

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

Name of Board/ Commission: Transportation Advisory Board
Date of Meeting: September 14, 2020
Contact Information Preparing Summary: Meredith Schleske 303.441.3204
Board Members Present: Tila Duhaime; Mark McIntyre, Alex Weinheimer, Lauren Lambert, Robert Hutchinson
Staff Present: Erika Vandenbrande, Director for Transportation and Mobility Bill Cowern, Deputy Director for Transportation and Mobility, Acting Principal Transportation Engineer Natalie Stiffler, Deputy Director for Transportation and Mobility Chris Hagelin, Senior Transportation Planner, Acting GO Boulder Manager Danny O'Connor, Senior Transportation Planner David "DK" Kemp, Senior Transportation Planner Amy Lewin, Senior Transportation Planner Ryan Noles, Senior Transportation Planner Jean Sanson, Senior Transportation Planner Jenny Godwin, Associate Transportation Planner Kathleen King, Senior Planning Planner Meredith Schleske, Board Secretary
Type of Meeting: Advisory/ Regular
Agenda Item 1: Call to Order [6:01 p.m.]
Instructions to Virtual Meeting Participants (not an agenda item) – Allison Crump, technical host reviewed rules and technical operations including interpretation on the virtual platform.
Agenda Item 2: Introduction: Director of Transportation and Mobility, Erika Vandenbrande [6:09 p.m.] Chair Duhaime expressed appreciation to Bill Cowern for serving as interim director for a long duration. She welcomed Erika Vandenbrande, who stated she is happy to be here and to serve the community. Chair overviewed TAB's background and role, challenges, envisioned role and hope for bold leadership on Transportation Master Plan (TMP) goals, transit, meaningful parking reform.
Agenda Item 3: Approval of August 2020 Minutes [6:26 p.m.] Motion: Approval of August 2020 Minutes as revised: replace "thirteenth" with "Thursday." Motion: McIntyre Second: Duhaime 4:0 Motion Passes. Hutchinson abstain/absent.
Agenda Item 4: Public Comment [6:30 p.m.] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lynn Segal – supports Duhaime's stated perspective of TAB role. There is a multidisciplinary aspect of planning and government including homelessness. TAB failed to discourage Planning Board (PB) with approving three floor construction at 15th and Canyon. COVID is our teacher – we need 15-minute neighborhoods, consider economics. Stop homelessness at root, it is driving up cost and transportation issues. • Lisa White – served on Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) – welcome to Vandenbrande, excited about progress on TMP. Works for growing employer in Boulder County, speaking as individual, not employee. Employer is moving away from near the downtown transit center next year, is concerned that moving to 30th and Valmont will decrease mode share progress, employees should have transit option. Concerned about modal equity aspects, bike access, inconvenience of Goose Creek path, passing major arterials en route. Employer is willing to work with the city on creative solutions and moving quickly on Vision Zero (VZ) goals. • Ryan Schuchard – new resident in Parkside neighborhood. Thank you and kudos to staff on "20 is Plenty", happy to be here working on it. Chose Boulder from international options, staff was helpful in obtaining local park "no exit" sign.
Agenda Item 5: Monthly Update [6:38 p.m.] A. COVID-19 Staff Update Bill Cowern made the update to the board.

- TAB received email from Mike Sweeney with traffic bike counts, crash data, transit data. Bike counts continue to be down around downtown, hopefully higher next month with University of Colorado (CU) students returning.
- Budget – postponing design and construction of the two Neighborhood Speed Management Program (NSMP) complex projects that were planned for this fall; carry over to 2021 fall due to lack of staff. Those projects are 26th Street and Kalmia, and 55th Street south of Baseline.
- City staff budget meeting last week emphasized cuts in 2021. For transportation and mobility, it includes \$4.6 million, four fulltime staff cut, and five positions remaining vacant. Focus will be on maintenance, GreenStreets and scheduled capital projects.
- Vision Zero Update – flex fund has been renamed “VZ Innovation Program” and includes 14 Group One projects: speed kidney traffic calming device at 9th Street and Cherry, improvements along 23rd Street, some already installed along Aurora, some along Grove tied to GreenStreets project. Group Two projects are being considered for 2021. TAB members should contact Amy Lewin and Jenny Godwin with questions.
- Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) confirmed grants for three of four projects submitted. Work is in process in conjunction with Community Vitality for road barricades, road closures and art.
- 34th Street artwork – neighborhood request did not meet Neighborhood Speed Management Program (NSMP) criteria so Noles worked with them to do a great road mural.
- TAB questions and comments regarding bike counts, any contemplation of cuts to HOP service. Staff reported that HOP service has increased with CU students returning to town.

