

Gatza, Jean

From: Crystal Gray <graycrystal@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, October 3, 2016 9:00 PM
To: Public Participation Working Group
Cc: Council; boulderplanningboard; Nagl, Amanda
Subject: Pubic information regarding projects

Hi Public Participation group,

The City of Seattle has a very good site with information about planning and building projects that you can view [here](#). As part of our ongoing discussion about public participation we might consider something like what Seattle provides for their residents so they have a baseline of what the process is and where the project is regarding the process.

Boulder could benefit from educating residents on the planning process (we use to do this) so residents can understand the criteria used in evaluating projects and target their public testimony to the actual criteria Planning Board and Council uses in their deliberations.

Members of the Planning Board supported, during an informal discussion under 'matters', having a Planning 101 type session for the public to better understand the planning process.

Good luck in your efforts to improve public participation in Boulder.

Best,

Crystal Gray

Gatza, Jean

From: Judy Nogg <judynogg31147@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 10:35 AM
To: Public Participation Working Group; lisa morzel
Subject: A Resident's Input to the PPWG

Public Participation Working Group

Comments from Judy Nogg, resident

Hello,

I attended the first couple of hours of the first PPWG meeting and I was very impressed with the credentials of the members of the group/staff/facilitators and the overall desire to enhance the public participation process in the City of Boulder.

You have a great opportunity to create a situation that improves interaction between residents and the City.

My thoughts/inputs reflect two paths that you may wish to consider – a few thoughts about your internal process and concrete suggestions for enhanced public participation.

Internal considerations.

1. While I heard several comments from group members recognizing that residents want to feel “heard”, I respectfully request that you also embrace the notion that residents, besides deserving to be heard, additionally may have great ideas. Obviously, your group doesn’t want the City just to “hear” residents; you want the City to make use of the creativity and practical solutions that residents can offer. This is a small shift in your focus, but it is one that would greatly benefit your process and bring about optimal results, at least in my mind.
2. I realize that you have a dilemma before you – on one hand, you want to gather input from the public (since your mission is public participation); on the other hand, your time is limited and you have many tasks before you. I noticed that there is in an option for written comments (which I am utilizing with this email).

I have some additional suggestions.

a. If you want to hear from the public during your regular meetings, you may want to do so at the beginning of each meeting. If someone has a great idea, you could discuss it at the meeting that follows the input. To have residents speak at the end of a meeting isn't very fulfilling to the resident because their comment just sort of hangs in the air and seems to be lost. It inadvertently may feel like disrespect for residents to be asked to wait until the end of the meeting. That is the last thing you want, of course, when your goal is public participation.

If you want to gather needed input in a manner that is more time-sensitive to your needs, you may want to offer five meetings in various Boulder neighborhoods (Gunbarrel, north, south, central and University, and east). You could have just three or four of your members facilitate each meeting, so that no individual would have to spend more time than was available. You would need to widely publicize such meetings.

b. For emails or other means of gathering resident input, you may want to enhance the City's traditional methods of outreach. Perhaps a big article in the newsletter that the City sends to all residents. Perhaps some ads in the newspaper. Perhaps articles in the Daily Camera and Boulder Weekly with a sidebar in each to promote means of gathering input.

c. I hope I am correct in assuming that public input about public participation is something you want. To not gather this input on the very topic of public participation actually would perpetuate rather than remediate many of the complaints that residents carry towards the city.

Concrete ideas

To me, it is a given that the City Council and staff have the best of intentions and truly want to incorporate residents into local planning. The problem is that many little (and fixable) details of the process have become fossilized over time. I believe that theories and intentions are great, but the "devil is in the details".

Indeed, some of the long-standing procedures inadvertently pit constituencies against each other and/or against Council when it is not necessary.

I think that my suggestions would bring about practical and specific enhancements that would benefit Council, staff, and residents. Here are some ideas that I hope you will consider:

1. Suggest to City Council that they modify the election of City Council members to have 5 members represent specific neighborhoods (Gunbarrel, north, south, east, and central/university). Four of the Council members would be elected at large. That would enhance

public participation because each resident would have a specific liaison and yet there would be citywide balance. Such a balance would be much more reflective of resident interests.

