

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

<b>Name of Board/ Commission:</b> Transportation Advisory Board	
<b>Date of Meeting:</b> 10 August, 2015	
<b>Contact Information Preparing Summary:</b> Kaaren Davis 303.441.3233	
<b>Board Members Present:</b> Zane Selvans, Andria Bilich, Dom Nozzi, Bill Rigler, Daniel Stellar, Andria Bilich <b>Board Members Absent:</b>	
<b>Staff Present:</b> Michael Gardner-Sweeney, Interim Director of Public Works for Transportation Gerrit Slatter, Principal Transportation Projects Engineer Greg Izzo, Public Works Maintenance Manager Kathleen Bracke, GO Boulder Manager Jean Sanson, Senior Transportation Planner Chris Hagelin, Senior Transportation Planner David “DK” Kemp, Sr. Transportation Planner Randall Rutsch, Senior Transportation Planner Natalie Stiffler, Transportation Planner II Kaaren Davis, Board Secretary	
<b>Consultants Present:</b> none	
<b>Type of Meeting:</b> Advisory/ Regular	
<b>Agenda Item 1: Call to Order</b>	<b>[6:01 p.m.]</b>
The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.	
<b>Agenda Item 2: Approval of minutes from 8 June 2015</b>	<b>[6:01 p.m.]</b>
<b>Move to approve July 13, 2015 minutes as presented.</b>	
<b>Motion: Nozzi Second: Rigler</b>	
<b>4:1:0 (Bilich Abstains)</b>	
<b>Agenda Item 3: Public Participation</b>	<b>[6:02 p.m.]</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Dave Morrison</b> – Lived here since '95- Folsom Avenue living labs is a boondoggle. Huge traffic backups. Drives around town all the time. Sees nothing but trouble with this. There may be more bicycles but there are a dozen cars for each bike. This project should be up to a vote of the people. Stop it right now. If you want more bikes there are other ways than taking away lanes from cars. Not convinced by the numbers so far provided.</li> <li>• <b>Andrew Celani</b>-Started at Smooth Motors in 1984. Have been there since. Since the inception of the Living Labs, what was a good corridor has turned into a nightmare. There has been a negative impact to business. The diminished capacity of the street and the difficulty of navigating the pylons has created a SNAFU. Our business is down a magnificent amount (43%) from an aggregate of prior years. City staff has decided they are the rulers and will make decisions for us. Staff member David Kemp admits to lack of data. TAB and Council need to decide whether the catastrophe on Folsom is to be repeated or whether those adversely affected will just quietly go away</li> <li>• <b>Sue Prant</b> – Thanks to the board and staff for their efforts on the Living Labs projects. There is actually quite a lot of data from the beforehand. It's a shame the Camera has decided to present the issue the way they have. There has been only one week of trial. The road is much calmer and quieter. The traffic is moving slower. It's much safer and more attractive to both bikes and pedestrians. Questions comparing one week of business in the summer with an aggregate of multiple years (referring to the prior speaker). This is a trial. If we pull out now, we learn nothing. Keep with the plan. Evaluate and study.</li> <li>• <b>Fred Ecks</b> – Live close to south 30<sup>th</sup>. Its bike lane is similar to how Folsom was. Rarely rides a bike in town anymore because it is too dangerous. Glad to see the change. Please continue.</li> <li>• <b>Sara Mayer</b> – Avid cyclist and does drive. Raised two kids with one car in the family. Kids walked or biked to school every day. Likes to see staff find ways to get people out of their cars. The Folsom reach is too small to provide any useful data. Does not include the most dangerous section. Rides Iris often. We owe it to people to study how much traffic actually travels Iris during all parts of the year. Routes on Hawthorne/Grape and Kalmia would allow bike travel without using Iris. Traffic will divert into neighborhoods with the Iris plan. What is the plan for cleaning the bike lanes and snow removal with all of the vertical elements that divide it from traffic? A community wide pass and more busses would make this all much easier. Likens car use to smoking, which became socially unacceptable. It should become socially unacceptable to use a car for any trip</li> </ul>	

under 5 miles, or driving an SUV or any vehicle with gas mileage under 35 miles to the gallon or to drive your children to school.

