

**CITY OF BOULDER
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
INFORMATION ITEM**

MEETING DATE: July 14, 2014

AGENDA TITLE: Information Item – TMP Follow-up – Briefing on Board actions and final submittal to Council

PRESENTER/S: Tracy Winfree, Director of Public Works for Transportation
Michael Gardner-Sweeney, Transportation Planning and Operations
Coordinator
Kathleen Bracke, GO Boulder Manager
Chris Hagelin, Senior Transportation Planner
Micki Kaplan, Senior Transportation Planner
Marni Ratzel, Senior Transportation Planner
Randall Rutsch, Senior Transportation Planner

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Since the Transportation Advisory Board reviewed the draft 2014 Transportation Master Plan (TMP) on June, 9, 2014, the plan document has been reviewed and recommended for approval by the Planning Board and the Environmental Advisory Board. Staff is in the process of preparing the July 22, 2014 council memo on acceptance of the TMP. This memo will be sent to City Council and posted on the city's website on July, 18, 2014. A hyperlink to the final Council memo will be provided to TAB members on that date.

The draft section of the memo containing the summary of these Boards discussion and motions is included in the following section. A draft of the June 19, 2014 Planning Board summary of its TMP discussion is included as **Attachment A** and the Community Cycle comments are **Attachment B**. Minutes of the Environmental Advisory Board are included at **Attachment C**.

Staff will available to discuss the comments and discussion of the draft TMP by these boards.

BOARD DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The following sections are taken from the draft July 22, 2014 Council agenda memo.

Planning Board

The draft 2014 TMP and summary for the BVCP were considered by Planning Board at its meeting on June 19, 2014. The Board approved the following motion unanimously:

On a motion by **J. Putnam**, seconded by **C. Gray**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**L. Payton** absent) to recommend to City Council to accept the draft

Transportation Master Plan, with consideration of the summary of the Planning Board's comments, and to approve the revised Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Transportation Master Plan Summary.

The summary of Planning Board comments is included in Attachment D (of council memo). The Planning Board generally supports the comments the Board received from Community Cycles, which are provided in Attachment E (of council memo).

The Planning Board approved in the same motion (6-0, all in favor) the updated Transportation Master Plan Summary for inclusion in the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan.

The revised Transportation Master Plan Summary for inclusion in the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan as approved by Planning Board is included in Attachment B (of council memo).

Environmental Advisory Board

The Environmental Advisory Board reviewed the draft 2014 TMP at its June 25, 2014 meeting. While there was a wide ranging discussion, the Board agreed on the following four areas which were reflected in their motion:

- We should be clear on why we are pursuing the strategies of the TMP and the risks of not doing this;
- We need to emphasize the role of land use change;
- We need to be concerned with the equitable distribution of costs and benefits and provide for sustainable funding sources;
- We should consider the co-benefits of moving away from carbon based fuels.

The EAB recommended approval of the TMP 5-0. The draft minutes from the June 25, 2014 EAB meeting related to the TMP are included in Attachment F (of council memo).

All the comments received from the boards were considered and integrated into the current plan document and TMP action plan. In many cases, these changes involved highlighting or strengthen language already in the document and in others, new language was added. As the plan document is meant to reflect an executive summary level document reflecting the community's transportation vision, it reflects a balancing of the comments received and the summary format. None of the comments received from the boards were inconsistent with the policy direction of the proposed plan.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will be presenting the draft 2014 TMP and the recommendations from the boards to council on July 22, 2014. Council will be asked to approve motions accepting the 2014 TMP and the TMP summary for the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan.

Staff is actively engaged on a majority of the immediate work items identified in the [TMP Action Plan](#) (link at left or www.bouldertmp.net); include taking the next steps in exploring a Community Eco Pass, advancing the Boulder Walks program and Bike 2.0 network, implementing additional living lab projects, including consideration of candidate corridors for road diet projects.

In addition, staff is continuing to foster regional partnerships to support regional transit and Transportation Demand Management initiatives, and actively working on integrated planning projects such as Access Management and Parking Strategy (AMPS) and Envision East Arapahoe corridor planning process.

These efforts will accelerate following the approval of the 2014 TMP as we move forward with implementing the community's goals for transportation.

Attachments

- A. Summary of the Planning Board discussion of the draft 2014 TMP
- B. Community Cycles Comments submitted to Planning Board
- C. Minutes of the June 25, 2014 Environmental Advisory Board meeting

Planning Board Comments on Draft Transportation Master Plan – 6/19/14

Planning Board had multiple clarification questions that will appear in the minutes from the planning board summary. In addition, they provided the following suggestions to enhance the draft TMP.