2. Suggest to the City Council that the Planning Department contacts all neighbors (and not just the ones that the developer selects) as soon as a development proposal is submitted to have a neighborhood representative involved with any interaction or meeting that a Planning Department or other staff member has with the developer. That would save the developer money from pursuing a plan that meets with huge resistance, save the Council time dealing with neighborhood upset, save the neighbors undo anguish, and save the Planning Department countless hours.

3. Suggest that the City eliminate the option for developers to pay their way out of affordable units in whatever development they propose. If developers had affordable housing spread evenly all over town, it is a win for the City, the residents, and the recipients of the affordable housing. Currently, the City is using that “in lieu” money to go for big projects that throw neighbors into a tizzy, because density is the real issue in most cases.

4. Suggest that the City change its policies so that “scrapes” are no longer allowed. Folks could only build on the footprint of what previously existed (except perhaps for an additional bathroom). That would preserve the middle-income houses that are disappearing all over town.

5. Suggest that the City modify its means of communication with residents. Too many residents are not receiving timely information. I consider myself reasonably informed and only learn about many meetings at the last minute and from a resident, rather than the City. In the City newsletter, a prominent article could ask residents to “opt in” to get notification on various issues: all, housing, neighborhoods, Open Space, traffic, etc. Additionally, the City could combine the total emails that they every department has received and email (bcc: for privacy, of course) everyone to “opt in”, if they want to be included in various emails.

6. Suggest to City Council and all departments that communication with the public be edited by regular residents before distribution. I can't emphasize enough how offended so many people are at the wording that is often used that shapes the responses rather than being open-ended. It often seems, inadvertently I believe, that the City is trying to obtain a predetermined response, rather than gather actual information. Just this week, I received an email from a neighbor who was incensed at a recent City survey they received, because the wording inadvertently was so offensive. The wording of requests for public input is key and, currently, the wording of requests for input/surveys/etc. could be enhanced. I can give specific examples.

7. Public input before meetings is important but not very satisfying all around. How about Council offered one day a week, say from 6 – 8 on a Tuesday during which 3 Council members attended on a rotating basis, to listen and to interact.

8. Suggest that every time a developer proposes a development to Planning Board or Council, a neighborhood representative (selected by the neighborhood) have equal time.

9. Reconsider the BVCP process to start with a much more vigorous and open-ended process to actually gather information from residents, firstly on their priorities and secondly on their solutions. The BVCP also needs to have much more specificity.

10. Suggest that the City offer a well-publicized (using newspapers ads, newspaper articles, social media, Channel 8, radio ads – Spanish as well as English) opportunity for residents to provide open-ended input on all the issues that are of concern to the individual respondent, along with their ideas for solutions.

Since this would be labor-intensive for the City, perhaps the City could get outside funding to hire some part-time temporary employees to pull it together. With enough funding (from the City or from foundations or donors), the City could even hire part-time temporary folks (who are residents) to go to the homes of people whose voices often aren't heard – people with financial struggles, people who don't speak fluent English, homebound people.

If you want to discuss this or other details more specifically, I am available. Thank you for providing me with this opportunity and thank you for taking the time to read this

. I wish you the best in your endeavor.

Best,

Judy Nogg

1182 Juniper Avenue

Gatza, Jean

From: kate chandler <kacbeyond@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 5:52 PM
To: Public Participation Working Group
Subject: Trendytown

Jane Brautigan recently said that all the cool towns are having the same problem of citizens complaining that they are not being listened to. One part of the answer is right there: city and county officials and staff feel they and "their" town is so cool that they have all the answers. They have already decided the outcome before the public process has even started. The Twin Lakes project is just such an example. The architects had already been hired before the first public meeting. So much for the Stakeholders group. The City Council's directive that experts be hired based on recommendations from all groups was arrogantly ignored. Experts had been hired before any discussion took place, ignoring some of the most critical factors tlag brought up in their recommendations. Boulder is unique, as is Portland, etc. We do not want to compete for coolness, that is your thing, Jane Brautigan,etc. I feel that is all you care about.

