CITY OF BOULDER
BOULDER, COLORADO
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING
MINUTES

Name of Board/ Commission: Transportation Advisory Board

Date of Meeting: 12 August 2013

Contact Information Preparing Summary: Laurel Olsen-Horen 303.441.3203

Board Members Present: Dom Nozzi, Jessica Yates, Matt Moseley, Zane Selvans
Board Members Absent: Andria Bilich

Staff Present: Tracy Winfree, Director of Public Works for Transportation
Kathleen Bracke, GO Boulder Manager
J.R. Clanton, Transportation Budget Analyst
Randall Rutsch, Senior Transportation Planner
Marni Ratzel, Senior Transportation Planner
Cris Jones, Transportation Planner
Micki Kaplan, Transportation Planner
Sam Assefa, Senior Urban Designer
Kathy Haddock, City Attorney
Laurel Olsen-Horen, Board Secretary

Consultants Present:
Tom Brennan: Nelson Nygaard Consultant

Type of Meeting: Advisory/ Regular

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order **[6:01 p.m.]**
The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.

Agenda Item 2: Approval of minutes from 8 July 2013 **[6:02 p.m.]**

Motion to approve the 8 July minutes as amended by: Moseley; Seconded: Yates
Vote: 3-0 Motion Passes (board member Selvans was not at the July meeting)

Agenda Item 3: Public Participation **[6:06 p.m.]**
Peter Richards: Mr. Richards is commenting on the Living Lab bicycle innovations for University Ave. University is a wide street from 6th-17th Street. The street is 60' wide which is too wide and should be reduced by 30-40%. There was a neighborhood meeting on 9 May 2013 regarding the entire project. The back in parking is great. Mr. Richards has issue with the buffered bike lanes. What is the need for buffered bike lanes in this location? The entire street needs to be looked at. It shouldn't be kept at 60 feet wide. Testing buffered bike lanes is great, but perhaps not in this specific location. The cost of removing the paint from proposed street design on University only to repaint the new lines one foot away from the existing ones is unnecessary and is a bad use of funds. The current bike/vehicle situation west of Broadway is fine.
Paul Heller: both Mr. Heller and his wife ride E-bikes. Using them on the bike paths has never been an issue. Is it really worth the staff effort to do a pilot project? How many tickets have been issued to E-bike riders? How many serious issues have occurred on bike paths involving E-bikes? If there haven't been many tickets and many issues, then that should be the city's pilot. Speed control and power limits are worth investigating. Devoting too much staff time to something that many people already do, [and isn't enforced] isn't a good use of taxpayer dollars. What is the purpose of the pilot? Legalizing E-bikes (Mr. Heller is not going to quit riding his E-bike) isn't necessarily the answer. Most E-bike riders probably aren't even aware of the city's ordinance against them. Look into what problems there have been. There's not an appreciation to what is going on. It's not feasible to accomplish the types of errands Mr. Heller would like to do without his E-bike.
Scott Allman: Mr. Allman supports the city's proposed pilot study as he did 10 years ago. According to the article in the Daily Camera, the city rejected the use of E-bikes 10 years ago, which is not the case. The topic was tabled. In order to have proper discussion, then information has to be correct. Boulder is going to continue to ride and walk on the paths. E-bikes are Mr. Allman's choice to get around because it allows him to go farther, not faster. It is Mr. Allman's choice to use the electric assist or manual pedal. In Mr. Allman's case, he will not discontinue the use of his E-bike. Please get the facts straight to start the pilot.
Charlotte Sorenson: Ms. Sorenson is founder of Walk Boulder. Ms. Sorenson is here to represent pedestrians. The MUPs are already congested and in some cases, are already narrower than the federally required 10'. Enforcement is impossible as there is currently no meaningful enforcement on the paths. Allowing E-bikes opens the doors to other

