



Community Working Group Meeting #5

August 23, 2017 6:00-8:00pm
Hyatt – Boulder Junction

DRAFT Meeting Notes v. 2

Attendance

Working Group Members in Attendance

Alana Wilson, Ann Haebig, Bart Miller, Cindy Kraft, Dave Bacon, Dom Nozzi, Elisabeth Patterson, Joan Gabrielle, Micah Schwartz, Stavros Roditis

City Staff and Consultants in Attendance

- City of Boulder: Noreen Walsh, Natalie Stiffler, Laura Telles, Bill Cowern
- Fox Tuttle Hernandez: Carlos Hernandez
- University of Colorado: Richelle Reilly
- Catalyst: Barbara Lewis, Willow Turano

Pre-Meeting Materials

- Vision, Goals and Objectives
- Additional Colorado Avenue conceptual options and modification to 30th Street conceptual option 3
- How Boulder Compares with other Cities regarding collision rates

Meeting Handouts

- Draft Packet for the September 25th Community Meeting, including an outline of the stations and draft materials for those stations
 - Open House Stations Outline
 - Project Purpose and Schedule – Background and Project Purpose
 - Vision, Goals and Objectives – Vision Graphic, Decision-Making Approach and Goals and Objectives
 - Existing Transportation Conditions - counts, speed limit
 - Conceptual Transportation Options for 30th and Colorado

- Performance Measures and Assessment Process Memo
- Multimodal Options

Introduction

Barbara Lewis (meeting facilitator) opened the meeting and explained the agenda, which focused on preparing for the upcoming community meeting. Specific topics for the meeting included presenting the draft Objectives for CWG comment, providing an update on the wide range of options for both corridors, explaining the status of the underpass projects and reviewing the draft community meeting packet. CWG and project team members then introduced themselves. No members of the general public attended this meeting.

Process Update

Noreen Walsh provided an update on the study process, noting the major steps moving from ideas to options and the upcoming community meeting on September 25, 2017. She also noted how the CWG meetings are purposefully scheduled at different locations along the corridors. She encouraged the CWG members to be observant about the changes around the Boulder Junction area where CWG #5 was held.

Noreen referred to the pending question raised by Elizabeth about how safe Boulder streets are compared to other cities and invited comments on the information she had sent out in advance of the meeting that compared Boulder to other cities in the region. She also mentioned that she had been continuing the one-on-one meetings. There were also two small group meetings with CWG members who missed the July CWG meeting to bring them up to date with the range of conceptual design options.

Vision, Goals and Objectives

Carlos Hernandez then invited everyone to read the Vision, Goals and Objectives packet. Dom suggested that the visions and goals be “measurable.” He referred to his experience with the state of Florida and how they approached setting objectives. He explained “the funnel graphic” depicting how the planning process moves from ideas to a wide range of options, to identifying potential major constraints with those options and then moving to assessing the options based on performance measures tied to the vision, goals and objectives. The major constraints with any options will be shared with the public at the community meeting, noting that they can be considered like “red flags” that need to be resolved.

Elizabeth asked, “then what happens?” Noreen answered by saying they will show the Vision Goals and Objectives and the range of Conceptual Options to the Transportation Advisory Board in October/November and then brief City Council in December. The options will be assessed throughout the fall and those results will be shared with the community in January. The CWG members then spent a few minutes writing sticky notes on suggestions for revised objectives. During the meeting, project team members organized the sticky notes into suggested “Revisions” to the objectives and input on “Performance Measures” as follows:

Goal 1

Revisions:

- Objectives 1.1 and 1.3/1.2 are redundant, no?
- Would there be a way to explain what all of the strategic plans say and when they were adopted?
- New objective- leverage safety in numbers by using effective tactics to up bike and pedestrian trips by 10% by 2025
- Reduce noise (eco buffer, prairie tall grass)
- What does “comfort” mean and how would it be measured?
- Objective 1.5, not sure meaning of “comfort” leads me to think comfort = more space but I think comfort means “less concerning”
- What about improve visibility?
- All-way red lights for cars, give pedestrians and bikes 3 seconds
- Objective 1.6, recognize that pedestrian and bicycle-based travelers are the most vulnerable street users.
- Community eco pass additional objective- more people can use transit
- 1.6, High crash trend

Performance measures:

- Safe crossing from bus stop to Jennie Smolens Caruthers Building
- No yellow flashing turn arrow with pedestrian and bike walk signal
- Someone else is going to die plus one million
- Beautiful bus shelter and stops
- Protected separated bike lanes
- Electric buses (quiet and better air)
- Target 30th street Bound for electric bus
- “Feel comfortable” (i.e., prairie grass buffer between car and multi-use)

In addition, Dom provided a marked-up version of the objectives with input on how to measure them; this will be reviewed and considered in developing the performance measures.

Goal 2

Revisions:

- What does “wayfinding” mean?
- Meaning racks and covered storage?
- Objective 2.8 suggestion, reword to “optimize corridor travel time for all modes”
- Objective 2.8 question, is this within some range? Is a trade-off of a few minutes to improve safety okay?

