East Arapahoe Transportation Plan Community Working Group

Meeting #1

May 5, 2016 5:00 – 7:30 pm, Naropa Nalanda Campus, 6287 Arapahoe, Room 9248

Meeting Notes

Working Group Members in Attendance: David Baskett, Aaron Cook, Brianne Eby, Jerry Shapins, Aaron Johnson, Andrew Johnson, Kai Johnson, Yvan Lehuerou, Liz Mauer, Nikki McCord, Ben Molk, Aaron Pasterz, Elisabeth Patterson, Anna Reid, Bill Roettker, Thomas Sanford, Johnny Drozdek

City Staff and Consultants in Attendance: Kathleen Bracke, Bill Cowern, Ted Harberg, Dave Kemp, Randall Rutsch, Jean Sanson, Oscar Saucedo-Andrade, Bill Fox (Fox Tuttle Hernandez), Barbara Lewis (Catalyst Communication)

See **Attachment A** for the slide presentation used throughout the meeting.

INTRODUCTION AND PROTOCOL

The meeting began with a brief discussion and presentation on the East Arapahoe Transportation Plan, its history, and its current status. Members introduced themselves and their interest in the project. Next, working group members had a chance to voice their initial questions and concerns, as well as discuss protocol for discussion going forward in the process. The "level of agreement" is a proposed silent feedback system in which working group members hold up 1, 2, or 3 fingers to indicate the degree to which they agree with a proposed idea.

Comments from the Community Working Group
- "Ownership" of an idea; don't "own" a suggestion or idea to the point of being personally vulnerable to disagreement.
- Suggestions could be introduced in a small group or 1 on 1 setting, gradually growing the groups to allow those who are soft-spoken to get their voice out. (Also known as pair-share)
- Always consider the interests of those not in the room. There are many other types of people in the community than just those represented on the CWG.
- Unsure that City Council always responds to community input.
- Would be nice to get a commitment of action from City Council early on in the process. For example, there was a commitment by Council to paint the local community transit network buses many years back, and this to action.
- Communication is important so that everyone can fully participate – for example, please announce when slides are being changed and be aware of other communication challenges in the room.

- It would be helpful to define the specific role of the working group – is it an advisory committee, or will the group have decision making power? *Staff response* – the role of the working group is to provide input and feedback to staff, which will be used to inform each phase of the planning process and will be relayed to the Transportation Advisory Board and City Council. The group will not have decision-making authority, but will be advisory in nature.

Other Questions from the Community Working Group

- *Question:* Are there plans to study the areas east and west of this study area? *Staff response:* Yes, Boulder County is conducting the State Highway 7 study between Boulder and Brighton to analyze the feasibility of a regional Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service.

- *Question:* Is BRT the only option being looked at? *Staff response:* No, other ideas may be just as credible, and many different options will be taken into consideration.

- *Question:* How will this be linked to the west end study? *Staff response:* Any improvements to transit are anticipated to terminate at the Downtown Boulder Transit Center. Routing options west of Folsom will be considered as part of this plan, and this may present an opportunity to collaborate on the Canyon Complete Streets Study.

PRESENTATION ON THE PLANNING PROCESS

Jean Sanson gave a brief presentation outlining the history of the project and the planning schedule. She also provided information on the following plan items: Planning Study Area & Plan Components, Coordination with Land Use Planning, Public and Agency Stakeholder Coordination and Plan Implementation.

DISCUSSION OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PLAN

Jean Sanson presented the rationale for developing a Purpose and Need, which is to (1) guide the planning process and analyze alternative solutions to multimodal transportation needs and (2) serve as the foundation for developing alternatives and evaluation measures.

Community Working Group members broke out into three groups to review the draft Purpose and Need Statements and provide their comments. See *Attachment B* for the draft Purpose and Need Statements. This discussion was organized into three specific questions, used here to organize the discussions.

Question 1: What is Most Compelling about the Purpose & Need Statements?

Group 1
- The range of options seems limited – excited to hear what other big ideas there are.
- Regional travel is compelling – in-commuting is continually increasing.

- This infrastructure is an opportunity for the future of the community.
- Should have vibrancy.
- Should be a place that people are excited to be.
- Accessibility for all types of people is important.
- Sidewalks, transit stops, curb cuts, etc.
- Can be a major barrier for those with different abilities.
- Last mile connections are compelling.
- Arapahoe is currently one of the worst corridors in town, and there is huge capacity for improvement.

