

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

Name of Board/ Commission: Transportation Advisory Board	
Date of Meeting: 12 October, 2015	
Contact Information Preparing Summary: Kaaren Davis 303.441.3233	
Board Members Present: Zane Selvans, Andria Bilich, Dom Nozzi, Daniel Stellar, Bill Rigler Board Members Absent:	
Staff Present: Michael Gardner-Sweeney, Interim Director of Public Works for Transportation Molly Winter, director, Downtown and University Hill Management Division and Parking Services (DUHMD/PH&S) Karl Guiler, Senior Planner PH&S Kathleen Bracke, GO Boulder Manager Bill Cowern, Transportation Operations Engineer Chris Hagelin, Senior Transportation Planner Marni Ratzel, Sr. Transportation Planner Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager, PH&S Courtland Hyser, Senior Planner, PH&S Lisa Smith, Communications Kaaren Davis, Board Secretary	
Consultants Present: Bill Fox and Carlos Hernandez of Fox Tuttle Hernandez	
Type of Meeting: Advisory/ Regular	
Agenda Item 1: Call to Order	[6:07 p.m.]
The meeting was called to order at 6:07 p.m.	
Agenda Item 2: Approval of minutes from 14 September, 2015	[6:08 p.m.]
Move to approve August 10, 2015 minutes as amended.	
Motion: Bilich Second: Nozzi	
5:0:0 Motion Passes	
Agenda Item 3: Public Participation	[6:10 p.m.]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loren Pahlke- Lessons learned on Folsom. Names matter. Right sizing was a poor choice. Aesthetics matter. The City needs to have a demonstrated capacity to care for modified streets in all weather. Numbers may not be enough to sell a project, but they can kill it. Models must account for all conditions. The before numbers must be irrefragable. Retraction of presumed rights is a hard thing to do. What were we offering drivers? Changing the core of downtown should have come after changes in the easiest, least controversial areas. Make sure the scope of the project will not require walk-back before implementing. Business and seniors need to be on board. Not just the bike community. Presumed beneficiaries (cyclists feeling endangered) need to agree that they will actually be beneficiaries. • Karen Worminghaus- Director of Ego Car Share- Emailing a document to TAB and staff regarding Ego Car Share. On street parking is a yes. Anything that is a highest and best use should be pursued. Bigger question is how. • Zach Swank – Ego Car Share Board member – Purpose is to reduce the impacts of personal vehicle ownership. Round trip car sharing is key. Has concerns regarding the impact of one way car sharing on bike and bus mode use. Not much data as it is a newer model. Two studies that have come out show a negative impact on transit and bike use. This is significant for a community that is trying to increase transit and bike use. If one way car sharing is introduced to Boulder, this must be done carefully or it could be counterproductive to the city’s efforts to increase transit and bike use. 	
Agenda Item 4: Staff briefing and TAB input regarding Access management Parking Strategy (AMPS)	[6:21 p.m.]
Molly Winter, Kathleen Bracke, Bill Cowern, Chris Hagelin, Carl Guiler and Carlos Hernandez gave the presentation to the board.	
Executive Summary from Packet Materials:	
The purpose of this memo is to:	

1. Seek the Transportation Advisory Board's input on draft recommendations for key priorities for 2015 and 2016:
 - a. options and draft recommendation for parking code amendments;
 - b. draft recommendations for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policies for new developments; and
 - c. options and draft recommendations on car sharing policy.
2. Share ongoing community engagement and work plan items related to AMPS and next steps.

The purpose of AMPS is to review and update the current access and parking management policies and programs and develop a new, overarching citywide strategy in alignment with city goals. The project goal is to evolve and continuously improve Boulder's citywide access and parking management policies, strategies, and programs in a manner tailored to address the unique character and needs of the different parts of the city.

Staff has gathered input from the community, boards and commissions to help identify 2015 priorities for further research and community discussion. Ongoing outreach to the city advisory boards and the community has served the dual purposes of educating the public about the multimodal access system and seeking input and ideas about future opportunities for enhancements. The community and board members attended an AMPS open house in September 2015, and provided the input summarized in Section II below. Staff is preparing the most recent feedback from the boards and commissions, surveys, and September 21 open house, which will be submitted to council prior to the study session.