Agenda Item 6: Community Check-in

[6:49 p.m.]

A. Follow-up regarding Chuck Brock email exchange concerning Cycling Improvements

TAB Comments

- Emails continue with David Kemp, discussion of whether they should be posted, any author concerns, continue public engagement.

B. Iris Avenue Mural

TAB Comments

- “It Could Be Me” video of street mural resulted from resident experiencing no bike separation for bikes on Iris, speeding vehicles. Cyclist who got hit in Boulder started It Could Be Me campaign, which helped design and paint the mural.
- Comments that transportation progress has been very slow, only key transportation project in two years has been North Broadway, crash data indicates that biggest safety problem is arterial streets but Folsom pilot treatment feedback seemed to dictate need for intense, expensive studies. Question if we can do something for \$1-2 million /mile rather than \$10-20 million/mile.

Agenda Item 7: Public hearing and TAB consideration regarding Neighborhood Speed Management Program (NSMP) 2020 Simple Projects

[7:08 p.m.]

Ryan Noles made the report to the board.

Executive Summary

The Neighborhood Speed Management Program (NSMP) was established in 2017 to address speeding issues on local and collector neighborhood streets. The program provides engineering, education, and enforcement tools to neighborhood streets to address speeding issues. All residents that apply to the program are eligible to receive education and enforcement tools. Applications for engineered traffic calming are evaluated and prioritized as simple or complex projects on an annual basis. In 2019, 26 total applications were prioritized for traffic calming projects, including nine projects on the simple project list.

Staff presented the evaluations of these applications and proposed project lists for 2020 to TAB on November 12, 2019 and held a public hearing December 9, 2019 TAB meeting. Following this public hearing the Board recommended final prioritized complex and simple project lists. The Board also recommended installing eight projects from the simple project list in 2020.

As a result of TAB’s recommendation in December 2019, staff began designing traffic calming projects for the locations included on the simple project list. In August 2020, staff held a virtual neighborhood forum (due to COVID-19 constraints) to review the proposed simple project plans, including the design and placement of traffic calming devices. Staff also held on-site, outdoor neighborhood meetings at Boulder Meadows in late August and early September to review proposed speed humps for Avocado Rd. and Persimmon Dr.

Following the virtual forum and on-site outdoor meetings, staff notified neighborhoods of the public hearing at the September 14 TAB meeting. With a recommendation from TAB, staff will proceed with installing the recommended simple projects by the end of 2020.

TAB Clarifying Questions

- Questions regarding if other neighbors impacted by but not residing on Upland were included, any difference between traffic east versus west of Upland, duration of chicane experiment, types of evaluations, neighborhood poll.
- Inquiries about vertical features that would alert travelers to chicane, if a pedestrian or wheelchair can navigate through chicane, parking blocks/curb stops.
- Questions concerning cost of treatments, number of children in area.

Public Participation

[7:50 p.m.]

