



Post Office Box 4682
Boulder, CO 80306
www.PLANBoulderCounty.org

June 12, 2007

PLAN-Boulder County City Council Candidate Questionnaire- responses-

1. Affordable Housing – What is your view of the City’s inclusionary zoning program and the results it is producing for the permanently affordable program? What can be done to increase the amount of affordable housing?

Matthew Appelbaum

It is an excellent program that requires new development to create permanently affordable housing. However, there are some improvements that should be examined:

- Require all 20% of the units to be on-site – instead of automatically allowing half of them to be moved off-site via a payment-in-lieu mechanism. This could help disperse affordable units, as is our goal, and place them in otherwise unattainable locations.
- Allow some of the required 20% units to be placed off-site, but tie the payment-in-lieu to the cost of the market units being built, perhaps by way of a negotiation between developer and city, to make the process more equitable and likely more profitable for the city.
- Assess the housing DET (as well as others) and possibly even the inclusionary zoning regulations against pops and scrapes that are substantially increased in size and/or that reach certain size extremes.
- Although of limited help currently due to high cost of even small units, try to ensure that a variety of housing units will be preserved via regulations on the size/bulk of units being built/redeveloped.
- Allow higher densities in targeted areas, and insist on substantial housing benefits where appropriate when rezoning properties or in those rare instances where property is annexed.
- Implement a minimum-density zoning regulation so that higher density properties are not developed with lower-density, large, expensive units.
- Revisit the regulations for accessory dwelling units.

Eric Bodenstab

The inclusionary zoning is a good way to increase the diversity of residents within the city. At the same time, it does transfer the burden of housing costs to those who do not meet the qualifications of affordable housing. The desire to have a diverse community seems to be very strong in Boulder, so as a council member I would continue to support the program. Even when buyers sell outside the 5-year window, and reap a potentially large profit, we should still support the program as it enables 1st time home-buyers to get started sooner.

Shawn Coleman:

Boulder's affordable housing program is an excellent program given the parameters of its current charge. However like any public program it is subject to review and updates. The inclusionary zoning program could use some rethinking. I would like to see some new market based alternatives added to options for new development. One in particular would help "empty nesters" downsize while stabilizing the price of fair market housing in new developments. (Unnatural inflation of fair market housing being an unfortunate consequence of inclusionary zoning.) This program would allow those looking to downsize into to use their current home as a substitute for "cash in lieu", this helps the folks looking to downsize and stay in Boulder get a better deal, it helps the developer keep the cost of his project down, saving the general consumer money, and adds to the community goal of affordable, it is this kind of creative thinking that I think will help the program work better while softening some of the unintended consequences. I also would suggest broadening the choice of affordable housing programs, focusing on expanding the rental program, and adding some non-permanent options. The point of affordable housing is community building, perhaps this can be the way in which we can begin to truly compensate, our first responders, teachers, and other over-serving/underpaid employees, and retain the most talented ones, by giving them an opportunity to be a part of the community both socially and economically. We should view affordable housing as a tool to transition people to affluence rather as a band-aid for a problem, this subtle shift in thinking about the program will open many doors of opportunity.

Kathryn Kramer

I think for the most part the program is working and that more and more affordable housing is becoming available in Boulder. However, I feel that just because housing is affordable does not mean that it should not be pleasing to the eye or that people should be stacked up on top of each other without windows or any thought to the architecture. Just because someone does not have a huge amount of money does not mean that they should not be able to take pride in where they live.

One thing that has been successful in my area is the use of community open space. The houses are planned so that everyone has a good view, either of the mountains, the community park or open space from one side of their home. Also the park is available for people in the area to use for get-togethers among neighbors which brings a sense of community.

To increase the amount of affordable housing I think there should be more incentives, including free media attention to those builders who are creating great places to live. Having worked in marketing and sales I know the value of getting your name and product "out there". It is worth its weight in gold.