motorized mobility devices on the MUPs such as mopeds or segways. All E-bikes weigh significantly more than regular bikes. How will the city monitor and enforce the transfer of these devices from paved trails to unpaved trails and MUPs? Everyone is a pedestrian, but walking is such a daily activity that all too often the pedestrian is forgotten in issues of this type. Legal access to the MUPs would signal a dramatic change to the MUPs for pedestrians.
Byron James: Mr. James supports the pilot program. He is an E-bike rider. They are no different than a regular bicycle except that they allow people a more relaxed and comfortable way to commute, run errands or recreate. E-bikes would help facilitate getting people outdoors and out of their vehicles. By using an E-bike, Mr. James used to ride a regular bike to work. By using an E-bike, Mr. James was able to arrive at work without having to worry about using the company shower, wearing his work clothes and ready to work. Not everyone has the same ability to power a regular bike. Having an E-bike allows three generations of people to go out at the same speed. Every bike has a motor on it whether it's a human motor or an electric motor.
Danny Larson: Mr. Larson is supportive for people to use E-bikes. However, they should not be allowed on the paths. They are already allowed on the streets. There's a disparity of power that an E-bike can travel at 20 mph for hours on end, whereas the human may not be able to go for long periods of time. Any powered vehicle on the path is a bad idea. The city needs facilities where the users don't need to worry about someone speeding along side them. It doesn't matter what type of powered device a user has, they will always be a bad idea and there will always be a disparity in speed between the individuals on the path. Mr. Larson asks the TAB to entertain a notion of looking down the way a little bit; E-bikes are fairly new, and thus there aren't that many users. Five-10 years down the road they may be more popular. If we allow for E-bikes to use the paths now, then what will happen 10 years from now when they clog up the MUP system? By that point, they will already be used to being able to use the infrastructure, thus the behavior will be hard to remediate and congestion will be tremendous.
Ralph Sorenson: Mr. Sorenson sent the TAB some comments last week. Safety, speed, congestion and courtesy are already issues along Boulder's paths. There are already issues along the paths between the different user groups. The whole idea of the paths is to allow the user to feel free to use the path without fear. Mr. Sorenson asked 19 random pedestrians along the Boulder Creek path what they thought of e-bikes and the city's proposal to allow them on the MUP system. Many of them commented that it was a bad idea. Others wondered what the city is thinking. Only two people said they wouldn't mind seeing them on the paths. The city needs to ask, in a neutral fashion, similar questions that Mr. Sorenson asked. The paths already have "No motor vehicles on paths" if the city changes its stance, than those signs will need to be changed. Do what Davis, CA is currently doing which is allowing only non-motorized vehicles on the paths.
Ann Haebig: This is a difficult issue as both sides have good points. The problem is the paths, not E-bikes. The cities that have allowed E-bikes don't list any problems. The cities that do allow E-bikes don't post any problems due directly to conflicts with E-bikes. The city is working on climate goals and E-bikes would help with reaching those goals especially for individuals that live farther from town and want to commute in without driving. The way our streets are built currently, it is not safe for riders to utilize the city's surface road infrastructure.

Agenda Item 4: Public hearing and consideration of a recommendation regarding the City Council August Study Session on the TMP Update [6:45 p.m.]

Randall Rutsch and Tom Brennan presented the item.
Power point given for this item. Handout given for this item.

Executive Summary from Packet Materials:
This memo shares the draft memorandum for the August 13, 2013 City Council Study Session on Transportation Master Plan Update. The study session materials have been prepared to highlight updates and progress-to-date in each of the TMP Focus Areas as well as the integration efforts with the TMP Update and other city-wide planning initiatives.

Staff requests that Transportation Advisory Board (TAB):

- Provide comments on the draft memo and presentation for the August 13, 2013 Study Session

Board Discussion and comments included:

- The nexus between what is happening with transportation funding – would we be looking for different things we can use the excess funding for once it's been used for O&M?
- The increases of transit ridership are likely to be constrained by the population densities which are implied by the BVCP growth limitations.
- How did the city add eight in-commuters per every additional job that has been created in Boulder? The Comprehensive housing strategy is looking into the dynamics of the study.
- Be more plain spoken and use less jargon
- Comparisons between Boulder and other cities – it may be more fair to compare Boulder to peer cities or

other college towns rather than to national averages. The picture can become more "flowery" when compared to the national averages rather than peer cities.

- Expansion of revenue sources is important in the TMP.
- Boulder transportation behavior is set by self-selected citizens of Boulder. People that come to Boulder that already use alt modes not necessarily due to Boulder's policies or infrastructure. Be careful about not assigning to transportation behavior too much kudos as the behavior is set by our demographics.
- Safety can mean making it safer for people to drive cars faster and more inattentively. Peds, bikes, and transit users need to be taken into consideration in regards to safety.
- There needs to be some awareness of how many of the regional commuters are parking in free parking.
- TDM – emphasis should be on demand reduction rather than focused on "carrots" (better transit or better bike lanes)
- The regional focus slide didn't include information from BVSD. Perhaps mentioning BVSD is open enrollment would be important.
- There appears to be a lot of concern regarding the overall congestion of the Boulder creek path. Please keep that in staff's sights.
- Perhaps adjusting the current transit system with pilot programs may assist with getting people excited about the TMP update.
- Accessibility over mobility needs to be emphasized.