- Steven Haydel – in Santa Monica for a month, “the city of stop signs.” Can we reconsider proposed treatments?
- William Mankin – lived on 44th Street since 1973, his comments were not solicited. On record, opposes project on 44th Street. How many speed-related injuries have there been, were other neighbors polled? Regarding speed humps on 43rd and 46th streets, have you measured how many vehicles rerouted, impact of treatments on those streets?
- Rob Stafford – opposed to speed humps on Pawnee Drive. Son suffered an unintended consequence, required shoulder surgery after impact with speed hump on skateboard at night. Skateboards and roller blades are not allowed on sidewalks. Special transit riders are also at risk and speed humps may impact property value. His house is in flood plain; are speed humps allowed?
- Aaron Solomon – opposed to chicane experiment on Upland, which is used by walkers and cyclists, is close to Jay, already a crowded street. Obstructions create danger for pedestrians, possibility of being hit.
- Michelle Esterella – Circulated petition for speed humps on Ithaca between Bear Creek Elementary and Crestview Elementary. This stretch is not conducive to sense of community; speed prohibits kids riding bikes. Commends TAB and city for continuation of speed mitigation and excellent public engagement. Postcards were great, suggests mailing a little earlier to get people involved sooner. In support of the project.
- Jenny Schmidt –regarding chicanes, how will efficacy be measured since speed limit was reduced to 20 miles per hour (mph) but was first measured at 25 miles per hour (m.p.h.)? Lives on Vinca Court, reiterates that Ithaca is a slalom course. It is a route for kids going to Crestview, opposes project, does not understand how speed humps turned into chicanes without additional input from the community.
- Lisa Cornell – Upland speed was measured when limit was 25 m.p.h., multiple vehicles are parked along the side all of the time, plants will decrease visibility, normal traffic volume does not justify, aesthetics are not good. Already, green strips outside of sidewalk are just weeds that become a mudslide in rain.
- Jane Thomas, has lived on Ithaca Drive for over 30 years – supports humps in road, should slow traffic, as it is a straight shot for a long way. Lots of children in street, thanks for postcards, ability to comment.
- Trish Groom – supports chicanes on Upland. Being a dead-end does not prohibit speed. Behavior has not changed with 20 m.p.h. sign, chicanes are worth a try, permanent structure can beautify and increase property value. Next to a school, great opportunity for Upland to show results to the city results and provide another option.
- Ryan Schuchard – little mention of climate change, need to balance against greenhouse emissions (GHE). Travels Iris by bike often, need protected bike lanes and more crosswalks, has other ideas.
- Gerry Bremmer – opposed to chicane experiment on Upland. Flawed study with data collected before “20 is Plenty” implementation. Street is already a slalom pattern, forced to be one-way road due to cars parked on both sides, sidewalks are unpassable due to weeds and failure to shovel snow. Experiment is not justified, believes it will result in a lot more pedestrian and bike accidents. Urges consideration of other alternatives.
- Dan Merchant – appreciates the process, feels heard. Dangerous to be in front yard with one-year old, would appreciate speed humps. 20 is Plenty has not changed driver behavior.
- Sheila King – echoes some of neighbors’ sentiments regarding chicane experiment on Upland. It is a very sleepy street. Flawed data due to construction traffic, elite cyclists. Consider less costly, more appropriate treatments, perhaps speed sign.

- Josie Warfield – opposed to chicane project on Upland. Crestview kids come from all over town, chicane makes street less safe. Lived on the street over 20 years, there have always been cyclists and runners.
- Elias Bachmann – lives on Upland straightaway. There are high speeds on that section, lots of bikes and pedestrians. Chicanes would slow traffic and be safer.
- Lynn Segal – consider from 30,000 point of view, should start now. People are not going to the office now; think about who is going where and when. Stratify when people work and eat to make it less intense, more efficient, reduce expense. There should be a long-term redesign of the grid.
- Elaine Pease – opposes chicanes, lived in Boulder since 1970. In perspective, today is a different ballgame, calm for most part. Concerned about snow, anticipates cars will crash into chicanes, does not believe they will solve the identified problems.
- Roof Gefmariam for Beth Lozen – many kids are moving in, recently a lot more pedestrians, cars are not slowing down on Ithaca, Emerson and Idlewild. Thanks for support and speed mitigation.

TAB Discussion

- Questions about how Upland scored previously and how Norwood compared, traffic volume, measurement and evaluation process, Boulder-based experience and data, if measurable speed differences have resulted from speed humps.
- Comments that it is an objective process, concern expressed that process is giving community the sense that change can be made in objective recommendation, general feeling that unless there is new information that would change the data, a decision should be made at this TAB meeting.
- Support for reviewing the process before going through another round of NSMP petitions and recommendations, only Upland merits TAB consideration for a chicane at this time. Desire expressed for installation by year-end.

Motion: Approve staff recommendation to proceed with the installation of the proposed simple projects on nine neighborhood streets in Fall 2020:

Boulder Meadows: Avocado Road, Persimmon Drive, Orange Drive speed humps

Motion: Duhaime **Second:** McIntyre

5:0 Motion Passes.

Evergreen Avenue speed humps

Motion: Duhaime **Second:** McIntyre

5:0 Motion Passes.

Ithaca Drive speed humps

Motion: McIntyre **Second:** Weinheimer

5:0 Motion Passes.

Pawnee Drive speed humps

Motion: Duhaime **Second:** McIntyre

Discussion: Requests for enforcement, encourage residents to observe and report, note that Mohawk also has elementary school traffic; encourage Mohawk residents to submit NSMP application.

5:0 Motion Passes.

South 40th Street speed humps

Motion: McIntyre **Second:** Duhaime

5:0 Motion Passes.

South 44th Street speed humps

Motion: McIntyre **Second:** Weinheimer

5:0 Motion Passes.