Alan O'Hashi

A home isn't affordable unless it is classified as such by the city. I think there are many "affordable" homes that are market rate homes based on square footage costs, but less expensive such as condo-ized apartments. The trend is to build higher density housing which I hope will free up single family homes that are defacto boarding houses to be reconverted for single family occupancy. The more homes of any density or type constructed in town will have overall effect of increasing supply and decreasing housing prices.

Eugene Pearson

The affordable housing program is a wonderful opportunity for home ownership for many of the city's lower income residents. It provides an opportunity to begin building a nest egg rather than engage in the endless rent payments that don't allow a person to ever develop equity. It is important to ensure that the housing is well distributed throughout the community. City Council

must balance buyouts from the policy to maximize this goal with that of providing additional units.

Increasing density in new developments such as the transit village while requiring a higher percentage of additional affordable units could help us achieve our affordable housing goals more quickly. We must also investigate the impacts that scrapping has on affordability for middle income earners and address this issue. The impacts of land filling a home are significant to the environment. Replacement homes that go to the lot boundaries and are 4,000 or 5,000 square feet are also a significant burden on natural resources not to mention the cost of living in our community.

Susan Peterson

I am in favor of the inclusionary zoning program, and am encouraged that we are steadily approaching our goal of 10% affordable housing (4500 units or so). I think that we need to be careful, however, that in our effort to create more affordable housing that we don't inadvertently give developers the green light to build 80% more units just to achieve the affordability goals. I also do not think that affordable should be synonymous with high density, as many developers seem to suggest. What can be done to increase the amount of affordable housing? Statistically, it looks like we are doing the right things to steadily increase the inventory. Another way to increase access to affordable housing is to pay people a Living Wage, so that we have fewer individuals and families in the very low and low income brackets. For Boulder, that means \$20K per year for an individual, or \$40K for a couple with one child – see <http://www.livingwage.geog.psu.edu/results.php?location=5920> .

Tom Riley

The idea that housing costs should be about 30% of one's income sounds like a fair number. Perhaps creating a range of 20 to 30 percent would increase the numbers of qualifying individuals and in turn the market demand for such housing – there are the low moderate earners who have trouble acquiring housing. In conjunction with this, Boulder could increase the number of units required for zoning approval. Other programs (low interest/no interest loans) could be backed by city, and in return, housing owner would dedicate a 3 to 10 percent commission on a future sale back to the city. This would allow young families and individuals to establish equity, and it would provide funds back to housing supports that would be used for further programs.

John Welsh

Yes, and necessary for many reasons. I do not want to see an increase in traffic into Boulder (causing auto pollution) due to the single fact that lower paid employees cannot afford to live here. People must accept 35 foot condos/townhomes to be the norm. By allowing high density, affordable homes, there must be parks and open areas attached to these developments, to give these citizens areas to recreate. The land for these developments must be well thought out, they should be close to bus routes, and shopping

Ken Wilson

The inclusionary zoning program is a good, progressive way to increase permanently affordable housing. If it functions properly it will bring part of the service workforce into the city, reduce traffic, and reduce the CO2 footprint. Inclusionary zoning should be focused in areas with good public transport and good walking access to services. It should also capture revenue for retail services that would otherwise be lost through people commuting out of the city. It is unclear as to whether inclusionary zoning is having the desired effect. At the appropriate time we need to evaluate the program and make changes if necessary if the program is not meeting its goals and objectives. There has been talk of putting fees on Pops and Scrapes to fund additional

affordable housing. This is potentially a good idea. However, we need to consider the extra burden this would place on homeowners who want to improve their properties.

2. Open Space – What are your views on the implementation of the City’s Open Space Visitor Master Plan? How might the city balance increased recreational opportunities with ecosystem preservation? Do you consider the precautionary principle to be the right philosophy for resource management of OSMP lands and resources? In view of the huge current use of Open Space and Mountain Parks by visitors from the greater Denver area, do you support additional staffing of rangers for enforcement and naturalists for monitoring as a high priority? Do you believe the City currently has an adequate balance in acquisition of new lands and maintenance/management of existing lands?