Group 2

- Addresses multiple modes.
- A lot of people are impacted by what we do.
- Can we quantify those people?
- Dream big, but remember the funding.
- Addressing both local and regional travel needs.
- Multiple purposes through corridor and destination.
- Provide affordable options for regional travel that fit with our sustainability framework.
- To achieve the purposes, we need to address the congestion in the corridor.
- Make transit appealing.
- Importance of access to BCH for people walking, elderly, and employees with 24-hour shifts.

Group 3

- Place making and taking advantage of underutilized resources.
- Funding.
- Improving alternative transportation options.
- Sticking with the tradition of improving alternative transportation options.
- Exploring new technologies in transportation.
- Thinking locally, but acting regionally and beyond the city limits.
- Regional transportation work force.
- Opportunity to transform the character of the corridor and area.
- Opportunities for infrastructure improvements to handle traffic.

Question 2: What is Likely to be Most Challenging about the Purpose & Need Statements?

Group 1

- It is a challenge to sell the vision and purpose to certain community members.
- Purpose and need could be explained from an even higher level.
- East end residents are not always receptive to change without a compelling underlying reason.
- Funding – finding a cost-effective plan may be a challenge.
- Integration of multiple transportation systems will be a challenge.
- Challenge to reach out to many groups in the community and be careful not to use industry jargon.
- It's hard to plan for land use compatibility when you don't know what that land use is going to be.

Group 2

- Balancing the efficiency of the through travel with local access.
- Integration of local and regional perspectives – a lot of different needs.
- Doing transportation independent of land use.
- Easy access transit service (ie streetcar); easy on/off, multiple doors, high quality.
- Most desirable may be the most expensive.
- Need to address regional trips when we can only influence but not control eastern land use or other regional factors.
- Really need to solve first and final mile.

Group 3

- How to handle short-term as well as long-term needs.
- Operational sustainability.
- Practicality.
- There is a contradiction between complete streets and regional transportation efficiency.
- City committee looking at a regional issue.
- City decisions are affecting jurisdictions outside the city.
- Can we manage current and future density and mixed demands?
- Will the City of Boulder provide funding sources and political support with bias towards action?

Question 3: What Refinements to the Purpose and Need would you suggest?

General Comments

Group 1

- Using the word "need" may not be the best way to discuss Transportation Master Plan goals… not everybody agrees with, or is invested in the TMP.
- Quality of life placemaking (design of places).
- Take jargon out.
- Focus on people.
- Outreach to existing neighborhoods, both city and county.

Group 2

- No preconceived solutions.
- Genuine public process.
- Happy with purpose and need.

Group 3

- These are not needs, these are strategies.
- Highlight challenges, pair challenge with needs.
- Too many action verbs (back them up) – need examples of how they can occur.
- More information about the challenges we are going to face and face today.
- The way this is organized doesn't grab. Organize differently. Highlight Q1 and Q2.

*Draft Needs Statements: **Complete Streets***

- Add emergency services and hospital access.
- Transit reliability importance.
- Hospital staff/clients access at all times of day.
- Highlight access to the hospital as a need.

*Draft Needs Statements: **Funding***

- Phased development, base price and options.

*Draft Needs Statements: **Transportation Demand Management***

- More emphasis on first and last mile.
- Information systems.

Draft Needs Statements: **Regional Travel**

- "Manage the demand" is a vague statement. What does that really mean?
- How does this corridor connect to other corridor improvements and studies?

Draft Needs Statements: **Sustainability**

- Preserve and improve economic vitality.
- "Competitiveness" may not be a positive word.

NEXT STEPS AND SCHEDULE

The meeting concluded with a discussion of next steps, including the proposed agenda, date and time for Community Working Group Meeting #2:

- Wednesday, June 15th
- 5 – 7:30 pm (possibly extend to 8 pm)
- Location to be Determined
- + Optional Corridor Tour Prior to Meeting

Staff will distribute the following materials prior to the next meeting:

- Draft Existing Conditions Report
- Draft Purpose & Need Report
- Public Input Summary (Nov 2015-April 2016)
- Community Working Group Meeting #1 Notes

The proposed agenda for the next meeting is as follows:

- Complete Streets State of the Practice Briefing
- Identify Long List of Alternatives
- Confirm Screening Criteria