- **Charles Brock** – Has been avoiding Folsom by bike for years since his son was struck by a car. Has been happy to take Folsom to and from work every day for the last three weeks. There is only congestion between 5 and 5:30. The project is 97% effective. If we solve the remaining three percent, we will have a solid transit corridor. Go the full time for the trial.
- **Michael Smith** – Lives at Folsom and Valmont. Agrees with the intention of encouraging bike traffic. But seems a great expense for little value. Does not see the overall plan for bike lanes in the city that actually moves cyclists effectively. There is enormous car inflow every day that makes biking hard. Does not see how this plan addresses that issue. It would also be good to better enforce the speed limit across the City. Stopped using Folsom unless he has to (by car). Worse congestion. Bigger backups and the pedestrian crosswalks make it worse still.
- **Gary Sprung** - In the short time the Folsom project has existed, he has ridden bike through a couple of times, driven his car through a couple of times. By bike feels safer which is great. By car, the flow was fine, though the perception was that congestion was worse since he had to start further back. Longer left turn lane might help. Overall it seems like the project is working. Loves the comments about needing to do something about the 40-65,000 cars and the Eco Pass (referring to a previous speaker), but those solutions cost a whole lot of money. This is pretty cheap to do, so why not try it? Not sure why there is so much anger over this project.
- **Aaron Johnson** – Appreciate the effort of the City to promote bicycling, and appreciate the effort to collect data. There was a real effort to prove the effectiveness of these treatments. Things like safety are hard to quantitatively compare to things like minutes of delay. Even if data shows that there are delays, you might still ask yourselves, how many minutes of delay are worth a life or an injury or a feeling of safety while biking. Encourages staff and the board to urge Council to stay strong. The squeakiest wheel is not always the one we should listen to. Instead listen to the well-ordered and data supported arguments.
- **Les Helbak** – Opposed to the Folsom Living Lab project. Most people he has talked to feel it is kind of kludgy. Folsom used to be a decent bike corridor, but is now a disaster for cars. Cars are backed up now with no cyclists in sight. In winter there will be still fewer bikes. Cars idling is bad for pollution. Right turns seem like an accident waiting to happen. This is not a good idea.
- **Robert Rowe** – Works in boulder lives in Broomfield. Supports all living labs treatments. As a cyclist has been on the Folsom stretch both before and after. Likes it now. Feels safer. Can take his wife on the route now. She feels safer. One less thing to worry about. Cars are there but can keep an eye out. Please continue with the trials.
- **Randy Offstein** – Tries to ride his bike around town as often as possible. In general feels that bike lanes around town are good. Has never had any bad experiences. Always yields to cars regardless of the laws (cars are much bigger than he is on his bike). But also minds the bikes when driving. Boulder has an existing car traffic problem. Sees no point in reducing traffic lanes. Bikes have many options for getting around town. Cars do not have alternate options. Many of us must drive frequently. It makes no sense to hugely expand the bike lane at the expense of making the car traffic problem worse.

**Agenda Item 4: Staff briefing and TAB input regarding August 25, 2015 City Council Study Session on TMP implementation progress including: Living Lab, Transportation Maintenance, and Capital Project Updates.**

[6:32 p.m.]

Mike Sweeney, Chris Hagelin, Randall Rutsch, DK Kemp and Gerrit Slatter gave the presentation to the board.

**Executive Summary from Packet Materials:**

The City of Boulder has a multimodal transportation system that serves as a model for sustainable travel in the U.S. The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) outlines the vision for transportation and provides the policy and investment direction for achieving the community's access and mobility goals.

The 2014 TMP builds upon a strong multimodal policy foundation and continuing refinements to the existing system. It includes a focus on "Complete Streets," with work programs centered on a variety of Bicycle and Pedestrian Innovations, as well as the community's Renewed Vision for Transit. In August 2014, the updated TMP document was accepted by City Council and work in 2015 and beyond is centered on implementing the TMP based on the [TMP Action Plan](#), which includes a list of "immediate" action items for 2014 to 2016.

The TMP implementation continues to focus on an integrated approach, with partnerships across city departments and with local and regional community partners. The TMP implementation is being coordinated and integrated with the city's priority-based budgeting approach and capital investment strategies.

The 2014 TMP update was developed through an extensive community engagement process and this spirit of ongoing community participation continues in all areas of TMP implementation. Examples of TMP implementation include the Living Laboratory approach for advancing the "Complete Streets" goals of the TMP and ongoing work with the community and agency partners in the transit area. Please see [www.BoulderTMP.net](http://www.BoulderTMP.net) for more details.

This is the second study session reviewing the implementation of the 2014 TMP in the 12-month period since the plan was accepted by council. These six-month check-ins ensure that the TMP implementation remains consistent with the council's priorities and the city's efforts to promote long-term sustainability and resiliency.

Highlights of the second six months of implementation include:

- Implementation of the Living Lab Phase II Corridor Projects, including a one-month check-in on the Folsom Street implementation;
- Progress on Maintenance Initiatives, reflecting additional funding in this area;
- Advancement of Capital Projects Implementation under the three-year bond funding approved by the voters in November 2011 and the sales tax reallocation in 2013.

The "Analysis" section contains more information about these and other implementation actions, organized into areas seeking more in-depth input from council and those providing updates to past materials or ongoing efforts.

### Questions for Council/TAB

1. Does council have feedback on the ongoing implementation and evaluation of the Complete Streets Living Lab Phase II corridor projects, including the installed Folsom Street project?
2. Does council have comments on the recent changes in maintenance activities or the ongoing evaluation and transformation efforts?
3. Does council have questions or comments about the ongoing Transportation capital improvements program or its individual projects?