Matthew Appelbaum

So far, I think the VMP has provided a superb, and long overdue, framework for guiding OP management and operations, and its implementation, while still in the very early stages, is going well. However, there are issues relating to planning new trails and enforcing the new rules that will need some careful handling. And I wouldn’t have rushed into the off-trail permit system just yet.

Balancing preservation and recreation must always be done with the understanding that ecosystem protection is primary so that future generations can enjoy the resource and it can fulfill its critical natural role. But clearly recreation has been allowed for many years, and as the VMP distinguishes, there are many areas when the impacts of recreation are relatively small. Further, it is essential that the recreational community support Open Space and its environmental goals. So for me, there is no inconsistency or imbalance with prohibiting people from wandering off-trail in HCA’s and also providing additional recreational opportunities elsewhere. And that balance can be improved by ensuring that we better maintain and manage all of our OS lands, both for environmental and recreational purposes.

The precautionary principle is, therefore, the appropriate approach. But we also must engage in adaptive management techniques, learning as we go what the best approaches are to preserving ecosystems while providing quality recreational access.

Finally, as you probably are aware, I have long fought for additional funding for OS maintenance and operations. This includes staffing of rangers and naturalists. It is essential that we encourage – and when necessary, require – appropriate behavior, and it is much more difficult to change behaviors after bad ones have become “accepted.” (Just as it is extremely difficult to take away privileges and access once people have become accustomed to them.) Currently, I think we have a far better balance between land acquisition and management, although I think we must be sure to fully fund the VMP, including capital projects, in as short a time period as possible. And while it is essential that we maintain reserves to purchase lands with important ecosystem qualities and/or wildlife/recreation corridor values, there are still trade-offs that should be considered between underfunded management activities and purchases of lower-valued lands far from the city that are under little or no threat and that should really be purchased by the county.

Eric Bodenstab

To address the most important part of the question, I believe the precautionary principle needs to be respected.

The Front Range is expected to grow by one million people over the next 25-30 years; we need to preserve the undeveloped/undevelopable areas as best we can.

Shawn Coleman:

While conservation is important, not just for long term sustainability but also on a pragmatic level, the impacts on the maintenance budget for the city of overzealous recreation. However this has become a Serious political issue. We have to remember that OSMP's are a community service and Boulderite's are accustomed to a high level of service from all City resources. My concern is that if there is not enough opportunity for recreation, that the very sales tax that pays for maintenance and acquisition might be in jeopardy. While the precautionary principle is laudable, if we truly want what's best for our open space and our community I think today's #1 agenda item is to ensure that the open space tax gets renewed, which means ensuring that all users feel they are getting return on their investment. As for acquisition, I think that in today's less than bountiful economic times, coupled with increase usage from non-residents, maintenance should be job 1 for OSMP, we are all aware of the remaining parcels of land, but I believe between, the county's program, those of our neighboring communities and the BLM, the remaining parcels are likely not in imminent danger of purchase or development. Meanwhile we do have serious deficits in maintenance today. An important part of municipal leadership is balancing urgent, immediate priorities with long term goals, today the scale needs to tip towards maintenance.

Kathryn Kramer

I think that monitoring the progress of the Master Plan is a key and critical element to assess what works best in achieving the plan goals. In order to maintain a balance with recreational uses and the environment, it is imperative to educate those using the space as to how to preserve it. If this does not happen then the people surveyed who believed that in 25 years the conditions of the area would worsen due to "people" will be proven right. Respect MUST be shown to wild life and plant life! Those who do not show respect should not be allowed to go there. Additionally, it concerns me that much of the wildlife will be threatened just because they are acting like...well...wildlife. The current hysteria about mountain lions, bears etc. can mean danger for the animals. That's why I emphasize "education" of people using the facilities. Additionally there should be even stiffer fines for those who "trash" the area. If you are going to take your dogs with you, don't pick up their poo only to leave the used sacks behind. I do support additional staffing of rangers and naturalists due to greater traffic. I am not certain that people from big cities really understand the importance of courtesy when trafficking on open space and definitely need to be watched. Unfortunately people can be stupid, careless and sometimes outright cruel.