Kate Chandler

Gatza, Jean

From: Lynn Segal <lynnsegal7@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 25, 2016 11:16 AM
To: Public Participation Working Group; mike lawyer twin lakes chiropolos
Subject: FW: Core reason for housing crisis. (now evident in Twin Lakes 21 Sept. County PC meeting)

From: lynnsegal7@hotmail.com

To: council@bouldercolorado.gov; commissioners@bouldercounty.org; drechberger@dmrgroup.com; mikechiropolis@gmail.com; kcglasscock@comcast.net; gatzaj@bouldercolorado.gov

CC: stevepom335@comcast.net

Subject: Core reason for housing crisis. (now evident in Twin Lakes 21 Sept. County PC meeting)

Date: Sun, 25 Sep 2016 10:50:39 -0600

These numbers below under "Affordable Housing" are from Steve Pomerance. Following it I posted his full commentary.

Ironically Ann Goldfarb on the County Planning Commission just commented on the failure of the Jobs/Housing balance to ever be resolved. I am at this meeting 21 Sept. Wed. about land use designation on Twin Lakes for affordable housing. They just are really having a hard time deciding. But you see, everyone here is set up to lose. This needs to change.

It is illuminating that in Denver multilevel office space goes for \$180-\$213/sf and in Boulder with our own local developers it goes for upwards of \$550-\$800/sf. We are being exploited by our developers due to the city charging anything less than \$70/sf. It is not just outrageous that land prices are not included in calculating impact fees, IT IS UNACCEPTABLE.

This is entirely the result of low impact fees that drive speculation and limit fair competition. I disagree with Lisa Morzel on \$25/sf.

\$70 MINIMUM/sf should be the fee to the developer.

It is not OK for the city to complain and spend my money on extensive mitigations and staff time to working groups on the housing crisis when it is the city that is causing the very crisis itself. The City of Boulder, expressly the City Council needs to direct the Finance department, not Planning and Transportation to objectively calculate fees, which may be higher than \$70/sf.

Be it affordable housing for the Housing Authority on a floodplain in Twin Lakes or affordable housing for seniors on a floodplain @ Hogan/Pancost, where flood waters downstream are redirected at pre-existing housing of seniors making them **less** affordable, it is an exercise in futility. More importantly, it is an indicator that the long term and fundamental problem of housing affordability has not been addressed. When Ballot Measure 301 lost, it was said that the BVCP would be the arena where this would be addressed. Last night's "decision" was a case in point disproving that assertion. The BCVP cannot validate an annexation like Twin Lakes that is disconnected from the City of Boulder by open space simply because it is able to be called a trail. It is a slippery slope when land use loopholes, not guiding principles of the BVCP become transformed

into a mechanism for "solving" the housing affordability crisis. In fact it is a condemnable misuse of the very principles underlying the mission of the masterplan itself.

The development impact fees are the problem.

Jean Gatzka, this needs to be sent out to the Public Participation Process Working Group as a prime example of the failure of public process and the cumulative effects over many years. As well, it is a case study demonstrating the need for integration of long standing attempts (such as the jobs/housing imbalance) on policy and the resultant failures to solve fundamental issues that cause the city vast losses of time struggling to solve growingly insurmountable problems such as housing unaffordability. It is the cycle of growth (population too, but not intended as a pun) in more interrelated problems, since the **fundamental ones go delayed or lost** on the wayside, that needs focus.

Affordable Housing:

Even the maximum proposed linkage fee of \$35/ft² for office space is completely inadequate. It will leave the general citizenry with the major portion of the burden of providing affordable housing for the new employees. And this then means that existing citizens' cost of living goes up, and their lives become less affordable. There are no free lunches.

As to the estimates of what developers can really afford, Pearl West provides a good example. (I used the numbers that are publicly available.)