General:

- Kudos on the document and all involved, and very pleased with what it contains. Would like to see action happen soon.
- Community Cycles suggestions are generally supported by the Planning Board. (note: See attached message from Community Cycles to Planning Board)
- Integrated land use and transportation modeling should be done as part of the comp plan process.
- Consider having a measurement dashboard – toward the front of packets or on website to track how we’re doing on goals to inform all decisions. Keep measurement tracking in the realm of what’s achievable and show trends versus precise measures.
- Balance measuring annual vs. long term goals.

Specific comments:

- **Safety objective:** Critical to move toward objective measures and criteria for safety, make “zero crashes” or “zero injuries/fatalities” the goal – a stronger standard and highlight more in the section of the plan. Maps seem important – especially for cyclists. Recognize that accidents related to substance abuse and student behavior may be harder to change. Address neighborhood safety issues for pedestrians and bicyclists to encourage more alt mode use.
- **Multi-modal level-of-service objective:** Make the emphasis be on shifting to bikes, buses, and pedestrians, rather than trying to decrease the delay for cars. Some provided comments regarding disincentivizing driving to incentivize use of other modes. Support for exploring multimodal level of service measure.
- **Electric Charging:** Include policies related to lower carbon fueling options, including electric charging stations, hydrogen, and other types of fuels. Consider charging network for site review, or large offices, etc. Put in as placeholder because the analysis of transportation measures needed to get to an 80% reduction in GHGs by 2050 showed that fuel switching will be the largest component of the strategy, we should make sure the City’s plans provide adequate focus on this issue.
- **School connections:** Would be helpful to discuss fixing small connections near schools to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and access. Concern expressed regarding open enrollment impacts on vehicle miles travelled (VMT).
- **Design:** Design and art makes such a difference with credibility and appeal of transportation programs, like bike cages and bus stops. It helps to brand and differentiate neighborhoods and will be more inviting for people to use.

- **Placemaking.** Be proactive to make bus stops more positive – honor the people riding; make them artistic and give good shelter.
- **Completer Streets:** Complete streets have left out the beauty (trees, art) and the pedestrian and bike. Small things are important, too such as curb cuts. Broadway doesn't feel good. (e.g., more trees were not in the budget.)
- **Funding:** Make the plan focus strongly on funding. The more visible, tangible changes as fast as possible would be great.
- **Eco pass:** We need people here to make the shift. EcoPasses are one way to capture. Do sooner than later. Need to work with RTD to address their concerns regarding risks of increased ridership.
- **Safety – cell phone/distracted driving.** Consider what other states such as California are doing to address distracted driving and other behaviors. (e.g. drivers have to be out of intersection when it's red) Expand safety section to include this.
- **Rail:** mention it because there might be an opportunity we don't foresee. Add something about protecting future rail connections.
- **North/South Bicycle Corridors or Boulevards:** They are important and needed, but definitely not easy to do. Need to look at in the 20 year plan. Piece together in two or three strategic places or segments of corridors where bike travel is prioritized. (e.g., 9th street has a lot of stop signs. If it was a bike boulevard with priority it might allow people to bike more often and easily).
- **Transit greening.** Could smaller buses be a part of it? Discuss efficiency with transit. We emphasize convenience but it would be good to see speed get more attention, which might reduce the stops. Prioritization of buses. Denver example on 18th. With SKIP – bunching of buses – can RTD make operational changes?
- **Transportation Demand Management (TDM):** Hope we do a clear evaluation of options through managing demand through tolling, and other financial and economic issues that have a direct impact on people's decisions. Look at those aspects carefully. Put real teeth in TDM plans in site reviews and monitor them for accuracy and effectiveness related to what they are trying to achieve and how effective they are and what type of land use and location they are in. (note: This will occur as part of Access Management and Parking Strategy project currently underway)
- **Fix charts:** P. 2-2 and 2-11 (legends)
- **Boulder Renewed Transit Vision map** – It shows good connections to the east, but no connections to the south – (i.e., 93. Jefferson County) or west. There's also no priority. Also, clarify the "Hospital" symbols and add to the key.
- **Car share/passenger pick up:** Mention other types of informal car sharing in same sections in same breath as other shared ride services such as LIFT, etc.

Other related plans or future processes to implement the plan:

- Parking management – although mentioned in this report – they are a fundamental management and control device as part of a TDM program.

Consider parking pricing, examples included charging for private parking and carbon tax as suggested ideas.