As to the balance in acquisition of new lands, I am curious why I am seeing more and more lights from houses up on the ridges lately as I thought this was one of the reasons for open space. Also, it is a real concern for me as to what is being planned by CU at their South Boulder campus area now that it appears that the flood plan will be authorized. This is the gateway to Boulder and if CU builds structures it can ruin the view as visitors drive into Boulder. Why not talk with CU and try to swap with them for this property. Surely there is a parcel of land that would be comparable in value, closer to the CU main campus. I know so many people hike on the berms, glorying in the beauty. If this is taken away it would be a real tragedy. Not only that, with all the frogs one hears in spring there is a wetland area and should be preserved. I would hope the City seriously considers staying firm with CU concerning this and other important areas.

Alan O'Hashi

As time goes on, there will be increasing pressure on the city open spaces. Some users like hiking in pristine environments others like to camp out of the back of their pickups. I worked as a Park Ranger in Rocky Mountain National Park and know first hand what its like to deal with visitors who want to bring urban and quasi-urban experiences into areas that are natural. Once the multi-use gate is opened, it's hard to close it. As users develop more uses and demands increase the gate gets pushed wider and wider. Recreationists and preservationists have to put their hubris and special interests aside, take a big picture approach and err on the side of open space preservation. **How might the city balance increased recreational opportunities with ecosystem preservation?** Open space and recreation are public goods. I believe there needs to be a balance between active recreation and preservation, including taking a look at how city parks are used, particularly Valmont Park which could help take some of the pressure off open spaces. **Do you consider the precautionary principle to be the right philosophy for resource management of OSMP lands and resources?** I think the precautionary principle applies both ways because eventually conflicting data will have to reconcile. Merely saying "I don't trust your science" isn't a responsible position. **In view of the huge current use of Open Space and Mountain Parks by visitors from the greater Denver area, do you support additional staffing of rangers for enforcement and naturalists for monitoring as a high priority?** Staffing up is part of the solution but managing park and open use like a hotel is a possibility too. Intensely used places like Yellowstone charge user fees and take reservations from visitors to use the back country, campgrounds etc. National and state parks routinely "rotate" trails and areas out of use to allow them to "come back." **Do you believe the City currently has an adequate balance in acquisition of new lands and maintenance/management of existing lands?** The city can never acquire too much open space. The best ways to control the destiny of the urban planning area is to either buy it or annex it.

Eugene Pearson

The Open Space Visitor Master Plan is a wonderfully crafted document so long as it is executed in the spirit in which it was designed. City Council needs to revisit the plan when making decisions regarding trail expansions and preservation designations. City Council needs to send clear messages to city staff that habitat conservation and the precautionary principal must be highly respected in all decision making processes.

Having done train maintenance work myself, I know that a poorly built trail or no trail at all may lead to the following situations. No trail where there is a compelling site to be seen such as a scenic overlook will often lead to the development of rogue trails by trail users. These trails often are the shortest distance from point A to point B regardless of slope, soil type, or type of vegetation in the area. They can act as rain chutes and obliterate habitat by rampant erosion and runoff. Trails that are built poorly face the same perils. Moreover, if trails are not accommodating the usage of the area they will become braided and have low pints where water collects. It is vital to have trail planning experts who cannot only plan a great trail that meets visitor needs, but also recognize that ongoing maintenance of our trail system is required.

In terms of the proper balance of acquisition and maintenance – I would like to see a comprehensive inventory of all trail maintenance needs. Before any new trails are approved, I would like the opportunity to determine if we can meet that need in a timely fashion with current staffing levels. There are a few precious morsels of land yet to complete the wildlife corridors and ensure a healthful habitat for Boulder's flora and fauna. We must put this as the top priority while recognizing that today's \$100 problem may very well become tomorrow's \$1,000 problem in terms of habitat restoration due to improper train construction or maintenance.