The 175,000 sq. ft. of Pearl West will likely sell for \$550-\$800 per sq. ft. This is per Lou Della Cava. in the Camera, and he should know if anybody does. http://www.dailycamera.com/top-business/ci_30004731/hallowed-ground-pearl-west-slated-open-next-month

To get some idea of the costs, the all-in costs for 1144 15th, a new 40-story 662,000-ft² building going up in Denver, was \$141,300,000. That's

\$213/ft². <http://www.denverpost.com/2015/06/09/construction-begins-on-new-denver-skyscraper/>

More general estimates for Denver for 2012 put costs around \$180+ per sq. ft. for 2-4 story office buildings. (The inflation that has happened would have kicked up the numbers slightly, but the inflation rate has been very low.) <http://evstudio.com/construction-cost-per-square-foot-for-office-buildings/>

The land costs for Pearl West were \$13,500,000, or \$77/ft².

Using the higher cost estimate and adding in land costs: \$213/ft² + \$77/ft² = \$290/ft². Permit fees were around \$2M, or so I've been told, which is about \$11/ft². So the total cost is right around \$300/ft².

Given Della Cava's estimate of a selling price of \$550-\$800/ft², even with soft costs, other fees, taxes, etc., **there is plenty of room for linkage fees that are at least double the proposed \$35/ft², and possibly higher.**

As to buildings in other parts of the city, their land costs will be lower to start with, and if linkage fees are raised, developers will drive harder bargains, pushing land prices down even further.

You have to decide what is more important – continuing to subsidize developers’ profits, or actually addressing the “housing crisis”.

And if someone doesn’t build the next giant office building because their profit levels are no longer astronomical, that would be a benefit in terms of taking some of the pressure off housing prices. With 60,000+ in-commuters, Boulder doesn’t need more commercial growth,

Recommendation: Set the jobs housing linkage fees at double the proposed \$35/ft² max number, as a minimum.

General comments:

Someone has to pay for the costs of growth – the only question is who.

There are costs associated with maintaining levels of service (LOS) given the impacts of growth. Either the developers pay, or the citizens pay through higher taxes or lowered levels of service.

The capital costs of maintaining levels of service generally go up, not down.

Once street capacity is used up (we have passed the inflection point on the hockey stick curve because intersections have exceeded their capacity), the costs of maintaining LOS go up and up more and more rapidly.

Housing prices go up when job growth creates more demand. So the costs of providing affordable housing (to maintain the same economic distribution, which is the LOS measure we apparently use) increase dramatically.

New facility costs – e.g. new libraries, parks, rec centers, etc. – go up, as land becomes more scarce and expensive.

Diseconomies of scale occur even for operating costs.

Even in the operating costs realm, as cities get bigger the complexities increase and the difficulties of dealing with conflicts become more severe. When is the last time you heard of a city lowering taxes because of the benefits of growth?

The 2002-3 Jobs/Pop study demonstrated that general taxes barely were keeping up with operating costs. And as to the alleged marginal benefit of commercial over residential in terms of revenues versus costs, the Study showed that this was mostly an illusion, and had to do with whether sales taxes were allocated to residential versus commercial.

Specific comments on the Impact Fee work to date:

General Fund departments:

The general fund departments’ impact fee work is good in general, but the land costs that were excluded should have been included.

The staff decided that land that had already been purchased would not be included in the calculation of capital costs. This means that the citizens at large, who paid for this land, will not be paid back for its costs. These costs are a cost of adding a new facility, just as concrete or windows are, and should rightfully be paid by new development.

There is no legal or economic basis for excluding these costs. For example, the water utility bases its tap fees on the \$1.2 billion market value of its assets, essentially all of which were paid for a long time ago. And setting tap fees (which are impact fees) using this approach was supported by the utility's consultants, and is consistent with the case law. So the exclusion of land costs was wrong.

Recommendation: Tell the staff to put these costs back into the impact fee calculation.

Transportation:

The transportation work is inadequate, and needs to be done properly.

First, the staff has no plan that actually maintains levels of service (LOS), and has not even properly defined what LOS measures they would use. So it is impossible to come up with legitimate numbers on which to base impact fees, or other development exactions. The 2014 TMP Action Plan is inadequate to maintain LOS, and the TMP Vision Plan is probably overkill (but not by much is my guess). And neither has been quantitatively evaluated against the TMP goals as to what it would accomplish.