Performance measures:

- Objective 2.5, replace “facilities” with “accessibility”?
- Objective 2.8 and goal 1, maybe in conflict: people may just need to slow down to improve safety
- I think it is very important to some people- it should not be changed

Goal 3

Revisions:

- Not just identify but do it, 3.7

Performance measures:

- This group of objectives is very difficult to make measurable as worded
- How will we show businesses that multimodal access is important (not just vehicle access)?
- Objectives 3.3-5, great that multimodal is in here. It's hard to safely access King Soopers on a bike. But some car access may need to be limited for safety
- What does place making mean?

Goal 4

Revisions:

- 4.2, Boulder slough as well? Wellman Canal? (new)
- Increase visits to Scott Carpenter pool, 4.3, from neighborhoods by bus, bike, and foot
- Lighting is key but avoid light pollution (e.g., up into night sky) (new)
- 4.6 Confusing. Change to minimize removal of trees that are not ash (diseased)

Performance measures:

- Green is great, but please don't let it interfere with visibility. Greenery that hides bikes/peds or medians that mean bikes lose the bike lane compromise safety. 4.8
- 50 or less road kills, 4.7
- Plant more than 50 trees a year, objective 4.1
- Increase bike parking at Scott Carpenter and all parks (4.3)

Wide Range of Options

Carlos then provided an update on the Wide Range of Options. He introduced the refinements to 30th Street and the two new options (4 and 5) for Colorado Avenue developed based on CWG input.

Underpass Projects

30th and Colorado Underpass: Pete Loris, from Loris and Associates, provided an update on the underpass at 30th and Colorado. The design for this project is being done in parallel to the work on the corridors. He explained how people using different modes of travel would move through the underpass under the two different configurations studied so far. CWG members expressed a concern that underpasses don't feel safe, especially at night, suggesting that at grade crosswalks should be available as an option. On the other hand, eliminating crosswalks reduces vehicular back-ups. Another concern was with potential flooding. Pete noted that pumps would need to be designed to address flooding concerns.

Foothills Underpass

Noreen gave the group an overview of the work on the Foothills Underpass where the overpass bridge will be removed and replaced with an underpass for bicycle/pedestrian travel. She explained the alignments currently being considered.

Information on both underpass projects will be included in the upcoming community meeting.

Preparing for the Community Meeting

After a break, Barbara asked the group to break into pairs to review draft materials for the September community meeting. She gave each pair a hypothetical “role” representing different perspectives (business owner, resident, commuter, student, CU staff, employee) and modes of travel (bike, on foot, automobile or transit.) Each pair filled in comment forms reflecting what they believed their “role” would want to learn at the public meeting as well as responses to the draft meeting materials. The following lists the responses on the comment form for each set of questions, beginning with “Community Information Needs,” or questions about what community members might want to learn/ask/communicate during the meeting, followed by comments on the draft meeting materials.

Community Information Needs

What might you want to learn in coming to this Community Meeting?

- *Improved pedestrian safety – what other options exist. CU students have bus passes....quickest, most pleasant*
- *Eminent domain or property infringement, changes to footprint (width), changes to my existing path of travel, how will I be influenced by construction?*
- *Travel times for all modes. Lane trimming. Future bus options (including to suburban connections)*
- *Personal impacts to me, my property and commute*
- *Construction impacts – how long? Access? Bike lane open? Business access*
- *How these potential changes will affect my life, commute, etc.*
- *Access to my business – how it’s affected by time, geographical access.*
- *Do I have road access during construction? Business access after construction?*
- *Will it be safer to my kids?*

What Questions might you have?

- *How long will the project take?*
- *How will travel be impacted during construction?*
- *Who/what types of backgrounds do the CWG members have? Unclear what is negotiable, which major constraints can be overcome*
- *Origin and destination information for those using the corridors, managing to the speed limit. Pro-active measures to affect*

- *How will this affect (above elements), plus safety, travel time, etc. Cross street accessibility? Left turns? Cross Walks?*
- *Where will I park and how much longer will my commute be?*
- *How can I carpool?*
- *How will I handle it when CU cuts traffic through main campus?*
- *Bus frequency/additional Bound/BRT? Incentives for me? Parking cash out? Free eco-pass? Easy for me to walk and bike? More Street trees? Cars slow down?*

What input will you want to provide?

- *Area for improvement – lighting, ease of travel*
- *How I view existing travel and ways to improve my experience*
- *Concerns and effects on safety.*
- *Where CU stands, plans far into the future. Word-smithing.*
- *Difficulties with bus timing or access to certain areas.*
- *Free bike parking; long term benefits*
- *Free bike parking*
- *Would want good access for all modes of traffic and comfortable access*
- *Improvement of advertisement of business*
- *Bike parking – where can I park my bike? Improve bus stops. Put bus/bike information next to bus? Bike parking at bus stops.*
- *As a cyclist, ramps need no lips (tumble risk)*

Review of Draft Meeting Packet

What worked well?

- *Good graphics, linear narrative/order makes sense*
- *Great data on existing conditions.*
- *Visual Cross sections are easy to understand (corridor “snake” maps less so.*
- *Stations 1 – 3 materials*
- *Goals and Objectives are clear.*
- *Multi use Greenery Bioswale Center turn lane Protected bike lanes*
- *Multi use paths and bio swell Addition of center turn lane Raised protected bike lane*
- *Figures and scale*
- *Visuals of options*

What refinements?