### Board discussion and comments included:

[7:56 p.m.]

#### Living Lab

- Support for option 2. Tweak but go forward.
- Execution and intention are a B-plus. Communication and public outreach is a D.
- Suggestions that info graphics should be simplified and graphs clarified.
- Suggestions to be very clear in future communications about what the goals of the project are and what benefits we expect to see if we meet them. Also to be clear on whether the goals are to make things better for everyone, or whether they represent tradeoffs.
- Questions regarding the ratio of favorable to unfavorable responses to the project and how these relate to the success of the project so far.
- Questions about the accuracy of the modeling as compared to data collected early in the project.
- Questions around the impacts to businesses on the Folsom corridor and what is being done to address their concerns.
- Thanks to staff for persevering through the early adversity.
- Suggestions that staff work to communicate to the community that the City does, in fact, have a large amount of "beforehand" data.
- Discussions around how much new data must be gathered and the timing of its release to effectively evaluate project effects and provide useful and solid data to the community.
- Suggestions that in the Council packet it be conveyed that TAB has been discussing right sizing for quite a while and that there is a significant body of data from other communities that shows that right sizing can work.
- Discussion around the impact of mid-block crossings on traffic in conjunction with the right-sizing projects.
- Discussion around how to deal with peak congestion.
- Suggestions for alternatives to mid-block crossings and signalized intersections with regards to reducing peak traffic issues.
- Suggestion to better explain how the project will reduce air emissions.

- Request for a way to find a quantitative expression of the tradeoffs between congestion and the GHG.
- Clarifications around the timeline for advancement of the other parts of the project (Iris and 63rd).
- An opinion that if the goal is to make the roads more accessible to the interested but concerned cyclist group (this is a very high priority in the TMP), this project is providing protected bike lanes meets that need.
- A suggestion to provide annotation to the data about how it was collected. This might address many of the concerns about the data quality.
- Questions regarding who is involved in the communication efforts and how the communications duties are divided up.
- Recommendation not to share numbers that are statistically insignificant.
- Discussion of observations on safety features of the 4 to 3 lane conversion on Folsom, and on peaks observed by a business nearby the treatment.

#### **Maintenance Initiatives**

- Recommendations to include information on strategies for snow control on higher sloped streets.
- Suggestions for clarifications on exactly what costs for street maintenance go to. Ex: \$1.6 million buys 5 miles of what kind of residential streets?
- Commendations for the data driven approach and for such measures as third party analysis.
- Questions regarding relative ratio of how much can be gained by repurposing or streamlining our current resources, and how much we lack resources to do.
- Questions regarding the environmental soundness of our de-icing materials.
- Questions about whether the City has an issue about accepting right of way for residential streets that then require very expensive ongoing upkeep.
- Discussion of the importance of transparency. Suggested use of social media for dealing with concerns/complaints. Real-time updates on maintenance and snow control.
- Suggestions to clearly convey to the public exactly how much we can do on snow control with the resources we have.
- Discussion of the importance of demonstrating in the Living Labs projects that we learned the lessons of snow control in protected bike lanes from the University Avenue trial.
- Questions about the adequacy of funding for roadway maintenance.
- Thanks for calling out the needs for crews to work snow removal at the transit stops.

#### **Capital Projects Implementation**

- Questions as to how the starting project for 28<sup>th</sup> and Foothills would interface with the Iris corridor right-sizing project.
- A suggestion to total the leveraged amounts of construction cost for Council.
- Clarifications on timing of the studies discussed.
- Appreciation for the quality of the presentation. Easy to understand.
- Suggestions for a map similar to Cone Zones (or a layer within Cone Zones) showing these projects so that people can see what is going on real time.

#### **Focus Areas Updates**

- Suggestions for utilizing social media to broadcast project progress.
- Comments about bike parking outside of the Library main branch.
- Clarifications on the VIA replacement grants.
- Clarifications on the BRT expansion on 28<sup>th</sup> (Flatirons Flyer).

#### **Agenda Item 5: Matters**

**[9:16 p.m.]**

##### **A.) Matters from the Board Included:**

Board member Selvans brought up the below matter(s)

- Discussion of TAB producing an op-ed to clarify that there is a lot of data and a lot of analysis that was done before the right-sizing project.

##### **B.) Matters from staff/Non Agenda:**

**[9:43 p.m.]**

- NPP briefing in advance of Sept. 14 public hearing cannot be provided at this time as Molly Winter could not come to this meeting..
- September Joint Board meeting on the Chautauqua lease.

#### **Agenda Item 6: Future Schedule Discussion:**

**[9:48 p.m.]**

Combined with Matters from Staff

**Agenda Item 7: Adjournment**

**[9:48 p.m.]**

There being no further business to come before the board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 9:48 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, 14, September, 2015 in the Council Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.