

**CITY OF BOULDER
BOULDER, COLORADO
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING
MINUTES**

Name of Board/ Commission: Transportation Advisory Board	
Date of Meeting: 23 September 2013	
Contact Information Preparing Summary: Kaaren Davis 303.441.3233	
Board Members Present: Dom Nozzi, Jessica Yates, Matt Moseley, Zane Selvans, Andria Bilich Board Members Absent: None	
Staff Present: Bill Cowern, Acting Traffic Engineer Kathleen Bracke, GO Boulder Manager J.R. Clanton, Transportation Budget Analyst Marni Ratzel, Senior Transportation Planner Kaaren Davis, Board Secretary	
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 12 August minutes as amended by: Nozzi; Seconded: Selvans Vote: 5-0 Motion Passes	
Agenda Item 3: Public Participation	[6:04 p.m.]
None	
Agenda Item 4: Matters from Staff- Early Update on flood impacts to transportation facilities	[6:07 p.m.]
Bill Cowern provided a brief update on flood assessment and recovery issues around the transportation infrastructure. There were no written memo materials for this update.	
<p>Fourmile and Boulder creek, Bear Creek and Twomile are areas most impacted. Many underpasses are both choked with debris and still experiencing flooding. Crews are clearing as the receding floodwaters allow. Two pedestrian bridges were affected. Many roads were impacted. Mud and debris was the most common impact. Several residential roadways suffered structural damage due to flooding. Several culverts overflowed and impacted the roadways that were adjacent to them.</p> <p>GO Boulder has been doing much work on bike and pedestrian facility assessments, as well as partnered with Boulder County staff to provide 24/7 coverage at the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) during the entire course of the event. Local school districts and Via provided buses to assist people in evacuation and in getting to resources such as Shelters and Disaster Assistance Centers. The City coordinated with Boulder County and RTD to restore local and regional transit service.</p> <p>There was a PowerPoint presentation for this item.</p>	
Board Discussion, questions and comments included:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions about the partnership with RTD in obtaining transit passes to assist those in need of transportation after the flood. • Praise for the County and the Transportation department for really rising to the herculean challenges presented by this event. • Thanks to staff for all of the amazing work being done. Gratitude from the citizenry for all of the speedy response and hard work to get things open. • If there are facilities which need substantial repair can we take this opportunity to improve them? Specifically noted was widening the Boulder Creek Path. Staff: This will be considered in any reconstruction evaluation. FEMA funding allows for this. • What lessons will be learned from this event and how can they be integrated into the Transportation Master Plan. If the TMP needs to be postponed to allow staff to work on the flood recovery that would be fine. • Questions about whether there are more car trips currently because of the bike/ped facility closures. Staff: 	

No tracking is currently being done as staff is concentrating on getting facilities operational again. Also, this would require too much data collection to obtain statistically valid data.

- How to coordinate the efforts of those from the community who wish to volunteer to assist in the flood recovery efforts.

Agenda Item 5: Public hearing and consideration of a recommendation regarding the City Council meeting in October on the E-bikes Pilot Demonstration Project. [6:31 p.m.]

Marni Ratzel presented this 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 October 1, 2013 City Council agenda item regarding a pilot project allowing electric-assist bicycles (e-bikes) on certain hard surfaced multi-use paths. The pilot would evaluate behavior of e-bike users to determine whether these vehicles can co-exist with current users on multi-use paths. It would be focused in the urban service area where there is a network of hard-surface, off-street multi-use paths. The pilot would not include use on facilities that are pedestrian-only or intended to preserve the natural environment.

Attachment C shows several hard-surface multi-use paths on OSMP fee-property that are integral to the greenway system within the City of Boulder. E-bikes may be in conflict with the Open Space and Mountain Parks Charter values that serve passive recreation and prohibit motorized vehicles on OSMP land. In late September, the Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) will convene a public hearing to consider and take action on whether OSMP hard surface multi-use paths are appropriate to include in the e-bikes demonstration project.

Board Discussion and comments included:

[7:18 p.m.]

General Discussion;

- In cities that allow e-bikes on paths none of the issues that have been raised as concerns appear to be present.
- Whether e-bikes on paths have ever been shown to have an impact on pedestrian behavior.
- What enforcement patterns have shown in Boulder on the bike paths in the last several years.
- The opinion that while rebuilding flood damage on the path system, reconstruction should produce greater safety and navigability.
- Some board members expressed the idea that allowing e-bikes on the paths is just regularizing what is already happening. Any real problems that arise can be dealt with if/when they surface.
- One board member expressed the concern that it is possible that pedestrians and bikes of any kind cannot coexist comfortably on the same path system. E-bikes may make this worse. Pedestrians already have a small and disappearing space to be in. Pedestrians are the most vulnerable and politically powerless yet the most necessary to the quality of life for a community.
- The potential difficulties of effective enforcement on pathways with mixed bike/ped populations.
- A need to build capacity on the existing street infrastructure so that bikes will be comfortable using streets as opposed to the paths.