- *Label more landmarks to make visuals easier*
- *Add “safety” to Performance Measure Evaluation.*
- *Add injuries/fatalities to existing conditions sheets/graphics*
- *Have a glossary. What does CWG mean? Charrette? ROW? (There is room to spell out)*
- *Existing conditions graphics are hard to read: small writing and difficult to interpret. Can you use the type of graphics from the options (like Station 5?)*
- *Station 2 process graphic has many things that will need to be explained further to the public (CWG, ROW, Charrette, etc.)*
- *Station 4 graphics are difficult.*
- *More ROW, noise pollution*

- *Maybe more ROW to reduce noise pollution and promote bike safety*
- *Bigger font size for options*
- *Put “Proposed Elements or Proposed Width” next to Existing (or overlay?)*
- *Option title focus on change from existing conditions*
- *‘ = feet, apostrophe = ft.*
- *Project Purpose and Schedule: On Background and Project Purpose, third item should say “six of thetop crash locations.” (Bart)*
- *Existing Conditions (Station 4) Graphics here are tough. The existing conditions graphics in the matrix summary are much easier to understand and comprehend.*

What information is missing?

- *Intersection improvements*
- *Unclear what is negotiable, which major constraints can be overcome*
- *Proposed timeline for funding, construction, city approvals, etc.*
- *Explain what “right-of-way” means in this context and that its flexible in many cases – clarifying benefits of various bike lane options (multi-use v. separate lane)*
- *Specifics on accidents (ex. How many could be avoided if center turn lane?)*
- *Accidents that could be avoided while using center turn lane*
- *Existing vs. options*
- *Where are mid-block crossings*

CWG Outreach Support

Barbara discussed outreach completed since the last meeting, including passing out postcards at the Farmer’s Market and the 29th Street Concerts. She then presented the various ideas for publicizing the upcoming community meeting, including the many ideas generated during the CWG Webinar on outreach:

- Posters/flyers at major employers/facilities (CU Academic buildings, USGS, NOAA, BVSD, Boulder Area Rental Housing Association, BTC, Scott Carpenter Park, CU Off-Campus Housing, 20th/Marine office park)
- Inside Boulder News Channel 8 segment
- Twitter posts with project hashtag
- Facebook and Twitter ads
- Visual Messaging Boards – include webpage
- Radio Events (Farmer’s Market, 29th Street events, etc.)
- Daily Camera Editorial Board
- Notices at intersections
- Articles in newsletters
- Next Door

CWG members talked about tools to make it easiest for them to forward information to their networks, such as having a clickable link to forward and using graphically compelling images. Members discussed the importance of reaching college students and how difficult that is. Ideas included reaching out to freshmen since they have a 4-year horizon, perhaps including information in their welcome packets, and providing food. The CWG also talked about the

importance of reaching low income residents and Spanish speakers. Noreen noted that publicity materials would be translated and that the postcards offer translation at the meeting or of the postcard upon request.

CWG members filled in comment forms with input on tools that would help them in reaching out to their networks as well as their individual commitments to help publicize the project and upcoming meeting. Results are listed below.

Suggestions for Additional Outreach Tools:

- *Catchy subject line essential*
- *Social media hashtags!*
- *QR symbol on flyers linking to information*
- *Photo/images for social media and posters/ads*
- *Flyers (e-copies and hard) to share*
- *I have a community potluck on September 10th and would love to have flyers about 9/25 meeting. I would like HOA to distribute via email too. We're on Next Door too. (Joan)*
- *Flyers, Post Cards, something to bring to my HOA (Micah)*
- *Advertisements, posters, cards*
- *Experiment! I want a "woonerf" on Colorado to Euclid (Dom and Jennifer)*
- *Blurb for Next Door (Jennifer and Dom)*
- *Social Media postcard for neighbors (Jennifer and Dom)*

CWG Commitments: How will you help spread the word?

- *I can also provide information to CU students, many of whom live in the corridor. (Joan)*
- *Social media hashtags (Alana and Dave)*
- *Contact coworkers/friends (Alana and Dave)*
- *Alana can talk to CU classes on East Campus*
- *Write a LTE to the Daily Camera (Dom and Jennifer)*
- *Dave can get to property Manager at Walnut Gardens and Sunrise*
- *Tweet; neighborhood listserv in Martin Acres (Bart and Cindy)*
- *Via methods proposed – as many as I can. (Bart and City)*
- *Talk to my next HOA meeting to invite Gold Run Community; need flyers (Micah)*
- *Can put something in the Community Cycles newsletter perhaps (Micah)*
- *I can attend the community meeting. (Micah)*
- *Tell people in my community Smiley Court (Zeke)*
- *Students at East Campus (Jennifer and Dom)*
- *Boulder Chamber and Better Boulder (Elizabeth)*

Wrap Up

Noreen wrapped up the meeting by summarizing next steps, reminding the group that the community meeting is scheduled for September 25th at the SEEC building at CU East.