Lot 2 is required to share access with Lot 1.

The subdivision plat includes the dedication of a shared access easement running along the southern boundary of Lot 1 for this purpose.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Best,

Charles

Charles Ferro, AICP

Development Review Manager

City of Boulder - Department of Community Planning + Sustainability

-----Original Message-----

From: Crystal Gray [<mailto:graycrystal@comcast.net>]

Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 2:19 PM

To: boulderplanningboard

Subject: one quick question call up -Foothills Parkway and Diagonal Highway

Hi - one quick question on the Foothills Parkway and Diagonal Highway site:

Will Lot 2 share the access from the Diagonal Highway and Independence Road with Lot 1? Or does it need its own access?

Thanks,

Crystal

---

**From:** Crystal Gray  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 19, 2014 1:57 PM  
**To:** boulderplanningboard  
**Cc:** Winfree, Tracy  
**Subject:** TMP

Hi folks:

RE the TMP:

Thought I would give you a heads up on things I plan to bring up if you do not cover them in the presentation. No need to reply to this email.

I would like to hear from staff how TDM plans, for developments that come before PB, are monitored for trip reduction. Also, is there any tool that is used to monitor increase in various modes for developments that are approved - are there before and after transportation plan analysis for both commercial and residential developments? This would cover tracking increase in car trips, bike and pedestrians.

Can someone explain the analysis between landuse and the transportation impacts on carbon output for various land uses - ie do we study if Class A office results in more auto trips, more bus trips, more bikes trips etc compared to commercial uses or smaller office spaces (micro offices - that we are starting to see now).

I would also like to hear about plans for increasing the length of time that eco-passes are required if parking reductions are granted.

How do you get input on walking issues for these plans? Are there groups you contact?

In a review of current engineering standards are there areas that can be retrofitted based on new standards - I think of the traffic circles and the excessive removal of parking that other cities do not have at circles. Ditto for bike infrastructure - are we up to date on what is being done in other cities and can we implement new bike standards, and proven good ideas, in Boulder.

Can someone explain the Living Laboratory process - my street is a living laboratory for a bike lane (love it) but I received no follow up as promised for how residents think it works. How are these judged to see if they will be finalized and how long does the process take?

How does the TMP integrate place making into the initial plans for transportation infrastructure?

There was no mention of future rail - at least that I found. Can staff comment on this.

Has staff had an opportunity to review the email from Community Cycles? They make 6 good suggestions and I would like to hear what staff thinks of 'street right sizing' (#7), LOS as a metric (#2)

Thanks,

Crystal

---

**From:** Ferro, Charles  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 19, 2014 8:28 AM  
**To:** Aaron Brockett; boulderplanningboard  
**Cc:** Van Schaack, Chandler  
**Subject:** RE: Callup item LUR2013-00050

Hi Aaron,

Thanks for the email.

While the size of the site triggers the requirements for a Concept Plan and Site Review, and the proposed use is only allowed through Use Review, there are no modifications to the code requested that would trigger a mandatory public hearing.

Typically the only things that trigger a mandatory public hearing before the board are modifications to height, parking reductions in excess of 50%, and non residential uses in residential zone districts.

In this case, the applicant has not requested any modifications to the code that would require a hearing.

Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions.

Best,

Charles

Charles Ferro, AICP  
Development Review Manager  
City of Boulder - Department of Community Planning + Sustainability



**From:** Aaron Brockett  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 18, 2014 5:53 PM  
**To:** boulderplanningboard; Ferro, Charles  
**Subject:** Callup item LUR2013-00050

Hi Charles. If you have a chance, could you please explain how this project needed a Concept Plan but doesn't require a board hearing for Site Review? I don't have a problem with it, I would just like to understand how the requirements work out.

Thanks,

--

Aaron Brockett

---

**From:** Sue Prant  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 18, 2014 5:16 PM  
**To:** boulderplanningboard  
**Subject:** Community Cycles Comments to Planning Board on TMP

## **Comments to Planning Board on Transportation Master Plan Update of 2014**

Community Cycles is a non-profit organization whose mission is to educate and advocate for the safe use of bicycles as an affordable, viable and sustainable means of transportation and personal enjoyment within our community. Community Cycle's Advocacy Committee is composed of professional staff and volunteers experienced in bicycle planning and design. We survey our 1000+ members to guide our advocacy efforts, and we focus on policies and infrastructure that will increase bicycling rates within Boulder and the region.

The CCAC has reviewed the draft TMP and has some comments. First of all, it's great to live and work in a city that is so forward-thinking about transportation, environmental, and quality-of-life issues. The City clearly recognizes the importance of transportation in building a sustainable city with outstanding livability for all residents. The TMP materials presented are a comprehensive and professional evaluation of Boulder's current transportation system and steps to achieve transportation and Climate Commitment goals of the city. City staff have done an superb job of research and analysis and have come up with many excellent recommendations for moving Boulder's transportation system to be more sustainable, equitable, efficient, and resilient.

There are several parts of the proposed TMP that we particularly support. We applaud the development of quantitative goals for mode share and a timeline for achieving them. Without such hard, objective goals, it's impossible to evaluate progress and adapt plans to reach the desired outcomes. The plans for visualizing, evaluating and completing a low-stress bike network are innovative and excellent. We also support the idea of re-evaluating bicycle parking requirements for commercial and multi-family residential construction and reconstruction, and the Living Laboratory concept for testing and evaluating innovative treatments for bicycle infrastructure. The "corridor" studies to evaluate transportation demand and bicycle safety on specific roadways are also very welcome, especially if they are executed promptly. And we support the plan's emphasis on on-going safety improvements for all modes.