Ordinance Authorizing the pilot project

- Clarification about whether “tadpole trikes” would be regulated differently than bicycles or other recumbent bikes confirmed that these vehicles are included in the definition of a bicycle.
- Technical questions about how e-bikes function and how the terminology would be included in changing definitions for e-bikes.
- Discussion that the peer city research did not find any evidence that problems cited are actually related to e-bike users.
- Congestion as a larger problem.
- Some board members support pilot project, and retaining the sunset of the City Manager rule making powers. By the time the trial comes to an end it will be desirable to shut down that rule making authority and codify things.
- Some board members are comfortable with the current Boulder definition based on the greater restriction on motor size.

Option for E-bike use of multi-use paths

- Whether OSMP trails are not included in the charge to TAB. Wherever bikes are allowed, we should allow e-bikes to be. (Option 2)

- General support for Option two: definition conforms to state law.
- General support for allowing e-bikes on OSMP hard-surface trails but not on sidewalks.
- Mixed support for the sunset provision on the City Manager, rule making powers.
- Preponderance of community opinion from participants would seem to be in support of the trial.
- Concerns that the greater weight of e-bikes might make collisions with pedestrians or other bicyclists more serious.

Public Comment:

[6:53 p.m.]

- **Peter Loris:** E-bike rider and enthusiast. Actively involved in bike/ped facility development. Logged 3046 miles in the last year. E-bike is favorite form of transportation for trips of 9 miles or less. E-bikes should be allowed on all city paths. No watt restriction, only a speed limit. Bikes should not provide power systems that allow speeds over 20 miles an hour. My average speed is 13.03 miles per hour.
- **Scott Allman:** Long time owner and rider of e-bikes. Not interested in changing the definition of the power. Interested in going farther but not faster. Pedestrian intercept survey discussed by a member of the public at the last TAB meeting supposedly found that pedestrians are alarmed by the concept of e-bikes. Mr. Allman recommend adding e-bikes and then ask pedestrians whether they noticed e-bikes on the path and what they thought about their presence. For those alarmed, ask if they are alarmed by all bikes. Suspect there is not much difference between all bikes and e-bikes. There are pedestrian only paths between here and Eben Fine park so no need to restrict. Support a pilot program to get real information
- **Danny Larson:** What has changed in the last 25 years that now would allow powered bicycles? No great difference. Initially motorized vehicles were not allowed. Consider the fact that a trial will be worthless in generating the data you need to make this decision, primarily because there are not many e-bikes now, so we can't get a sense of what the congestion will be like in the future if e-bikes are allowed. Congestion will increase, especially as e-bikes get less expensive and more interesting. There will be enforcement issues with speed. E-bikes could use the side streets instead of the paths.
- **Rena Gabbay:** E-bikes should be allowed on the multi use paths. She and her husband have used them on the path for 8 years with no comments from other path users and without awareness of any restrictions. Ride at sane speeds and are routinely passed by cyclists in flip flops. Multi use paths are safer and comfortable to ride. Have there been any recorded e-bike incidents to date? E-bikers she knows all ride e-bikes because of some limiting physical issues and are not interested in drag racing. No pilot required, unrestricted access should be allowed to all paths, and streets. Goose Creek performed beautifully in the flood mitigation.
- **Manfred Schwoch:** Not an e-bike rider yet, but have come around ot appreciating them through an ebike rider in the family. Those he has observed are not the ones who push the limits of the bike and follow the rules on the paths and streets. Highly responsible groups. Greater weights of bikes is like the heavier and lighter cars that are both regulated by traffic laws and speed limits. This should work the same for bikes. Anyone on the paths can observe that the non-e-bike riders are much more prone to speeding than the e-bike riders. More attention should be paid to improving safety in the engineering of the paths. People use e-bikes to compensate for aging, physical impairments, hauling heavy loads and to get themselves out of their cars. E-bikes should have unrestricted access and no pilot program is needed.
- **Martin Ogle:** 5 year owner of an e-bike. Full support of the pilot program with option 2 or 3 being acceptable. Huge supporter of e-bikes. Excellent potential (as in Europe and Asia) for a mode shift out of cars. Congestion issue will be moot as we are actively encouraging mode shift to bikes anyway, which will increase congestion regardless. Behavioral issues will not prove to be a serious problem. Filled out the survey and is very willing and able to help out with this to make it a very real solution for the region.
- **Evan Ravitz:** Started the e-bike petition in January. Biked across Mexico when younger. Has serious physical issues now and can't ride far without great pain. The only way he can avoid moving to a car and maintaining his biking lifestyle is to go to an e-bike. Going to the state/fed definition is fine, but need to remember that speed limits work fine for cars, and will for bikes. If the Creek Path is not included in the pilot it is not a proper test. Flood event gives an opportunity to consider, prepare for and eventually widen and straighten the path to accommodate the increase in cycling and electric bicycling that Boulder will have to do to avoid the "hockey-stick increase" in congestion that the Transportation Master Plan predicts.
- **Byron James:** Proponent of Option 2. If you want more people on bikes, you must convince them it is easy, convenient and safe. Easy and convenient is obvious with e-bikes. To address the "safe" component, all paths must be opened up to bikes and e-bikes. There have been two terrible accidents recently with bicyclists riding on the streets. With such things happening on the roadways, it is difficult to convince people to get out of their cars and onto bikes unless they have access to the paths and can stay off of the streets.