Additional rangers would be welcome in our open space although, if I were forced to prioritize investments it would be third in ranking behind acquisition and then maintenance. I would like to see a greater effort to empower the average citizen to report behavior that is not appropriate

in our open space. The system is so vast that only a community wide enforcement effort can adequately address noncompliance issues. A position whose job assignment was purely to make sure the public was empowered to confront individuals degrading our open spaces and report them may be much more effective than hiring additional FTEs.

Susan Peterson

I think that OSMP did a great job of balancing preservation and recreation in the Master Plan and that their implementation plan is quite comprehensive in its scope. Now we just need to empower and fund them to enforce it. How might the city balance increased recreational opportunities with ecosystem preservation? I think that this balance is defined quite well in the OSMP master plan – although I personally would vote to err more on the side of preservation. Do you consider the precautionary principle to be the right philosophy for resource management of OSMP lands and resources? Yes. I believe that our ecosystem is so complex and interconnected that it is better to err in favor of the reasonable possibility that some action might do harm. I also believe that we would need to put some guidelines in place for use of the precautionary principle, to avoid frivolous complaints. In view of the huge current use of Open Space and Mountain Parks by visitors from the greater Denver area, do you support additional staffing of rangers for enforcement and naturalists for monitoring as a high priority? Yes, and I would encourage an education program that “deputizes” average citizens who love open space to encourage good behavior from other hikers on the trail. Do you believe the City currently has an adequate balance in acquisition of new lands and maintenance/management of existing lands? I was unable to find enough data to form an educated opinion on this, although I have recently heard that budget cuts in maintenance/management are making it difficult for staff to keep pace with the plan.

Tom Riley

There appear to be an ample supply of outdoor enthusiasts in Boulder. They would make excellent recruits for a volunteer Open Space Ambassadors/Stewards. We should consider a use fee/parking fee for out of town users of our open space to fund training of volunteers and public awareness programs, and to pay off open space debt. The more non-paid residents who know best practices could create informed guardians and advocates of our land.

The City should partner more with local schools to create coming generations of knowledgeable and land caring citizens. Local schools could conduct Natural history and Biology and other sciences in the field. A requirement in high school to do field research could go along way in raising future generations appreciation, knowledge and guardianship of our open space. Rotating scheduled days of designated use bike only days, pedestrian only days etc could make recreation a more enjoyable and safe and more eco friendly. Also, letting certain land and trails lie fallow on a rotating schedule, say every 3 to 5 years (or when excessive wear is visible) could create eco friendly opportunities and natural repair. This seems especially important during animal migration and nesting. Responsible dog policies should be supported and continued as well.

GOALS OF PLAN are compatible with a healthy long-term vision and planning for the future: “Enhance Experience, Improve access, Enjoy and protect, partner with the community.”

However, I’d advocate for more of an emphasis on management of preservation and protection.

Also, as a runner and dog owner I appreciate responsible dog policies. My dog never goes off leash. I have the highest respect for individuals who can actually maintain sight and voice control.

John Welsh

There must be a plan in place to encourage the usage of our existing parks and recreation system without destroying the ecosystems around them. I would support more rangers and naturalists to monitor usage. I believe the city is doing a great job so far on this matter.

Ken Wilson

The Visitor Master Plan (VMP) is a sound document that was created through collaboration with many groups and individuals. The implementation of the VMP is causing a great deal of anxiety in the recreation community. It is important that all of the citizens of Boulder support Open Space as we will need to vote on continued funding in a few years. Without wide based support, this funding will be in jeopardy and we will not be able to maintain, much less expand Open Space. We should do a better job of prioritizing Open Space parcels, setting aside the most unique and allowing appropriate recreation on the rest. The section of the VMP “Dealing with Uncertainty” should be followed until actual impacts can be assessed. We need to use good science to determine impact and adjust our use accordingly, based on the environmental priority of each property. I currently work in the Ecological and Evolutionary Biology Department at CU where there are some world-class ecological scientists. Graduate students working with these scientists could be funded to conduct studies of impacts on some of our Open Space parcels under different use conditions. Graduate students are much cheaper than consultants and working with CU would help community relations.