Second, the capital calculations for the impact fees were based on collecting enough money for the "growth" component of the current CIP, which even the staff acknowledges is inadequate to maintain LOS, for any reasonable measure of LOS. And whether they did this division of the CIP accurately into "growth" and "non-growth" components is anyone's guess, since they had no real plan to base it on.

Third, the TMP has 9 "goals", only two of which are bottom line measures of what the citizens think are important: travel time, and overall VMT (as a measure of emissions.) The rest are interim measures, in one form or another. So whatever impact fees they came up with would be hard to defend legally, and would only survive a challenge because they are obviously too low.

Note on Transportation Impact Fee Process: Even though there was about a year's lead time from when this impact fee update process was started (with the writing of the initial RFQ) until the consultants started working, the staff did essentially nothing to prepare a workable transportation plan on which to base the calculations. This is a major management failure IMO. It isn't as if this is their first rodeo...

Recommendation: Tell the staff to refine the goals of the TMP Action and Vision Plans into meaningful LOS measures, then refine these plans into one real plan that will maintain the selected LOS measures, then do realistic cost calculations for that plan's capital and operating costs, and then set the appropriate capital impact fees and other development exactions based on this plan. The proposed fees are better than nothing, at least for the interim, but as the staff develops the real plan, including the operations costs (which is where the big money is), they can update these capital impacts fees.

Affordable Housing:

Even the maximum proposed linkage fee of \$35/ft2 for office space is completely inadequate. It will leave the general citizenry with the major portion of the burden of providing affordable housing for the new employees. And this then means that existing citizens' cost of living goes up, and their lives become less affordable. There are no free lunches.

As to the estimates of what developers can really afford, Pearl West provides a good example. (I used the numbers that are publicly available.)

The 175,000 sq. ft. of Pearl West will likely sell for \$550-\$800 per sq. ft. This is per Lou Della Cava. in the Camera, and he should know if anybody does. http://www.dailycamera.com/top-business/ci_30004731/hallowed-ground-pearl-west-slated-open-next-month

To get some idea of the costs, the all-in costs for 1144 15th, a new 40-story 662,000-ft2 building going up in Denver, was \$141,300,000. That's \$213/ft2. <http://www.denverpost.com/2015/06/09/construction-begins-on-new-denver-skyscraper/>

More general estimates for Denver for 2012 put costs around \$180+ per sq. ft. for 2-4 story office buildings. (The inflation that has happened would have kicked up the numbers slightly, but the inflation rate has been very low.) <http://evstudio.com/construction-cost-per-square-foot-for-office-buildings/>

The land costs for Pearl West were \$13,500,000, or \$77/ft2.

Using the higher cost estimate and adding in land costs: \$213/ft2 + \$77/ft2 = \$290/ft2. Permit fees were around \$2M, or so I've been told, which is about \$11/ft2. So the total cost is right around \$300/ft2.

Given Della Cava's estimate of a selling price of \$550-\$800/ft2, even with soft costs, other fees, taxes, etc., **there is plenty of room for linkage fees that are at least double the proposed \$35/ft2, and possibly higher.**

As to buildings in other parts of the city, their land costs will be lower to start with, and if linkage fees are raised, developers will drive harder bargains, pushing land prices down even further.

You have to decide what is more important – continuing to subsidize developers' profits, or actually addressing the "housing crisis".

And if someone doesn't build the next giant office building because their profit levels are no longer astronomical, that would be a benefit in terms of taking some of the pressure off housing prices. With 60,000+ in-commuters, Boulder doesn't need more commercial growth,

Recommendation: Set the jobs housing linkage fees at double the proposed \$35/ft2 max number, as a minimum.

* * * * *

Summary:

As I think you can tell, I don't think this impact fee project was managed very well. I have participated in 3 updates, and the quality has degenerated from one to the next. The 1996 one worked quite well and the staff and consultants were very responsive to suggestions

and critiques. The 2008 one initially had some costs excluded based on what were nonsense legal theories (IMO), but at least much of it got straightened out. But this update has some serious flaws.