Upland Avenue experimental chicane

Motion: Duhaime **Second:** Hutchinson

5:0 Motion Passes.

Agenda Item 8: Public hearing and TAB feedback regarding Shared E-scooter Ordinance Options [9:14 p.m.]

David Kemp made the report to the board.

Executive Summary

City Council provided staff direction at the January 28, 2020 City Council Study Session to not move forward with e-scooters as part of the city’s Shared Micromobility Program and requested further monitoring of the e-scooter industry and related aspects, including safety and sustainability. Council is supportive of the introduction of private sector e-bikes as part of a Shared Micromobility Program and recently approved an update to the Dockless Bike Share Licensing Program on July 7, 2020.

Since the January 28th City Council study session, staff has further investigated a new, seated style of e-scooter. These lightweight electric vehicles come equipped with a seat offering a lower center of gravity and a larger wheel diameter offering a higher ground clearance over standing e-scooters.

Staff recommends piloting seated e-scooters as part of the city's Shared Micromobility Program. On March 9, 2020, TAB informally supported staff's recommendation to proceed with adding seated e-scooter devices to its program.

Staff stands by our recommendation to not include standing e-scooters as part of the city's Shared Micromobility Program, primarily due to safety and environmental sustainability concerns as presented in the January 28, 2020 City Council Study Session memo and presentation. Most recently, a publication prepared by the Governor's Highway Safety Association (pages 9-11) also raises similar safety concerns associated with e-scooters, although it does not make the distinction between standing and seated e-scooters. In order to provide safety data specific to seated e-scooters, staff has reached out through NACTO member contacts in various cities regarding their experiences with shared, seated e-scooters and the results did not yield any specific safety concerns. Staff also reached out to the companies providing seated e-scooters and was able to collect more data which is detailed below in the analysis section of the memo.

It is clear in NACTO's latest Shared Micromobility report that e-scooters trips (standing and seated) represent a majority of the 136 million micromobility trips taken nationally; however, the safety of these devices, particularly standing e-scooters, remains questionable.

Staff has prepared for TAB and council consideration three options for a shared e-scooter ordinance.

The options include:

1. Ordinance 8422 - Indefinite prohibition against licensing businesses offering shared, standing e-scooters and allow licensing businesses offering shared, seated e-scooters.
2. Ordinance 8423 - Allow licensing businesses offering all types of e-scooters (standing and seated).
3. Ordinance 8424 - Indefinite prohibition against licensing businesses offering all types of shared e-scooters (standing and seated).

On September 1, City Council passed all three ordinance options on first reading. Second reading of this ordinance and a public hearing is scheduled for City Council on September 15 where council will select one of the three ordinances.

If shared e-scooters are allowed, staff will fold the regulations for both shared dockless e-bikes and e-scooters into an overall Shared Micromobility Program and release a request for proposal (RFP) to select an operator in 4th quarter 2020. Staff anticipates launching a new Shared Micromobility Program in spring 2021.

TAB Clarifying Questions

- Comments that comparing scooter to bike injuries per trip versus injuries per mile traveled is tricky, consider safety versus convenience.
- Questions about privately-owned scooters, advantage of scooter over assist e-bike, providers' current markets, any cap on fleet size, clutter versus availability,
- Inquiries regarding sequencing, why do this before a decision is made on B-Cycle, timing of request for proposal (RFP), whether dockless bikeshare is a separate effort from scooters.

Public Participation

[9:46 p.m.]

- Stephen Haydel – Santa Monica took away car parking, implemented scooter parking, scooters are used by a lot of seniors, two years of useful crash data.
- Arthur Oregon – represents Bird scooters, implemented Bird 2 model in Fort Collins, expects 2.5 years duration. Comparative risk - NACTO shows 45% shift away from cars, 23 deaths over 170 million trips, encourages TAB to support ordinance 8243 and allow all scooters.
 - Question regarding standup scooters – per studies over 125 cities in 12 countries, 99% of riders prefer standup scooters.
- Lisa White – heard and seen comments about safety and sustainability – status quo is for cars, how much mode share impact is expected? Sees clutter all over. Supports dedicating parking spots to scooters and bikes. Questions whether staff time could be better spent on higher impact projects.
- Lynn Segal – preference of standup versus sitdown scooter style was not clear. Does carrying items like backpacks or valise impact safety? Would Flatirons Business Park be a good prospect to offer and test out scooter parking? Agrees that B-Cycles should be incorporated.