- Follow up with Bob Eichen or finance regarding fees and how growth is footing the bill commensurate with impacts (transportation, GhG, and other areas).
- Ecopass - how feasible and when? Would like to see a timeline that shows when we'll be done. Working committee, funding, – etc.. Interest in seeing this move forward in a timely manner.
- Land use, transportation, and carbon connection – if we could go a good analysis on the carbon output. Ties to comments from Community Cycles and need for integrated modeling of land use, transportation, jobs/housing. For example, does Class A office space result in more trips than micro units? Assuming that offices will generate trips that come in from the region, but want to know the impact of different uses on GHG, including various residential. Trip generation and parking. (note: This could be part of future Climate Commitment analysis)
- Get updated list of neighborhoods and use these contacts to improve community engagement and communication for the TMP as well as for programs such as neighborhood walkabouts and walk audits.
- Communicate with the public with graphics on greenhouse gases in least wonky way. Important as part of the action plan.
- Calculate the GhG savings of getting people on transit. (e.g., emissions reductions versus cost arising from – long term impacts at discount rates – such as cost from fires and floods – if you put that cost into budgets it's more compelling to make investment.)
- Provide analysis of the cost of making the investment in transit and other transportation options included in the TMP versus not making it. Annual metric tons – come up with cost range ascribed to the cost range ascribed to the carbon volume.
- Can we start to explore and mention economics of tolling, VMT travelled, or fee related demand management possibilities.

On Jun 18, 2014, at 5:15 PM, Sue Prant <sue@communitycycles.org> wrote:

Comments to Planning Board on Transportation Master Plan Update of 2014

Community Cycles is a non-profit organization whose mission is to educate and advocate for the safe use of bicycles as an affordable, viable and sustainable means of transportation and personal enjoyment within our community. Community Cycle's Advocacy Committee is composed of professional staff and volunteers experienced in bicycle planning and design. We survey our 1000+ members to guide our advocacy efforts, and we focus on policies and infrastructure that will increase bicycling rates within Boulder and the region.

The CCAC has reviewed the draft TMP and has some comments. First of all, it's great to live and work in a city that is so forward-thinking about transportation, environmental, and quality-of-life issues. The City clearly recognizes the importance of transportation in building a sustainable city with outstanding livability for all residents. The TMP materials presented are a comprehensive and professional evaluation of Boulder's current transportation system and steps to achieve transportation and Climate Commitment goals of the city. City staff have done an superb job of research and analysis and have come up with many excellent recommendations for moving Boulder's transportation system to be more sustainable, equitable, efficient, and resilient.

There are several parts of the proposed TMP that we particularly support. We applaud the development of quantitative goals for mode share and a timeline for achieving them. Without such hard, objective goals, it's impossible to evaluate progress and adapt plans to reach the desired outcomes. The plans for visualizing, evaluating and completing a low-stress bike network are innovative and excellent. We also support the idea of re-evaluating bicycle parking requirements for commercial and multi-family residential construction and reconstruction, and the Living Laboratory concept for testing and evaluating innovative treatments for bicycle infrastructure. The "corridor" studies to evaluate transportation demand and bicycle safety on specific roadways are also very welcome, especially if they are executed promptly. And we support the plan's emphasis on on-going safety improvements for all modes. The TMP documents propose impressive shifts in modal share for Boulder's transportation future. These quantitative targets include reducing single-occupancy vehicle share of all trips to 32% or lower by 2035, and increasing bicycle mode share to 15% by 2020 or 2025, 30% by 2035, and 40% by 2050. These goals, which we enthusiastically endorse, require truly transformative changes to our transportation network and culture, and would place the levels of bicycling and walking in Boulder in the range of those found today in Copenhagen and Amsterdam. Achieving these objectives will not be easy, and will require decisions that initially may be unpopular. It will take political courage to achieve them.

We are strongly committed to helping Boulder reach the levels of bicycle and walking that are described in the 2014 draft TMP update documents. To that end, we'd like to make the following suggestions for the plan that may help Boulder reach its goals.

- 1) Systematically and continually review design and engineering criteria for bicycle infrastructure. There have been dramatic changes in engineering approaches in the last few years as cities around the country strive to get the "Interested but Concerned"

cohort out of cars and onto bikes. Because of rapidly evolving practices in this field, the TMP needs a mechanism to continually evaluate and improve the engineering design standards for bicycle infrastructure. For example, the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) has developed new technical bike facility and street design standards and promises to regularly evaluate and update them. By adopting these standards as official engineering guidelines, the City could rapidly implement many types of new bicycle infrastructure that it currently does not keep in its toolbox. It might be wise to restrict the Living Laboratory approach, which requires extensive planning, testing, and evaluation before implementation, to truly innovative or customized approaches that have not been proven in other cities or countries, and to rely on NACTO or other approved sources for design guidance for more common treatments. Our hope is to get more facilities, like protected bike lanes, in sooner without the excessive testing and long delays we now often see. As so many cities around the country are able to quickly put in facilities like protected bike lanes, we have to wonder, why not Boulder?