The fundamental objective – to maintain LOS in all areas and not force the citizens to pay the costs that growth imposes (as the Comp Plan policy states) – have not been met, or even close.

BTW I'm not criticizing Chris Meschuk; the problems seem to come from behind the scenes, i.e. from higher levels in the organization.

The working group was a good idea in theory, but when issues were raised, they were ignored, except when the developers complained, so it was not really that useful in terms of doing quality work.

At least that's my opinion of this whole thing.

So....

Final recommendation: Next time you do any impact fee work, let the Finance Department manage it. They have no agenda about growth, are used to looking at costs as well as revenues, and actually know the budget. They need to be given full authority to get this work done objectively, completely, and without bias. Then if the council wants to make some political decisions about who gets let off the hook, so be it, but at least we'll have real data to start from.

* * * * *

=

The views and opinions expressed in this email are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of Boulder Neighborhood Alliance.

Gatza, Jean

From: Cece Bloomfield <cecebloomfield@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 25, 2016 2:51 PM
To: Public Participation Working Group
Subject: Thoughts on public participation in Boulder

1. Public participation should not be about process - it should be about problem-solving and collaboration.
2. Advisory groups are bad - they create an extra layer of special interest, cause delays and frustrate the people who are directly affected by an issue.
3. Boulder City Government has a warped sense of "public service." Misguided attitudes I've experienced:
 - we can't be everything to everyone
 - we listened to you or gave you an option, therefore we've done our job
 - constituents are not made equal. Newcomers beware
 - culture lacks creativity
 - hiring decisions reinforce "boulder bubble"
4. The city's model of public participation leaves everyone unhappy. The government workers feel like they are going above and beyond. The participants feel like their views are being heard, perhaps even repeatedly, but there is no change.
5. Fairness IS an issue, and public process is not the appropriate place to address fairness.

Rather than create a working group on public participation, you would get a lot farther researching how other municipal, state and federal agencies do public engagement. This is just one more example of Boulder creating a lot of make-work and asking for more public input . . . to what end??

Just do your research, come up with options, make a proposal, get public feedback, and move forward with clear explanations as to why the public feedback was accepted or rejected.

Gatza, Jean

From: Gatza, Jean
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 8:50 AM
To: Public Participation Working Group
Subject: FW: Historical public process problem case studies.

From: Lynn Segal [mailto:lynnsegal7@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 5:15 AM
To: Gatza, Jean <GatzaJ@bouldercolorado.gov>
Cc: jeff rivkin <jkchinkin@gmail.com>; Jeff McWhirter <jeff.mcwhirter@gmail.com>; Pomerance, Stephen <stevepom335@comcast.net>
Subject: Historical public process problem case studies.

For the Public Participation Process Working Group initiated 19 Sept. '16.

Erosion of the public trust and confidence.

1) Homeless shelter on Baseline. Mark Russin changed his swing vote 2 wks. after the final vote following public hearings spread out to two days, probably the longest in BO history. This issue is timely because it is now coming back to haunt the Dakota Ridge neighbors who are outraged that the Homeless Shelter dumped in their neighborhood as a result of the rejection of the Baseline site, is now being considered to be opened off season in the summer because of the demand to accommodate homeless. It was promised back then that this would never happen. Public? PISSED!

2) Mapleton Rehabilitation Complex redevelopment proposal by Gary of the Academy on University Hill and five to seven "local" owners. Fought this for years. First the Boulder Junior Academy got sold to Steve Tebo, Gill Million and Phil Shires. Steve owns considerable real estate in BO, 400 some cars with 3 full-time mechanics in Longmont, Gill's been in jail on criminal exploitation of an at risk elder of her house worth \$600,000 which she received \$2350 for as a real estate deal between them. Russ Dalbey of "Winning in the Cash Flow Business" bought it for \$10 M, an upped price by his buddy Steven Tebo after Steve made money on it from BCH, the details of which I don't recall, but he did actually win in the cash flow business. Lou Delacava, Steve's associate's name is commemorated on the Cancer Center at Foothill's campus. Russ Dalbey was sued by the FTC for defrauding consumers of large amounts of money with phony claims they could make lots of money quickly and easily. Interestingly Andrew Shoemaker, at the time Planning Board member and now City Council member defended him. Someone else bought it from Dalbey and it's now covered with \$1.6 plus million dollar homes that are complaining about the Academy's proposal that blocks their development adjacent to open space. The Academy has grand plans for charging \$5-\$13K for one senior with 350 sf. which would be equivalent to \$100,000/mo. in those single family living homes at that level of expense spread out to 3500 sf. They could pay off their \$1.6 M house in 1 yr. and four months and have 10 people living there to take care of each other. With multiple generations they wouldn't need the extra healthcare expenses that the Academy offers as a benefit.

