CITY OF BOULDER
BOULDER, COLORADO
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING
MINUTES

Name of Board/ Commission: Transportation Advisory Board

Date of Meeting: 8 June 2015

Contact Information Preparing Summary: Kaaren Davis 303.441.3233

Board Members Present: Zane Selvans, Andria Bilich, Dom Nozzi, Bill Rigler
Board Members Absent: Daniel Stellar

Staff Present: Michael Gardner-Sweeney, Acting Director of Public Works for Transportation
Kathleen Bracke, GO Boulder Manager
Marni Ratzel, Sr. Transportation Planner
David "DK" Kemp, Sr. Transportation Planner
Bill Cowern, Transportation Operations Engineer
Randall Rutsch, Senior Transportation Planner
Gerrit Slatter, Principal Transportation Projects Engineer
Melanie Sloan, Transportation Planner
Kaaren Davis, Board Secretary
Consultants Present: Bill Fox of Fox, Tuttle, Hernandez

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 11 May 2015 **[6:02 p.m.]**
Motion to approve the meeting minutes from 11 May 2015 TAB meeting as presented:
Motion by: Nozzi, Seconded by: Rigler
Vote: 4:0

Agenda Item 3: Public Participation **[6:03 p.m.]**

- **Loren Pahlke**: Concerns about multi use path on 28th Street where it intersects Lumen Apartments. City groups with different goals were involved in the planning and approval. The resulting raised island and zig zag are dangerous. Island has been removed but zig zag is here to stay. Please fix it even though it will be at the City's expense. It remains dangerous.

Agenda Item 4: Public Hearing and TAB consideration of a recommendation regarding the 2015 Complete Streets Phase II Living Labs Projects
[6:11 p.m.]

Marni Ratzel and DK Kemp presented the item to the board.

Executive Summary from Packet Materials:
This memo shares the draft memorandum for the June 16, 2015 City Council agenda item regarding a motion to approve the Complete Streets Living Lab Phase II "rightsizing" transportation pilot projects, as part of the implementation of the Transportation Master Plan. The Living Lab Phase II candidate corridors under consideration for rightsizing include segments of Iris Avenue, Folsom Street, 55th Street, and 63rd Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
The staff recommendation is to install Complete Streets Living Lab pilot projects to test rightsizing design treatments for 12 to 18 months on each of the four candidate corridors.
The combination of an in-depth technical analysis and the community input process has guided the staff recommendation to install the rightsizing projects in Summer 2015. If approved by City Council, staff will utilize technical analysis as well as walk/bike audits, social media, and public meetings to gather community input and evaluate the new street configurations for 12 to 18 months following the project installation.

TAB ACTION
Staff requests TAB consideration of a recommendation to City Council regarding the installation of Living Lab Phase II pilot projects, as part of the implementation of the Transportation Master Plan.

Public Comment:

- **Linda Loose** – Lives on 25th Street which is one block long. Already tries not to travel out during peak hours because of traffic in her area. People cut away from the light and go through their street. She and her neighbors would like to know what mitigation can be done to reduce through traffic issues. Speed bumps? Traffic lights?
- **Judy Richtel** – Has lived in the city of Boulder since 1971 and is the target demographic. Thinks the plan is unrealistic. Would like to see an alternative way of getting her out of her car in a way that works for her. She does not commute to a single location each day but has many trips to a number of locations. Adding a bike lane will not get her out of the car. Despite being an active, involved senior, she cannot always bike. Looking for a third alternative to car and bike.
- **Mark McIntyre** – Great potential for a win-win situation. Expects the result of the experiment to be more bikes, fewer cars, less carbon and reduced congestion resulting in better travel for those using cars. Eco Pass is a fine thing to help with transit. Thinks bike lanes will be a similarly good thing. There is little to fear with this experiment. Move forward with all corridors.
- **Steve Krog** – Potentially affected by changes to Iris and Folsom. Bikes a lot but is against the proposals. Most of the talk is about how this will be better for cyclists. It will, but it will be worse for those who must drive their cars. Taking away lanes in this corridor will make things worse. He does not understand the plan for the 55th corridor at all as the area is all industrial. Who will benefit from this?
- **Steve Gaede** – Cyclist and a motorist. Concerned by the sugar coated term Right-sizing. Term feels pejorative. We have explosive growth and this plan will not help. RTD changes will result in more in-commuting. Explosion of office space adds as well. When the young bike community gets older and has children they will need to bike less to accommodate speedier travel between activities. RTD needs to be a practical alternative and today it is not. What happens when the snow falls? Recommends that we hold on this project until affordable and good mass transportation is available.
- **Tim Rohler** – Actively uses three modes of transportation 2/3 are bike and pedestrian travel. Addressing the Folsom and Iris corridors. Staff got it exactly right on Folsom, but Iris proposal will adversely affect a large number of disabled persons and those who care for them. The Smart Home Residential group home was entirely overlooked in planning. Staff had to ask him where it was when he contacted them to ask about it. The plan for the Iris corridor will add a large burden to the disabled residents of the group home and those who care for them.
- **Mozelle Sutton** – Lives on Kalmia and is familiar with its traffic. Has had her house hit more than once and her yard driven through frequently. Safety is her primary focus. Looking for the criteria used by staff to evaluate traffic load in her area. She could not find any. How will we know whether traffic has increased or decreased after a year? She does not want cut through traffic from Iris to add to their problems. Urges the TAB not support the Iris corridor plan.
- **Brian Graham** – Board of Directors for Community Cycles, speaking on his own behalf. Speaking in support of the plan for the 55th Street corridor. He traveled that corridor today and got buzzed frequently by fast moving vehicles. The 8 second delay predicted in the plan is not very long at all. Especially where safety is concerned. Right sizing reduces speed and increases safety.
- **Fred Rubin**- Has not actually seen much in the way of numbers thus far. Asked for data points at one of the public open houses. Was told that the data would be on the website the next day. It still has not appeared. There appears to be no concrete data to support the assumptions of success in these plans. How is biking a women's equality issue? Are there really going to be more bicyclists? The delays are easy to quantify today. Citizens have a right to know what the expectations are in quantitative data.
- **Judy Bolles** – Addressing the corridors on 63rd and 55th. 63rd already has a beautiful bike path that she seldom sees cyclists on. A major missing link in the bike system is Jay Road to Valmont. On 55th Street the train tracks are a serious problem. Traffic already backs up badly there with two lanes. Moving to one lane will make this worse. The plan will affect not only 55th but Arapahoe. How will emergency vehicles be dealt with?
- **Brad Sutton** – Born in Boulder, has lived here 60 years and has a transportation degree. Manages several buildings along 55th corridor. Data staff presents regarding minimal impacts to traffic on 55th with lane reduction is wrong. Twice in the last two weeks, said road has been closed to a single lane each way. Backups amounted to 2/3 – 3/5ths of a mile. Arapahoe was heavily affected as well. This will not work, as has been shown over the last two weeks.
- **Aaron Johnson** – In support of these projects (All corridors). Would like to see Folsom extended. Given that this is experimental and it takes only one missing lane to severely damage a project, staff needs to optimize use of space in the corridor. Need to stress the benefits to all over the delays. Delays are small and the safety benefits are large as are the benefits to cyclists.
- **Linda B Overlie** – Lives on Kalmia. After going to local open house, went door to door to talk to neighbors. Most were not aware of the plan or were not clear on details. Once informed the vast majority were against the proposal. Kalmia is a bike corridor and there are many pedestrians and children. When traffic slows on Iris, it

cuts down Kalmia to get around the delays. This problem will make the problem worse and this has not been addressed. This will discourage existing cyclists. Petition from neighbors asking TAB to reject the Iris corridor project was presented.