2) Reconsider the use of vehicle LOS as a metric. While no one wants hopelessly snarled city streets that prevent all vehicle movement, a certain level of congestion is a sign of a successful and vibrant city. If driving is faster, more convenient, and similar in cost to transit, biking, and walking, people will continue to choose to use cars at the expense of livability, sustainability, and climate goals. Current Level of Service (LOS) criteria place a higher value on the delay time of drivers at intersections than the on the walkability, vitality and environmental sustainability of our streets. We feel that a complete system would evaluate LOS for all users and consider them equally – even increasing LOS for bikes/ped and decreasing LOS for private automobiles – in areas where there are no bike/ped alternatives and/or where current or future land use would stimulate a lot of bike/ped trips. Many cities, counties, and states have already moved beyond the use of vehicle LOS, and we should too.

3) Consider signal-timing changes to benefit bikes and peds. Related to LOS is current traffic signal timing that emphasizes the smooth flow of motor vehicle traffic at the expense of other modes of travel. The majority of signals in Boulder are synchronized to the rush-hour volumes on major arterial streets such as Foothills, 28th, and Arapahoe. As a result, many signalized intersections with quite low traffic volumes have signal intervals that are longer than appropriate (easy examples include 13th and Pine, and Folsom and Colorado). These long signal cycles produce frustrating and unnecessary delays to people walking or biking, and frequently lead to disregard for the law. It would also be desirable to develop signal timing schemes that prioritize bus service, especially for the new Bus Rapid Transit routes that will be arriving over the next few years. We recommend a thorough review of Boulder's signal timing, synchronization, and priority using the goals of the revised TMP to guide engineering choices.

4) Introduce shorter-term checkpoint targets. The objectives set ambitious and laudable targets for 2035, but we need intermediate-term targets in addition, to ensure that we're on track to meet the later targets. We suggest adding incremental targets for 2020 and 2025.

5) An integrated approach to the low-stress cycling network. We are greatly in favor of the low-stress cycling network analysis proposed as part of the 2.0 bicycle network initiative. We urge that efficiency (minimized start/stops, average speed) and directness be quantitatively considered as criteria when evaluating all cycling networks in town.

6) Use modeling to ensure that the TMP strategies will succeed in meeting the goals. As pointed out in the draft TMP, we're not on track to meet our previous goal for single-occupant vehicle (SOV) mode share. How do we know that this new plan is going to get us back on track? We urge the City to perform integrated land use/transportation modeling to project whether the strategies proposed will allow us to indeed reach our goals. Ongoing modeling should be an integral element of the TMP.

7) Institute a consistent, planned program for street right-sizing. One method to reduce SOV use and increase walking and biking would be to adopt a consistent, permanent program of identifying streets that have excess vehicle capacity or are wider than appropriate (based on considerations such as vehicle speed, pedestrian crossing time and ease, stormwater runoff load, and quality of urban design). These overbuilt streets could then be prioritized for lane or pavement reduction. This methodical approach should be an explicit element in the TMP revision.

8) Increase staffing for bike/ped planning, including in CP&S. Current bike/ped staffing is not adequate for the workload, and will fall even further behind as the city works to meet its goals in the TMP. The city needs to budget for increased staff levels, including for staff within CP&S who have a specific mandate to consider bike/ped aspects of development projects.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this draft TMP document.

The Community Cycles Advocacy Committee

--

Sue Prant
Acting Executive Director
Community Cycles
2805 Wilderness Pl Suite 1000
Boulder, CO 80301
Phone: [303-564-9681](tel:303-564-9681)
e-mail: sue@communitycycles.org
www.CommunityCycles.org

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

NAME OF BOARD/COMMISSION: Environmental Advisory Board

DATE OF MEETING: June 25, 2014

NAME/TELEPHONE OF PERSON PREPARING SUMMARY: Susan Meissner,
303-441-4464

NAMES OF MEMBERS, STAFF AND INVITED GUESTS PRESENT:

Environmental Advisory Board Members Present: Mara Abbott, Tim Hillman, Larissa Read, Stephen Morgan, and Morgan Lommele (Morgan Lommele will either be late or absent from tonight's meeting)