Questions for the Boards and Commissions

1. What is your input on the following AMPS 2015 priority work program items:

Updates to Off-Street Parking Code Regulations

- a. Recent parking data shows that current parking requirements generally require more parking city wide than is needed for land uses. Which scenario for parking code changes would be advised moving forward (*see Section III*)?

TDM Plans for New Development

- b. What are the pros and cons related to the two approaches – district focused and city-wide – for a TDM Plan ordinance for new developments?
- c. Should staff include in the city-wide approach an option to have the trigger based _____ on the number of employees or bedrooms/housing units or number of peak hour vehicle trips?

Car Share On-Street Parking Policy

- d. Should the city include a designated on-street parking alternative for car share companies in our car share on-street parking policy?
- e. Should the city include a permitting process for geo-tracked car share vehicle to park in undesignated public right-of-way parking spaces in managed districts, in excess of time restrictions present in these areas?

2. Do the Boards and Commissions have any feedback regarding the ongoing AMPS community engagement and related work plan items and next steps?

Board discussion and comments included:

[6:33 p.m.]

Off Street Parking Code Regulation Update:

- Questions regarding whether there are other communities whose rates for NPP commuter permits we can use for comparison. Ours seem really low.
- Questions regarding whether there are demonstrated trends, or whether expansion of NPP zones can be tracked. Is it a self-perpetuating process as overflow parking gets moved out of an NPP zone into surrounding areas?
- Requests for clarification on the community engagement process for the pricing structures.
- Concerns that the complexity of AMPS (with its many parts and timelines) may make it difficult for the community to engage meaningfully in the process. Recommendation that the process be simplified and therefore more accessible.

- Questions around what the driving motivators are for the proposed increased to long term permit prices.
- Support expressed for unbundling parking prices in areas outside Boulder Junction.
- Question regarding the viability of a “fee in lieu of parking” strategy.
- Questions regarding requirements for “cash out” parking pricing.
- Questions regarding percentages of “in commuters” paying for parking and whether there are goals around this concept as a strategy for reducing car commuting.
- Short term hourly parking goal clarifications.
- Concerns regarding how satellite parking will be handled.
- Strategies for how to get acceptance from businesses for priced parking.
- What lessons learned from “Right-sizing” can be applied to AMPS.
- Questions regarding what success would look like related to concerns that businesses have regarding their parking.
- Questions regarding public relations strategy and recommendations for messaging.
- Clarifications regarding rates of occupancy near NPP districts as opposed to further away.
- Discussion of various potential strategies for funding residential NPP zones.
- Discussion of reducing the parking minimums in the code in order to provide a market for priced parking.

TDM for new development:

- Questions regarding methodology for demand and peak time measurements.
- Questions regarding the relationship of zero price parking to demand.
- Concerns about implementing a city wide approach, specifically a district based approach allows a more aggressive pricing structure.
- Clarifications on the scope of the TDM toolbox in development planning.
- Concerns that ordinances might be weaker than desirable.
- Recommendation that parking reduction should be eliminated if we have no minimum.
- Recommendation for simplification of the issue in order to make public engagement easier and more successful.
- Concerns that the city’s multimodal system and TDM are not yet well enough developed to pursue more stringent requirements in parking codes.
- Concerns to approach minimums carefully with enforceable and verifiable TDM.
- Clarifications regarding the maximum being set at 4.0 when it appears that goal has already been met.
- Support city wide parking standards if the data supports it as a successful strategy.
- Questions as to whether the parking requirements for new development can be enforced upon existing development.
- Support for the district approach and a hybrid approach if that looks like it gets us more options.
- Support for including a mechanism to add “Carrots” to the TDM.
- Discussion regarding whether an ordinance is necessary or whether interest in TDM can be naturally generated.

Car Share On-Street Parking Policy:

- Clarifications on primary uses of those who use car share services.
- Questions regarding how on street parking for car share programs would provide benefit.
- Clarifications regarding what areas would be affected by changes in the code.
- Concerns regarding the one way share for commuting.
- Questions regarding what type of information is already available and what resources could be deployed to get data for study if the issue were to move forward.
- General support for question 2 provided any ordinance created can handle the nuances needed to make this initiative successful.
- Emphasis on gathering data from existing programs in other cities to provide good grounding for public engagement.