TAB Discussion

- Comments that micromobility is a moving target changing quickly, caution expressed against being over-prescriptive with restrictive requirements.
- Question regarding auto-pedestrian and bike fatalities in Boulder County last year.
- Agreement that micromanaging micromobility is a waste of time, preference expressed for e-bikes, dockless bikes, standing scooters, seated scooters in order.
- Support for ordinance 8423 expressed to offer full range of options that chosen vendor provides, adjust if warranted, let the market decide.

Motion to recommend City Council adopt Ordinance 8423 - Allow licensing businesses offering all types of e-scooters (standing and seated).

Motion: McIntyre **Second:** Duhaime
4:1 Motion Passes. Weinheimer opposed.

TAB representative to City Council consideration of this topic September 15 – Duhaime.

Agenda Item 9: Staff briefing and TAB feedback regarding test concepts for the East Boulder Subcommunity Plan [10:30 p.m.]

Kathleen King and Jean Sanson made the report to the board.

Executive Summary

Subcommunity planning provides an opportunity for Boulder community members to visualize the implementation of citywide goals outlined in the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) on the ground. The citywide goals are ambitious and through a comprehensive study of existing conditions during the Inventory and Analysis phase of the planning process, it was determined that the East Boulder Subcommunity has potential to make future contributions to these goals. See Attachment D for the full Inventory and Analysis Report. The great challenge of the East Boulder Subcommunity Plan, and all future subcommunity plans, is prioritizing these goals and making decisions between the trade-offs of various outcomes. In order to help the community make these choices and work towards a future vision for the area, the planning process includes scenario testing in the next phase of work.

Guided by wider community engagement beginning in 2019, the East Boulder Working Group (EBWG) has worked with staff to iterate three “Alternative Future” land use concepts during the Concept Development phase of work. These concepts will be tested for impacts on citywide goals and the local community. The three Alternative Future concepts and impacts will be shared with the community during the next major engagement window (Winter 2020/2021) with the results of scenario testing. Community members will be asked for feedback on the most desired outcomes of either maintaining the current land uses in the area or changing those land uses based on the three Alternative Future concepts.

Staff recommends the following indicators be used to test land use changes in the East Boulder subcommunity:

- Land Use Mix
- Population
- Households
- Housing Units
- Jobs
- Energy Use
- CO2 Emissions
- Daily Trips
- Walk Access
- Parking Required
- Water Use
- Solid Waste

Staff recommends collecting community feedback on trade-off choices through the use of a community questionnaire. The questionnaire will allow for both citywide and targeted participation, quantifiable results and will accommodate the need for an online method of data collection, which is now essential to accommodate safety restrictions during COVID. Results of this questionnaire will be shared with boards and Council in early 2021 and will provide a guide on community preferences for the Working Group to shape development of a Preferred Alternative land use concept, should the community indicate a preference for changing land uses.

Questions for TAB

1. Does Transportation Advisory Board have feedback on the recommended indicators to be tested during the Scenario Testing Phase of Work?
2. Does Transportation Advisory Board have feedback on the recommended engagement strategy for the next phase of work?

TAB Feedback

- Questions about indicators such as difference between households and housing units, what population measures are used, how concepts vary between the three scenarios, which indicator(s) reflects energy use and CO2 emissions.
- Inquiries whether San Lozero residents are within city boundary and/or subcommunity boundary, comments regarding quality of composition of working group, noted that only Planning Board has a liaison to EBSP process, comment that parking is the indicator that represents transportation.
- Observation that walk access is good but transit and bike access are missing; raises question of the best placement for a transit center.

Agenda Item 10: Matters **[11:15 p.m.]**

- A. Matters from Staff/Non-Agenda** – there was none.
- B. Matters from the Board**
 - Greenways Advisory Committee (GAC) update regarding Greenways Capital Investment Program (CIP) Budget – Mark McIntyre emailed report in advance of TAB meeting.
 - Appoint 2nd TAB member to Access Management and Parking Strategy (AMPS) Working Group - Hutchinson
 - Open Board Comment
 - Sustainability/Transportation Connections (Hutchinson) – defer to October due to time.

Agenda Item 11: Future Agenda Topics **[11:18 p.m.]**

- RTD NECOPass – October
- Scoping at Table Mesa underpass

Agenda Item 12: Adjournment **[11:18 p.m.]**

There being no further business to come before the board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 11:18 p.m.

Motion: Moved to adjourn: McIntyre **Second:** Duhaime
Motion passes 5:0

Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be a regular virtual meeting on Monday, October 12, 2020 at 6:00 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.