3) Matt Appelbaum was voted on to Council years ago, resigned and got Council to place his buddy Don Mock in his placeholder something like only 3 mos. after he was voted in. Ruth Goldberg was the highest vote-getter next to him and there was a heated argument that she should have been appointed in his place. In fact

AFTER the public outrage, this was changed by citizen initiative so that it will never happen again and the highest vote-getter will be appointed if someone vacates their position prematurely.

4) Making my head spin! Rich Lopez, former Council-person is defending Sterling Place owners within the last month for their illegal fire-hazard subdivision of their student rooms.

5) NB Safeway. 1992 (?). Just before the election for of all of Boulder accepting or rejecting a NOBO sub-community Safeway under heavy public opposition, there is a sudden deal made by Planning Board to give the former Kmart to Safeway for the biggest Safeway in CO. After SO much public process watching out for the impact of a large grocery on smaller ones in a given radius surrounding the megastore. Carey Sarlow knows this backstory well.

6) Crossroads Mall. Macerich malfeasance. Big "Community Consortium" for the public to waste their time at putting up all their dreams of what the new space would be. After the consideration of that, BURA went into executive session and chopped down the public space to a sliver of nothing. At least we didn't have a Flatirons mega-mall that is breaking down from poor construction and expansive soils. The guy from the new pizza place in BO junction told me the latest story about that. That's why they moved to Boulder. Their place in Flatirons Crossing literally crumbled. Macerich never dared to put the Macerich-proposed Mall to a vote of the people for Tax Incremental Funding so they could fund it by charging the taxpayers. Oh those REIT's! (Real Estate Investment Trust).

7) SB Floodplain development by CU and now by developer Bruce Dierking for the benefit of "senior affordable housing". Reference Jeff McWhirter and Jeff Rivkin, advocates for the preservation of the floodplain. The seniors downstream are the ones harmed by the floodplain changes resulting from the land buildup for the upstream senior affordable housing development. Pretty pitiful. What's more, that's not the end of it. Twin Lakes has the objective of affordable housing on their floodplain under the auspices of the Boulder Housing Authority. The affordable housing card has been played. And the developer Lou Delacava has the audacity to claim the increased linkage fees from \$9 to \$30 some/sq. ft. should be "spread" out to the residents in property taxes! What could he be thinking? Actual impact fees are, I believe more like \$60/fees. Choice is this, developers pay their way or taxpayers pay the developers way. SOMEONE DOES PAY. What were the opposers to Impact Fees 301 thinking?

8) Attention Homes. It seems affordable housing is creeping up everywhere. Like with the Attention Homes debate for the give-away to the First United Methodist Church and their developer downtown. There has to be some catch, in this case misguided youth. As long as it is for affordable housing, be it floodplain, promised use limits of a homeless shelter, or punishing small scale single property Airbnb users for the cause when it is merely the symptom of unaffordable housing, helping out youth, anything is fair game. There has to be an emotional pitch.