3. Parks Master Plan – Do you think the Parks and Recreation Department is adequately addressing the various demands for recreation that exist in our community? Do you have any suggestions or specific ideas for implementation of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan?

Matthew Appelbaum

Probably not entirely. I think it is likely that, relative to other communities, we underfund our parks and recreation at least to some extent. I would guess that is in some part due to our Open Space program, which not only takes a huge chunk of our revenues, but also provides for other types of recreational opportunities that most cities do not provide. While that does not, of course, substitute for most parks/rec functions, we have chosen – wisely, I am certain – to set our priorities as we have.

That said, we should try to improve our parks/rec operations. This may require a new look at the fee structure (which is ongoing, and, of course, controversial), various subsidies to user and age groups, and the possibility of pursuing public-private partnerships, especially for large capital items like a velodrome. Naturally, new taxes are always an option, but these must be very carefully studied in light of significant other needs and the larger study of revenue stabilization and diversification.

Eric Bodenstab

One notable absence is the inability to ride a mountain bike from the city to a trail. To get to good trail now, you have to plunk your bike on your Subaru and head to the hills, sucking up more precious petroleum.

Shawn Coleman:

I followed the current (new) parks master plan through the approval process. While perhaps not everyone is happy with the outcome, I feel that department is one of the finest in the city in terms providing the highest possible of service allowed in scope of economic realities.

Kathryn Kramer

I think that Boulder has made a GREAT start (safe, clean and beautiful parks) but that more needs to be done still. One thing that needs to be kept in mind is the changing demographics. We need to take into consideration that the population (“Baby Boomers”) are aging and will not be able to be as mobile as before. Therefore I think we need more indoor pools that are available to the public. Also there are recreation plans that could include and provide for more year-round activities for days of bad weather. Also, there is a North, South and East Recreation Center. Why not a West Rec Center as well? I also think that the Council could come up with ideas to fund money for these centers without taxes or fees – fund raisers, events or concerts for example.

Alan O’Hashi

As far as I know, yes. But service demands in Boulder tend to be high. I come into contact with many publics and haven’t heard any complaints or praises. I may not be in the right circles one way or the other! **Do you have any suggestions or specific ideas for implementation of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan?** I think that Valmont Park has some un-explored opportunity to develop some active use like biking trails that should be explored.

Eugene Pearson

Neighborhood parks and Boulder’s three recreational facilities cannot become the ignored stepchild of our recreation infrastructure. Robust urban parks and recreational facilities can reduce the strain on our Open Space system and facilitate in the development of healthy habits and therefore a healthy community. We should have the mindset that our recreation centers are in competition with private firms in the community offering the same services. In doing so, we can position the recreation centers to get a greater market share and therefore a higher profitability in terms of revenue generation.

Susan Peterson

Yes – we’re a very “kid-centric” community, and I’d like to see us stay that way. I think we have enough recreational facilities to meet demand, but hope that we can find funds to meet the Action Plan, at a minimum. Do you have any suggestions or specific ideas for implementation of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan? Perhaps assessing a Parks and Rec fee for houses or redevelopment above a certain size would help to fund more of the plan (under the premise that if you want to take more of the community for yourself, you have to contribute to making the rest of the community more accessible for others). Beyond that, the plan is so new that I would wait a year to give it a chance to work, before making further recommendations.

Tom Riley

I do. They have created what appears to be a living document that is reviewed annually and will undergo major changes every five years. They have done extensive surveys have created a balanced plan that strives to meet the public’s diverse interests while meeting the need to care for the land in the long-term with carrying capacities, light and air pollution guidelines, working toward water conservation etc.