- **Henry DiBernardo** – Lives on Kalmia. He has noticed in the five years he has been here that many people cut down Kalmia and run the stop sign at 16th. This is with two lanes on both sides. If you bring it down to one lane both ways, there will be increased traffic and perhaps crime. Speedbumps would be a good mitigation.
- **Ann Haebig** – Used to work on 55th and quit riding that street because it felt unsafe. Lanes are not wide enough for safety right now. If the Double left keeps the delays to a minimum this is fine, so long as they are properly signalized for safety.
- **Carolyn Hales** – Excited to have the Iris corridor experiment in her back yard. Whether one percent or ten percent of people bike this corridor is irrelevant. This project signals that we, as a community want not to have multiple lanes rushing by and prefer a slower, safer alternative.
- **Gary Sprung** – Supports the Iris corridor. Change to the crossing at 15th street will be a very positive change for him. This will encourage him to ride Iris more. He currently does not because it feels unsafe. The only way to know what the future will be is to try it. He would like to see traffic counts for the corridors to aid the prediction of results.
- **Pieter Van Der Mersch** – Came here on the bus because of concerns about time to get to this location. North/South route is not good. He has used Folsom and Goose Creek Bikeway quite a bit. Questions whether making the bike lane wider on Folsom will make things better. As a cycle commuter, there is much time he cannot ride because of snow and Ice. How will that be removed when there is an added structure or facility that needs to be worked around?
- **Adelaide Perr** – Gave up her car last February. In October a car came through a light and hit her. She is all for the protected bike lanes to prevent similar occurrences. Drivers often cross into the bike lane. Drivers take way too many risks around cyclists. Biking is inherently more dangerous than being in a car, but having a larger cycle lane will make cyclists feel safer and encourage more riding.
- **Howard Bitman** – Expressing full support for any experimental program that encourages people to get out of their cars. Industrialized nations have decided that getting off fossil fuels is key to averting major climate change problems. Making options available and encouraging people to do what is in their best interests is key to success in getting people to change. Recommends support of plan and to go still further. More bikes. Discourage cars. There are many who don't have to drive, but choose to do so. This must change.
- **David Harper** – There is a problem at Iris & Broadway with the flashing left turn arrow. Only about two or three cars can get through during peak hours. He already diverts through Norwood or Kalmia during peak hours. He is the example of what the people in this neighborhood are concerned about and it will only get worse if this plan is put into effect. With the predicted delays, it's not a time issue, but a frustration issue for motorists. If he can't tell how long he will be backed up in traffic he will divert.
- **Charles A. Brock** – Supports all four corridors. His interests in the project are different. He is an air quality and climate researcher. The world is looking at 4-5 degrees of global temperature change over the next several years. Need to do everything possible to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Transportation is 28 % of this figure. Getting people out of vehicles is what is needed to bring this number down. How can we all do our part to move to better forms of transportation?
- **Carl Forest** – The problem with climate is numbers of people not numbers of drivers. He is opposed to this plan because there is no concrete data. No numbers about Boulder's current situation. No numbers about other cities. He is not about to get on a bike as a main mode of transportation at 75 years of age. Traffic has increased hugely. This proposal for Folsom make traffic worse and will kill McGuckins and other businesses along the corridor. You can't carry things away from McGuckins on a bike. Go ahead and experiment, but watch carefully what happens in case things get worse.
- **Karen Weber** – Opposed to the Iris Corridor plan. Iris is the only four lane road East to West on the North end of town. It does not matter how big the bike lanes are, she will not ever be riding on the streets. Why can't we have bikes separated from traffic entirely? Make the bike trails fully interconnected.
- **Fred Ecks** – In favor of the proposal (all corridors). His only questions about the criteria is why south 30th Street did not make it onto the list. Currently he does not ride on Folsom because it's a scary corridor. The bike lane narrows a lot and speeds are high. Cars are close. Urges extending the Folsom corridor to Arapahoe as facilities are not good there. Getting safe bike/ped facilities is key because we cannot support our motor vehicle traffic.
- **Sara Harper** – If you slow traffic down, you increase texting, talking on phones, etc. Safety will decrease with speed.
- **Lynn Guissinger** – Former TAB member. Speaking in favor of the proposal (all corridors). This is a pilot project. Facts are what we need to support these developments.