Staff Members Present: Brett KenCairn, Lauren Kolb, Randall Rutsch, Kathleen Bracke and Susan Meissner

MEETING SUMMARY:

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Environmental Advisory Board Chair **M. Abbott** declared a quorum and the meeting was called to order at 6:09 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by **M. Abbott**, seconded by **T. Hillman**, the Environmental Advisory Board voted 4-0 (**M. Lommele** absent) to approve the June 4, 2014 meeting minutes.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Local Food (Lauren Kolb, OSMP)

L. Kolb presented the item.

M. Abbott thanked **L. Kolb** for the presentation. She thought that the programs presented were fantastic.

Board Questions:

L. Kolb answered questions from the board.

Board Comments:

S. Morgan thought the programs were great and recommended that staff look for opportunities to better inform the community about them through improved outreach and communication. He suggested that OSMP speak with the Brewers Association given the community's interest in local beer and breweries.

T. Hillman thought that the Open Space Local Food efforts were great and noted that he did not know about them previously. He thought there was value in engaging the community in the process.

L. Kolb explained that OSMP is working to make the website navigation and content more user friendly and plans to better identify city-owned farms by adding signage.

L. Read asked whether OSMP has plans for mitigating the future effects of Climate Change on the properties and suggested implementing grazing plans that teach cattle to eat weeds. She congratulated **L. Kolb** on OSMP's recent successful volunteer day. CSA member tours could be a popular way to connect members with their farms.

M. Abbott thanked OSMP staff for efforts to evolve and improve its programs. The community appreciates the open space management and boundaries.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. Transportation: Transportation Master Plan Update (Randall Rutsch, Transportation)

Staff Presentation:

R. Rutsch and **K. Bracke** presented the item.

Board Questions:

R. Rutsch and **K. Bracke** answered questions from the board.

Board Comments:

L. Read congratulated staff on the TMP update; she thought it was thorough and appreciated the joint meetings. Highlight the main objectives. It's helpful for the public to see how all of these things are integrated.

R. Rutsch noted that transit plans aim to support the BVCP goals but there is a limit to what transit can do alone. Land uses must also adapt to support transit.

K. Bracke hoped that the plan will reinforce the interconnectedness between different facets of the planning process. New tools show which areas of the community are walkable and how can they be used to measure the progress at a regular interval. Metrics are important means to inform collective decision making and for making improvements.

B. KenCairn suggested that staff focus on areas where there is room for innovation such as East Arapahoe. Show the community what can happen when various planning efforts are integrated.

T. Hillman thought the TMP update was comprehensive and highlighted that there is a lot of work to be done in the community. Trends show that things are moving in the right direction but require continuous improvement over time. He liked the living laboratories and suggested that user-based fees be implemented to support community values. Community-wide Eco Pass funding could come from legislative incentives such as a gas tax, or car insurance fees. Assure that the community perceives the fees as supporting community values as opposed to a means for building government revenue.

S. Morgan thought the TMP Update was comprehensive and that an integrated approach made sense. Prioritize what the city can afford to do from capital and staffing points of view. Assess how much can get done and the risk. Consider Public Private Partnership

solutions for roadways and charging stations in the future, but do not count on them merely for quick fixes. Explain the economic, health and community-wide risks of climate change if the plan is not implemented.

M. Abbott cautioned that some people may not want a community-wide EcoPass. Explain the rationale and emphasize the risks and consequences of not doing it. Encourage regional bus-like linkages along the Front Range to Colorado Springs and other destinations. Show the bike and walking path systems online and add them to Google maps. Streamline transfers between different modes of transportation with mobility hubs. Remember that not all people have smart phones. Install map kiosks on the bike paths showing “You are here”. Aim to increase the usage of the resources that we already have. Encourage private employers to provide showers for employees biking and walking to work. Continue year-round creative community outreach and target the reasons why people don’t use alternate modes of transportation. Explain the risks of non-action and land use considerations.

Motion:

On a motion by **M. Abbott**, seconded by **L. Read**, the Environmental Advisory Board voted 4-0 (**M. Lommele** absent) to recommend that City Council adopt the TMP Update with the following amendments:

1. Keep an eye on new metrics to emphasize the high level costs and benefits of moving toward more sustainable transit and away from dependence on fossil fuel;
2. Keep public focus and emphasis on risks and costs of not implementing the TMP;
3. Assure that funding modalities are sustainable and equitable distribution of costs and benefits.

T. Hillman discussed the scale of transportation costs to the community and explained that much of the local economy is based on moving people and goods.

The board thanked staff for the great work and for reaching out to the EAB.