Strengthening the partnership with area schools is the one suggestion I would provide. Educational opportunities to help instill the highest land values and natural awareness will ensure that generations to come can make informed decisions on Park, and Open Space, issues. The more knowledge people are the more responsible they will act.

John Welsh

Yes, as stated earlier, the city is doing well on addressing the various demands for recreation. I especially enjoy the dog parks.

Ken Wilson

The Parks and Recreation Master Plan is a comprehensive document that details objectives, in three stages. Parks and Recreation is currently operating at the “Fiscally Constrained” level, far short of the “Action Plan” level and even farther short of the “Vision Plan.” I believe that we should find innovative ways to address the “Action Plan” level. I think that we could actually achieve most of the Vision level effects with judicious use of funds at the Action Plan level.

4. Comprehensive Plan – Last year, City Council voted to keep the 5-year, comprehensive update to the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan open indefinitely so that lands in Boulder’s Planning Reserve could be considered for development. Do you believe this action was appropriate? Please explain.

Matthew Appelbaum

No, it wasn’t, although I can certainly understand council’s action (and I’ve written about this in a past Camera column). While nominally legal, the action certainly seems to violate the intent of the agreement and planning process, and the ends-justify-the-means approach shouldn’t be taken lightly.

That said, the process is in dire need of updating, as I’ve also written about. Specifically, the four-body review concept, while brilliant and essential in the early years, has long ago served its purpose and now it more a hindrance to good planning than a help. And this council action certainly demonstrates that.

As for the Planning Reserve, I have no desire to see it annexed – nor did council, I think – except in exceptional circumstances, of which keeping Naropa in Boulder could certainly be an example. Obviously far more study of this is needed, but the completely artificial and unhelpful requirement of the current Comp Plan process would almost certainly kill Naropa’s interest even before we had a chance to investigate it – which would be unfair to Naropa and damaging to the city. Thus council’s action, but it is still very hard to justify.

Eric Bodenstab

Some growth will have to be allowed for. So I do agree with their decision. I hope to make that growth appropriate and strategic.

Shawn Coleman:

The rationale behind this decision was to keep the door open for Naropa University to continue its expansion plans. That is a simplistic answer, which well all know had the unintended consequence of leaving the door open for any other project that may have eyes for this site. However it must be understood, that the process of planning any new development in Boulder is a long expensive process and for an entity like Naropa to undertake it with responsibility they must prove to their contributors that their is at least a high probability of successes. Since the parcel would be subject to comp-plan restrictions, I think the "keeping the door open" approach was the most fair way to allow Naropa to move forward. If Naropa does finally scrap its plans, let’s remember this parcel is still protected by four body review (City Council, County Commission, and City and County Planning Board), so this strategy while removing a real barrier to the planning process for anyone thinking about developing the parcel, still ensures the public significant process and protection.

Kathryn Kramer

Boulder has always been way ahead of its time and has a long history of community planning, starting in 1910 with Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. The “blue line”, residential growth management, purchase of open space and preservation ordinance have helped make Boulder what it is today. Unlike in California we don’t have houses hanging from the hillside or tall buildings that are taller than the Flatirons. However I am concerned that more and more changes are helping developers whose primary interest is profit and I do not want to see so many changes that Boulder ceases to be unusual. In our effort to create affordable housing we don’t want to make Boulder a mish mash of architectural styles, or see houses painted yellow, blue or green (like clones of Prospect near Longmont), or see clones of Williams Village dotting the landscape. Bear Creek located on Highway 36 should be a lesson in what not to do and that you can not always rely on developers. Also, I am among many Boulderites who do not like the mixed use of industry/commercial and residential (which idea began in the middle ages with the Merchant Class). Particularly when some of the architecture is just outright UGLY. Many people have written to me and told me how they grieve the changes that have come upon Boulder in the last 3-4 years.