- **Nicholas Flores** – Comments on the analysis. A three minute increase in the average commute time equates to 900 collective commuter hours per day. The analysis needs to take this on directly. Delay implies increased idle time which means increased pollution. This should be quantified. (1:44:39 Track three). When analyzing success, need to distinguish between new and existing bike commuters to prove values. Value to bikes is seasonal. Impact to cars is year round. Ditch near ball fields could be covered and turned into a multi-use lane. Without meaningful goals and good data, the project is not responsible.
- **Jeanne Walsh** – CU freshmen should not be allowed to have cars. Regarding the Iris corridor, her daughter was almost hit at Iris and Broadway. She would like to see an underpass there which links to the bike path. Cars line up to pick up their kids, so the school district needs to get involved. CU needs to get involved. Open enrollment creates traffic problems.
- **Patrick Rea** – His house backs up on Kalmia. He and his daughters are enthusiastic bikers. He is surprised and concerned that success/failure metrics have not been set. He supports the Iris project IF pre and post metrics are set and evaluated. Study cannot be limited just to the roadways where changes will be made. This will affect traffic on Kalmia. Crosswalk at 15th & Broadway needs to be moved. It is unsafe.
- **Waylon Lewis** – Has been witness to the Living lab on University. It is safer now. It's been great, would love to see it improved. Having a lot of metrics to measure success would be great, but the project should still move forward. Has been hit three times in 10 years of cycling. He does bike all winter and does shop at McGuckins.
- **Mary Eberle** – Lives on Norwood. Cut through traffic is already a concern. The Iris corridor project will make this worse. This set up is bikes against cars. Every time a car has to be delayed by a bike or pedestrian, pollution is increased. Why is there no experiment in the South part of town? If success is 2-5% increase in bikes, 100% of car users will be unhappy.
- **Evan Kalina** – Supports the Complete Streets Project. Routinely bikes down Folsom. He is not alone in cycling to work. Boulder commutes by bike at 21 times the national average. Roads should reflect the citizen's commitment to healthy transportation. Close calls with traffic is not a way to encourage biking. He has been hit. Having a set of protected bike lanes will improve safety for cyclists. Delays are minimal.
- **Rochelle Worsnop** – CU Grad student. Bikes Folsom every day for work. Every week she is almost hit when cars merge into her lane. The inconveniences to cars discussed are a plus for her. Driving should be more inconvenient and harder to do for everyone. Cars should like this because it gives better visibility of the cyclists.
- **Eric Budd** – Supports the plan for all four corridors. Land is Boulder's scarcest resource. Need a transportation system that is just and provides equity. Biking and walking use less space than car traffic. Reconfiguring the streets increases the equity of safety. Must provide more varied and cost effective modes of transport to address equity of income.
- **Sue Prant**- Since Wednesday Community Cycles has been circulating a petition in support of the Right-sizing project. 500 have signed in support. Right sizing has been done not only in warm weather climates. Boulder is just following a national trend. If LA can do it, we can do it. The City has done excellent outreach. Part of the outreach is the project itself. This is a pilot project. We have downsized roads before and the world did not end. Let's try it.
- **Ben Binder** – Concerned that two of the members of the TAB are avowed anti-automobile advocates. How many bicycles use each one of these corridors on a daily basis? Does the city have a comprehensive computer model of the entire city traffic system? Do the models take into consideration the increase in automobile traffic due to the new projects being built right now?
- **Merrill Elustrom** – In support of the project (all corridors). Having lived 17 years in Atlanta, can bring its example as a cautionary tale. They greatly increased numbers of lanes and this resulted only in a commensurate increase in traffic, accidents, road rage, etc. The external costs of cars (pollution and climate change, etc) are never considered. Metrics are needed. Listen to people with specific points but go ahead.
- **Sarah Hoskin Clymer** – Lives on Iris. Two lanes with the left turn lane is an exciting prospect. Real possibility of improvement. Beautification is also important. Traffic is bad now. How will seven seconds make it worse?
- **Jordan Man** – The leading cause of death for those under 35 is auto accident 15 % of this are bike and pedestrian accidents. Statistics from other right-sized communities show reduced speeds and numbers of accidents. Safer for everyone. Win for both bikes and cars.
- **Debbie Ralya** – Commercial property manager. Needs her car for work. While he is in support of bike commuting, she cannot do it herself. Business point of view – She did query of tenants a few years back. There were about 400 people, most of them do not live in Boulder. They will not be riding their bikes to work or around town. If something is not broken, why fix? What is wrong on 55th that needs fixing?