The TMP documents propose impressive shifts in modal share for Boulder's transportation future. These quantitative targets include reducing single-occupancy vehicle share of all trips to 32% or lower by 2035, and increasing bicycle mode share to 15% by 2020 or 2025, 30% by 2035, and 40% by 2050. These goals, which we enthusiastically endorse, require truly transformative changes to our transportation network and culture, and would place the levels of bicycling and walking in Boulder in the range of those found today in Copenhagen and Amsterdam. Achieving these objectives will not be easy, and will require decisions that initially may be unpopular. It will take political courage to achieve them.

We are strongly committed to helping Boulder reach the levels of bicycle and walking that are described in the 2014 draft TMP update documents. To that end, we'd like to make the following suggestions for the plan that may help Boulder reach its goals.

1) Systematically and continually review design and engineering criteria for bicycle infrastructure. There have been dramatic changes in engineering approaches in the last few years as cities around the country strive to get the "Interested but Concerned" cohort out of cars and onto bikes. Because of rapidly evolving practices in this field, the TMP needs a mechanism to continually evaluate and improve the engineering design standards for bicycle infrastructure. For example, the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) has

developed new technical bike facility and street design standards and promises to regularly evaluate and update them. By adopting these standards as official engineering guidelines, the City could rapidly implement many types of new bicycle infrastructure that it currently does not keep in its toolbox. It might be wise to restrict the Living Laboratory approach, which requires extensive planning, testing, and evaluation before implementation, to truly innovative or customized approaches that have not been proven in other cities or countries, and to rely on NACTO or other approved sources for design guidance for more common treatments. Our hope is to get more facilities, like protected bike lanes, in sooner without the excessive testing and long delays we now often see. As so many cities around the country are able to quickly put in facilities like protected bike lanes, we have to wonder, why not Boulder?

2) Reconsider the use of vehicle LOS as a metric. While no one wants hopelessly snarled city streets that prevent all vehicle movement, a certain level of congestion is a sign of a successful and vibrant city. If driving is faster, more convenient, and similar in cost to transit, biking, and walking, people will continue to choose to use cars at the expense of livability, sustainability, and climate goals. Current Level of Service (LOS) criteria place a higher value on the delay time of drivers at intersections than the on the walkability, vitality and environmental sustainability of our streets. We feel that a complete system would evaluate LOS for all users and consider them equally – even increasing LOS for bikes/ped and decreasing LOS for private automobiles – in areas where there are no bike/ped alternatives and/or where current or future land use would stimulate a lot of bike/ped trips. Many cities, counties, and states have already moved beyond the use of vehicle LOS, and we should too.

3) Consider signal-timing changes to benefit bikes and peds. Related to LOS is current traffic signal timing that emphasizes the smooth flow of motor vehicle traffic at the expense of other modes of travel. The majority of signals in Boulder are synchronized to the rush-hour volumes on major arterial streets such as Foothills, 28th, and Arapahoe. As a result, many signalized intersections with quite low traffic volumes have signal intervals that are longer than appropriate (easy examples include 13th and Pine, and Folsom and Colorado). These long signal cycles produce frustrating and unnecessary delays to people walking or biking, and frequently lead to disregard for the law. It would also be desirable to develop signal timing schemes that prioritize bus service, especially for the new Bus Rapid Transit routes that will be arriving over the next few years. We recommend a thorough review of Boulder's signal timing, synchronization, and priority using the goals of the revised TMP to guide engineering choices.

4) Introduce shorter-term checkpoint targets. The objectives set ambitious and laudable targets for 2035, but we need intermediate-term targets in addition, to ensure that we're on track to meet the later targets. We suggest adding incremental targets for 2020 and 2025.

5) An integrated approach to the low-stress cycling network. We are greatly in favor of the low-stress cycling network analysis proposed as part of the 2.0 bicycle network initiative. We urge that efficiency (minimized start/stops, average speed) and directness be quantitatively considered as criteria when evaluating all cycling networks in town.

6) Use modeling to ensure that the TMP strategies will succeed in meeting the goals. As pointed out in the draft TMP, we're not on track to meet our previous goal for single-occupant vehicle (SOV) mode share. How do we know that this new plan is going to get us back on track? We urge the City to perform integrated land use/transportation modeling to project whether the strategies proposed will allow us to indeed reach our goals. Ongoing modeling should be an integral element of the TMP.

7) Institute a consistent, planned program for street right-sizing. One method to reduce SOV use and increase walking and biking would be to adopt a consistent, permanent program of identifying streets that have excess vehicle capacity or are wider than appropriate (based on considerations such as vehicle speed, pedestrian crossing time and ease, stormwater runoff load, and quality of urban design). These overbuilt streets could then

be prioritized for lane or pavement reduction. This methodical approach should be an explicit element in the TMP revision.

8) Increase staffing for bike/ped planning, including in CP&S. Current bike/ped staffing is not adequate for the workload, and will fall even further behind as the city works to meet its goals in the TMP. The city needs to budget for increased staff levels, including for staff within CP&S who have a specific mandate to consider bike/ped aspects of development projects.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this draft TMP document.

The Community Cycles Advocacy Committee

--  
Sue Prant  
Acting Executive Director  
Community Cycles  
2805 Wilderness Pl Suite 1000  
Boulder, CO 80301

---

---

---

---