9) Washington School. City puts a hold on the sale of the school by the District to see if someone comes up with a public use. After a couple years of nothing, it reverts to the school district, who proceeds to maximize their monetary gain. The community has been divided between their appreciation of cohousing and cohousing's insistence on a zoning change that would give them a density bonus. Citizens gather the necessary 7+ thousand signatures to put it to a vote of the people and the cohousing developer backs down and puts in penthouses to make up for it. What's more the School District has an agreement to charge a entitlement fee for each unit that goes from low to higher income that is effectively stolen from the city, who experiences the impact of transportation and infrastructure costs for the units. I won't vote for any school bond issues since that experience of centralizing schools. It pitted the citizens against the cohousers in a very

insideous way, the cohousers blaming the citizens for failing to view them as a community benefit they should support. Neighborhood schools are a bigger community benefit than cohousing. The school district is 500 sq. mi. and Boulder is 28 sq. mi. In the charettes put on as part of the public process, these issues never even came up. Real solutions never will-- absent direct dialogue and curiosity.

10) Developer Pay for Impact Fees. This the root cause of the growing wealth inequality and unaffordable housing and homelessness. Jobs/housing imbalance ratio has never been attended to in many public sessions of a task force on the subject. Developers come and job centers with no consideration for the four underpaid support jobs with inadequate housing supply resulting from every high paid employee. Or infrastructure costs resulting from them that the public is paying.

11) Confusion and crossed objectives. Will Toor, the former environmentalist engages the millennials that the only problem is that there is not enough density.

Even the old apartment buildings are being replaced with new ones driving up the costs because the real embodied costs of replacement over fixing are not in consideration through incentives in the planning and development department. Last election, the three council members with institutional memory and strong, broad, long term integrated interests were outspent by the Will Toor people and his three candidates opposing Developers Pay Your Own Way. With Yates, Burton and Brockett came an opposition to municipalization. Yates lied about it and said he supported Muni. in his campaign and came out opposed recently. Development Pay it's Way may have be a front for the real agenda of hurting Municipalization. One key person behind municipalization even voted against her own better interests by voting opposed to Developers Pay Their Own Way. The millennials did too buying the twisted logic of Will Toor and Better/Open Boulder. Will Toor supported Plenary's 50 yr. contract on the transportation corridor to Denver with "Bus Rapid Transit" which is not that at all, but high frequency busses, and comes at the expense of the protective road service shoulders for accidents which was opposed by the State Patrol. ALEC is behind this and education privatization reforms. Now the corridors to the resorts are on the same demand pricing scheme and using the shoulders. 50 yrs. of structural adjustment policies that used to be reserved for 3rd World countries is now applied for high US highway tolls when the citizens of BO never even got their fair share of Fastracks, which they voted for. Trump and Hillary are nothing compared. ALEC has entered our localities and turned our own people against themselves.

12) Impact fees working group report process. 20 Sept. the working group reports to Council. Public Hearing was scheduled. But it has been removed as of last week. Or as Chris Meschuk says **moved** to mid Nov. when the decision is made. NOT when council could contemplate the safety of their seats after the public has weighed in **20 Sept.** So should I feel short-shifted for attending all those Impact Fees Working Group Meetings, along with all the BVCP updates which the Impact Fees losers were punted to when they lost Ballot Measure 301 (Developers Pay Their Own Way) ? This is the perfect example of the public being disregarded and the nature of the public process problem illuminated. But you can still speak at public comment, Chris says. LAME. Public comment is nothing like a public hearing and it is an insult to the intelligence of the public to even suggest it.

Public trust? Where's the discourse in the Public Participation Process Working Group on specific cases to explore, much less even hope to remedy this long trail of tears? This first meeting was pontification, all wordiness, no substance. There is one 3 hr. meeting per month until June and already 3 hrs. has been wasted. Where was the public? Why wasn't that room full? How come you lost the other 3 members of the public who came earlier --to attrition? I was the solitary one left. The "process" for the process will come if you just jump in and attempt some problem solving from the rich history in this community. There's enough brain power around the room to get some traction without a lot of

homework or googling or links or reading or articles or comparisons. There's culture in itself, an authentic informal communication between members of the group without need of the fear of disrespect. If you can't mix it up here, how are you going to get somebody else to mix it up? Maybe the national impression of this group has no substance because there is nothing below in the fundamentals. No deep integrity at the base, as evidenced in this first meeting.

Two things. Direct dialogue and curiosity.

Lynn Segal 303-447-3216 24/7