Motion by Bilich; Seconded by Yates: TAB recommends supporting the proposed ordinance as given in attachment A of the city council memo.

Vote: 5-0 Motion Passes

Motion: Yates, Seconded by Moseley: Move that TAB support the pilot project as per Option 2 with the following modifications: That e-bikes shall be permitted on multi use paths, excluding the sidewalks but including hard surface OSMP trails.

Vote: 5-0 Motion Passes

Moseley departs.

Motion by Nozzi, No Second: TAB recommends that cell phone use on e-bikes be prohibited.

No second, motion not passed.

Agenda Item 6: Matters

[8:09 p.m.]

Matters from the Board Included:

Follow-up from the 19 August Joint Board Workshop: Staff presented a draft summary which the board will consider and comment on at future meeting.

- The board presented no further matters. Follow-up from the joint board workshop was postponed to allow for the dissemination of a draft summary prior to a future meeting.

Matters from staff included:

[8:13 p.m.]

- **Railroad Quiet Zone Study:** Nine crossings and what it would take to make a quiet zone for each are being considered for the study. Education and enforcement approach rather than a hard infrastructure approach is being explored. This has never been successfully done in any community, though it is an option. Ongoing costs of this approach are being examined. Analysis complete by the end of September and finalize the report in October. Also partnering with other communities along the corridor for joint application.
- **Regional Studies Update:**
 - RAMP funding from CDOT. CDOT staff recommending funding for diagonal reconstruction east of 30th. It is not clear if this funding is still available given the flooding issues.
 - Statewide funding - groups continue to meet about transportation funding statewide. Next impact 64 meeting is next week. Denver Post ran an editorial recommending gas tax rather than statewide sales tax, which option polls poorly.
 - NAMS Study- Meeting last Thursday with the TAC. Preliminary RTD info on preliminary ridership projections and cost estimations. COB staff is reviewing and will develop a list of questions and comments to return to RTD.
- **Project Updates/Closure (i.e. progress, Council action, “after” studies):**
 - Pavement Maintenance/Sidewalk Repair programs - Complete for 2013 will resume spring of 2014. Any additional funds will be re-purposed for flood reconstruction purposes.
 - Arapahoe Ave - 15th to Folsom started June 3rd and is still anticipated to be completed in the Fall of 2014.
 - Boulder Transit Center - Construction began June 3rd at 14th between walnut and canyon. Will be completed by October 4th.
 - Boulder Junction – Bond funded project. Constructing multi-way improvements on south side of Pearl Parkway from 30th to the Railroad. This section should be complete by the end of October. Details of various aspects of the project were provided.
 - State Hwy 7 (east Arapahoe) – Project should be completed by the end of October.

Jessica Yates requested that for the foreseeable future, staff include an item related to the Flood Recovery under Matters from Staff.

Agenda Item 7: Future Schedule Discussion:

[8:25 p.m.]

November TAB meeting set for November 14th.

Inquire about joint board workshop in November (had been tentatively set for the 7th).

Agenda Item 8: Adjournment

[8:27 p.m.]

There being no further business to come before the board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

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

Motion passes 4:0

Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be a regular meeting on Monday, 14 October 2013 in the Council Chambers, 2nd 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.