Public Comment: None

Agenda Item 5: Matters **[7:39 p.m.]**

Matters from the Board Included:

Board Member Yates brought up the below matter(s):

- Update on Funding/Ballot Issues. Council voted to go to a final reading on two different ballot measures. 1.) New 0.15% tax for six years dedicated to transportation. 2.) 0.15% sales tax originally dedicated to OSMP to continue for an additional ten years for Transportation. After that, it would go another ten years into the general fund.
- What about the rules for campaigning for TAB members? Staff provided a brief memo and city attorney Kathy Haddock helped the TAB understand the proper role and communication when involved as a community member in campaign.

Board Member Selvans brought up the below matter(s):

- Joint board workshop next Monday. What are we doing? Staff response: a joint board workshop with TAB, Planning Board, EAB and some Parking/Access District boards. It will be an opportunity to discuss overlapping topics related to the TMP update, the Access Management and Parking Strategies and Climate commitment.
- The busses on 15th Street are often parking in front of the bike path, thus blocking the entrance to the bike path.

Matters from staff included: **[7:53 p.m.]**

- **Sustainable Streets and Centers:** There are three distinct corridors being addressed in this project. Will there be differing design treatments based on land use? Staff response: Each area will need to be looked at specifically for design solutions for that area. Transportation drives land use. There needs to be equal analysis on both sides – transportation and land use.
- **E-Bikes Update:** (6:37 p.m. item was done right after public comment to allow for the community to not have to wait until the end of the meeting) City Council directed the transportation division to test the use of electric assist bicycles on multi-use paths on an accelerated timeline. Between now and the 23 Sept TAB meeting, staff is working on public outreach. Last week, the city held a public open house on whether or not there is support for a pilot project. Boulder is looking into a peer review to see what other communities that allow for E-bikes do and how they enforce the use of E-bikes and what the results are. There is an E-bike survey on the TMP webpage seeking comments on concerns. On 22 September the community can test E-bikes at the Boulder Green Streets event. Intercept surveys were suggested at the open house, so staff will continue to gather information.
    - Do other cities that allow E-bikes have any regrets or things they would've done differently?
    - The paths aren't designed to handle such variable types of users.
    - Did law enforcement weigh in on any issues surrounding enforcement? The PD is involved with the

interdepartmental group discussing E-bikes. The PD did not indicate any major issues as of yet.
    - Educating current users may need to occur to help facilitate change in behavior.
- **Regional Studies Update:**
    - There was a link in the memo sent to TAB for tomorrow night's Study Session.
    - RAMP funding and Jefferson parkway has submitted for state funding when they were included in the regional plan at the DRCOG based on private and local funding only.
    - The Northwest Area Mobility Study (NAMS) – we're waiting for data to come in. Boulder may only be included as a station if the NW Rail line extended all the way to Longmont. If there's going to be a rail line, then Boulder needs to be a part of that. Overall, NAMS options will be considered based on future data and performance analysis.
- **Project Updates/Closure (i.e. progress, Council action, "after" studies):**
    - Araphaoe Ave is going to reopen in both directions by Saturday, 17 August. It will go back to one lane next summer and it will be completed by fall of 2014.
    - Boulder Transit Center Area Improvements should be done mid-September.
    - Depot Square commencement of construction groundbreaking will occur in the next week or so. An invitation will be sent to TAB.
    - Pavement maintenance program will have over 29 miles of resurfaced, chip-n-seal or reconstructed projects completed thanks to the voter-approved Capital Improvement Bond.
    - The city is going to proceed with a single left turn on NB 30th at the Diagonal and watch the impacts from adjacent development and consider TMP policy discussion.
- **Other Matters:** Council Chambers will be under construction Nov. 12- Jan. 10th so TAB will be meeting in an alternate location.

Agenda Item 6: Future Schedule Discussion: **[8:13 p.m.]**

September meeting will need to be rescheduled to September 23rd, which is when the E-bikes public hearing is scheduled

October meeting may include agenda item(s) recommending changes to existing NPP neighborhoods. Two expansions and one reduction.

Agenda Item 7: Adjournment **[8:15 p.m.]**

There being no further business to come before the board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Motion: moved to adjourn; Selvans, seconded by: Moseley

Motion passes 4:0

Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be a re-scheduled September meeting on Monday, 23 September 2013 in the 1777 West Conference Room, 1st floor of the Municipal Building, at 6 p.m.; unless otherwise decided by staff and the Board.

APPROVED BY:	ATTESTED:
_____	_____
Board Chair	Board Secretary
_____	_____
Date	Date

An audio recording of the full meeting for which these minutes are a summary, is available on the Transportation Advisory Board web page.