Agenda Item 5: Staff briefing and TAB input regarding Phase II Living Laboratory evaluation update, corridor refinements and upcoming community engagement events. [8:53 p.m.]

Mike Sweeney, Bill Cowern, Kathleen Bracke, and Marni Ratzel gave the presentation to the board.

Executive summary from packet materials:

This memo provides an update on the Living Lab Phase II evaluation, corridor refinements, and upcoming community engagement events for the Folsom Street corridor project.

Following the Sept. 14 TAB meeting, staff developed a recommendation for City Council consideration at the Sept 29th City Council special meeting. The staff recommendation is more in alignment with Option 3 presented at the Aug. 10 TAB meeting and Aug. 25 Council study session. At the Sept 29 meeting, Council supported the staff recommendation. In response, staff has scheduled work to restore Folsom Street to its pre-Living Lab lane configuration from Canyon Boulevard to Spruce Street, returning it to a four-lane street with standard bike lanes.

Staff continues to monitor and evaluate the Folsom Street project on a daily and weekly basis. Additionally, staff has scheduled several community outreach and listening events in the coming weeks to continue gathering public feedback regarding how the corridor is functioning from a multimodal user perspective.

TAB Action Requested

Please review and provide feedback regarding the Living Lab Phase II Folsom corridor evaluation results from weeks 1-9 and planned community outreach activities. Staff also would like input from TAB on their interest in participating in an opportunity to debrief the Living Lab phase II program to-date with staff.

Board discussion included:

- **Living Lab Item Deferred to a future date in the interest of time.**

Agenda Item 6: Staff briefing and TAB input regarding Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP)

[8:54 p.m.]

Lesli Ellis and Courtland Hyser gave the presentation to the board.

Executive summary from packet materials:

The purpose of this item is to provide an update on the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) 2015 Update and receive feedback on the foundational work to date (i.e., Trends Report, projections, fact sheets, and mapping); the community engagement plan and input so far; the initial focused topics for the BVCP update; and next steps for the 18-month project.

TAB action requested:

Does TAB have any questions about the foundational information (i.e., Community Profile, draft Trends Report, Sub community Fact Sheets, 2040 projections), or feedback about:

1. Community engagement and next steps?
2. Focused topics for the 2015 update and/or specific topics relevant to TAB, including policy directions adopted as part of the 2014 Transportation Master Plan?

Board discussion included:

Community Engagement:

- Questions regarding how those in the community who are less technically savvy can be accommodated for the purposes of community engagement.
- Questions as to whether the comp plan engagement will include any visual preference surveys and 3D graphic representations.
- Suggestions for revisions to page 6 of the packet.
- Encouragement for as much in person, out in the community outreach as possible.
- Clarifications on the role of transit in the BVCP.
- Suggestions that transit access metrics should be separated into RTD and non-RTD transit.
- Preferences for some metric other than VMT to be used in the future.
- How to assess the actual will in the community to enact the connectivity goals that the TAB works on.
- Suggestions for the creation of a BVCP 2015 Twitter account to aid with outreach.
- Suggestions for the inclusion of more visuals and more niche narratives that people can explore.
- Recommendations to discuss tradeoffs clearly with the community during outreach.

Topics of Focus:

- Transportation action items at the end of the TMP.
- Concerns regarding how November ballot issues may affect the city’s ability to implement the goals being discussed.

Agenda Item 7: Matters

[9:28 p.m.]

A.) Matters from the Board Included:

Board member Bilich brought up the below matter(s)

- **Land use reviews for land adjacent to the Broadway Boogie route (Broadway and Table Mesa).** Staff provided updates on the Transportation related aspects of this project.
- **Flatirons running company** is putting a tent sale on their sidewalk that blocks cars from being able to see bikes on the bike path.
- **RTD Bus Shelter at the location.** Staff provided updates.

Board member Selvans brought up the below matter(s)

- **Joint board meeting** did not provide enough time for the Boards to interact with each other. ¾ of the time was spent being talked at by staff. Desire was expressed for a less structured meeting between the boards on smaller specific topics.

B.) Matters from staff/Non Agenda:

- **None**

Agenda Item 8: Future Schedule Discussion:

None

Agenda Item 9: Adjournment

[9:39 p.m.]

There being no further business to come before the board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

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

Motion passes 5:0

Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be a regular meeting on Monday, 09 November, 2015 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.