- **Bogie D**. – Sold car to bike commute. 2 years ago was hit. Then used a tricycle. Lanes are too small for that. Now commutes by car. If bike lanes had been protected, he would not have been hit. Disappointed by people whining about small delays. Safer bike lanes, people driving slower.
- **Sandra Cirian** – Representing the middle aged women this is targeted at. Excited by whole project. Does commute fairly regularly by bicycle. Commutes by paths and bike lanes. Her family only has one car and still manage to get their child where she needs to be by public transportation and bike. It just takes a little more planning.
- **Angelique Espinoza** - Representing business concerns from the East area. Most of the larger employers are out there around the 55th and 63rd corridors. A good percentage of their employees are coming from outside the city of Boulder. Those distances are not always bikeable. This limited project will not change their mode. She does not agree that the outreach has been good. The City is working on too many projects so outreach is often not effective because there is too much of it for people to choose from or focus on. Postcards and even an extra meeting is not adequate to educate people. The Chamber is not opposing the project, but are urging better outreach even if it affects the timing of the project.
- **Sharon Samson** - Representing the business community from the industrial zone on 55th. We chose to live there because it was accessible and not congested and has a wonderful bike path. Her employees come from as far as Fort Collins (by shuttle) and the nearest lives in Louisville. Adding the commute time is a significant issue. These people are not going to commute by bike. Clients will also not bike to office. Most are out of town, some are international. Don't disregard the fact that there are alternative ways people are reducing traffic in that area.
- **Johan Feddema** – Commutes to work by bike every day from Kalmia. Concerned about traffic bleeding into his neighborhood. Does not see that putting a few cyclists on Iris as a good tradeoff for increased car traffic on Kalmia where there are already many bikes. Please explore ways to keep cut through traffic out of the neighborhood.
- **Julie McCabe** – Sees TAB as a transportation board biased towards bicycles. There are many people who will not be forced out of their cars by social engineering. It is inappropriate for this board to engage in that. The real crux is mass transit. Every year Boulder and Broomfield County pay millions for Denver light rail that does not aid us. The next project should address Boulder's commuter traffic. She does not buy that this is an experiment. Everything said tonight by the public is not important because the political powers have already decided to move forward on these projects. 9th to Arapahoe is a bad project. Dangerous.
- **Megan Tolbert** – Gets around many ways. Walks a dog, runs, bikes, motorcycles, walks the paths, uses transit and drives a car. She is very excited by the project. It will improve safety for her in any and all of her forms of transportation. She is the Executive Director of Boulder Transportation Connections. That organization promotes Eco Passes. Businesses are concerned about employee transportation issues. The more options they have, the more they will use them.
- **Milos Novotny** – Out commutes from Boulder. When he does get on his bike and ride across town, he uses only back streets. He cannot imagine wanting to ride on a major street. He is not convinced by staff's statistics or modeling. How do the stats for success in other cities translate to Boulder? Laws regarding bike injuries are outdated. He urges support for this pilot project. He would like to see metrics and "off-ramps" in case things need to be changed mid-stream.
- **Will Toor** – Is in favor of the pilot. He is the Co-chair of Better Boulder which voted unanimously to support the project in all four corridors, as they feel it will aid getting more people riding on the streets. Historical perspective –Boulder has many times made infrastructure changes that have made things safer for bikes. Each time there have been predictions from some in the community of dire consequences and impacts. Every time it has been successful. Biking numbers are up.

Board discussion and comments included: **[8:34 p.m.]**

- The board heard community concerns and the desire for "off-ramps" and agrees these should be considered.
- General agreement that pilot projects are part of the outreach process. They give the community something to discuss.
- Discussion of the difference between an anti-car stance and encouraging other modes of transportation.
- General expression of support for all four corridors.
- Thanks to those who turned out to speak and to staff.
- Suggestions for a stronger communication effort especially with the Chamber of Commerce and Businesses.
- Discussion regarding equity issues surrounding non-car modes of transportation in planning efforts and the importance of even incremental shifts over time.
- General agreement that metrics (both "before" and "after") are needed in order to measure success.
- Clarifications about whether diversion traffic into surrounding neighborhoods has been considered and what

sorts of traffic calming are available.

Motion: TAB recommends to Council the adoption of the staff recommendation on the Iris Avenue Corridor
Motion by: Nozzi Seconded: Bilich
Vote: 4-0 Motion Passes

Motion: TAB recommends to Council the adoption of the staff recommendation on the Folsom Street Corridor
Motion by: Nozzi Seconded: Rigler
Vote: 4-0 Motion Passes

Motion: TAB recommends to Council the adoption of the staff recommendations on the 55th and 63rd Street corridors.
Motion by: Bilich Seconded: Nozzi
Vote: 3-1 (Rigler Opposed) Motion Passes
Rigler declines to add an opposing position statement.

Agenda Item 5: Public hearing and TAB consideration of a recommendation regarding the 2016-2021 Transportation Capital Improvements Program (CIP) – Part III of III [9:19 p.m.]
Mike Gardner-Sweeney Gave the presentation.

Executive Summary from Packet Materials:
Every year the city goes through a budget process that creates a six-year planning budget, this year for the time period of 2016 through 2021. Within this process, funds are appropriated for the first year, 2016. The Transportation Advisory Board's (TAB) role in this process is defined in the Boulder Revised Code (BRC) TITLE 2 GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION, Chapter 3 Boards and Commissions, Section 14 - Transportation Advisory Board; ". . . to review all city transportation environmental assessments and capital improvements." It is within this context that the board is asked to hold a public hearing and provide a recommendation on the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) to Planning Board and City Council.

Board discussion and comments included: [9:24 p.m.]

- Minor clarifications on issues discussed at prior meetings

Motion: TAB recommends adoption of the staff recommended Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for 2016-2021 to the City Council.
Motion by: Selvans Seconded: Nozzi
Vote: 4-0

Agenda Item 6: Staff briefing and TAB input regarding TMP measurable objectives update, including results from the Boulder Valley Employee Survey. [9:30 p.m.]
Chris Hagelin presented item to the board.

Executive Summary from Packet Materials:
Since the adoption of the first Transportation Master Plan (TMP) in 1989, the city has collected transportation data for all modes to understand travel in the community and to monitor the results of the TMP policy direction. This data is collected through a variety of count programs and surveys and evaluated comprehensively as part of the Transportation Metrics program. As part of this program, a number of technical annual reports were produced between the 1996 TMP and the 2003 TMP. More recently, the 2012 *Transportation Report on Progress* has presented this information in a more user friendly way. The *Transportation Report on Progress* is being produced every other year with the next report scheduled for release in 4th quarter 2015.

This memo provides a summary of recent data collected through a number of the Transportation Metrics program efforts. These results show that the roadway system continues to perform well and progress in mode shift away from the single occupant vehicle by Boulder residents. At the same time, the single occupant vehicle mode share for non-resident employees shows little change and remains a challenge. Summary highlights are provided for the following

- Intersection level of service
- Travel time survey
- Bicycle count program
- Downtown bicycle parking counts
- Boulder Valley Employee Survey

- Downtown Employee Survey

Staff also continues to develop and refine the Measurable Objectives of the 2014 TMP, including the three new objectives:

- Safety – goal of "Vision Zero"
- Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita for residents and non-resident employees
- Neighborhood accessibility – 15 minute walkable neighborhoods

Board discussion and comments included: **[9:50 p.m.]**

- Questions regarding integration of information and the timing and development of the Boulder Valley Comp Plan.

Concerns that traffic calming may be so tentative that we will have trouble achieving "Vision Zero".

Agenda Item 7: Matters **[10:00 p.m.]**

A.) Matters from the Board Included:

Board member Selvans brought up the below matter(s)

- Form Based Code pleasant to work on. Lots of support for narrower streets. Much focus on street environments over buildings. Emphasis on how buildings interact with the street.

Board member Bilich brought up the below matter(s)

- Bus then Bike Shelter at Boulder Junction status? Project is being led by Boulder County. Working with stakeholders to narrow down to two sites. One adjacent to bus depot entrance. Other across from that area at Junction Place (where Goose Creek Path comes together with the street).

B.) Matters from staff/Non Agenda: **[10:11 p.m.]**

- Safe Routes to School on Hanover. Making good progress working with the neighborhood. Intent is to take a portion of Hanover and reconstruct it as a multi-use path. Working through issues of parking configuration and overall street width. Planning will be finished this year. Construction will happen in 2016.
- RTD Service Plans: RTD Board has moved the public hearing from June to July providing more time to work with the corridor stakeholders. Some things are moving in the right direction. Still need support coming from the community to RTD.

Agenda Item 7: Future Schedule Discussion: **[10:14 p.m.]**

None.

Agenda Item 8: Adjournment **[10:16 p.m.]**

There being no further business to come before the board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 10:16 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, 13 July, 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:

_____
Board Chair

_____
Date

ATTESTED:

_____
Board Secretary

_____
Date

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