Alan O’Hashi

I’m on record as supporting a more coordinated look at the Planning Reserve North of Highway 36/28th Street. North Boulder is changing rapidly and the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan could be updated to better reflect the new development in Uptown Boulder, Holiday Neighborhood and other redeveloping areas. This will better inform decision making affecting Boulder’s Planning Reserve. As it stands now, projects seem to be evaluated one-by-one on a piecemeal basis with not a lot of thought about what future “hightest and best” uses might be. Are they more places of worship? expanded educational facilities? active / passive recreational uses? I’d rather evaluate projects based on North Boulder Planning Reserve gestalt rather than one parcel at a time. I don’t think that keeping the BVCP open indefinitely sets a very good precedent, particularly since there are other parcels, such as Diagonal Plaza that are also potentials for redevelopment.

Eugene Pearson

No. Although it may be prudent for council to keep the planning reserve open because of exceptional circumstances and opportunities, it was not so in this instance. What do we have a 5-year planning process for if we do not follow it? There are far too many spaces within the current city boundaries for redevelopment for there to be “a compelling need” to open up the planning reserve currently.

Susan Peterson

No. I think that Planning Reserve Area IIIb should be included in the rural preservation Area IIIa now – otherwise, it’s too tempting for the City to change their mind in the future. In particular, I believe that it’s important to keep the NE side of the 28th Street Extension rural as a clear and crisp boundary and reminder of our rural heritage. And to those people who would like to put a big-box store on this site, I would recommend that we work with one of those big boxes to develop a business plan for a “medium box” store prototype that focuses on the kinds of products that a specific demographic wants, in a smaller more human-scaled setting.

Tom Riley

Yes. It gives Boulder the flexibility to act quickly and it positions Boulder to influence decisions about these lands. Any development would need the guarantee that the city could provide adequate services. Also, development should go to a vote of Boulder’s residents/voters so that they may weigh the impact on environment, city services, and transit/traffic issues.

John Welsh

Yes, I agree with this plan. I see no down side to having land set aside for the future needs of the city. I would favor more purchases, just like we do with open space.

Ken Wilson

We need to keep some flexibility in our use of Planning Reserve properties. There may be strategic opportunities to keep businesses like Naropa in Boulder or to attract specific businesses to Boulder (such as biotech, organic foods or other Boulder specialty businesses.) These are long term planning properties and most-likely will not be used in the short term. However, strategic opportunities could arise quickly and we need to be able to respond quickly.

5. *Transportation Master Plan – What challenges do you see to implementing the Transportation Master Plan and how would you propose overcoming those challenges?***Matthew Appelbaum**

Seems to me that the biggest challenge is money! And an perhaps equally important challenge is the regional cooperation that will be needed to implement some of the most critical parts of our transportation network, particularly the BRT system and commuter train, but also improvements for traffic and transit on other key corridors.

As with Parks, the search for money must be done in the context of a comprehensive look at the city's needs and possible revenue sources, which is now underway. However, transportation would seem to be a most appropriate place for user fees of various sorts, although we are limited by state law in many ways. Thus we should examine license fees, tolling (as now being envisioned along US 36), although I have reservations about HOT lanes, and perhaps working with the state to be a test location for more exotic concepts such as VMT charges. We should also revisit our DET for transportation. And it's time for a close look at "head" taxes – understanding their potentially serious negative impact on the business community and the critical need for business acceptance.

Regionally, we must lead the charge for the implementation of US 36 and BRT as we supported with our votes, and work with the county and other cities to greatly improve transit options from the easy county areas. Finally, although it doesn't directly bring in funding, various development techniques, such as more affordable housing, targeted higher densities, and mixed-use can help reduce auto dependency and perhaps reduce the need for some aspects of the TMP.

Eric Bodenstab

Certainly the shortfall in Sales Tax Revenue over the last six years is an obstacle. This appears to be lessening some over the last year. We could look within the next 6 years to implement the "Action Plan" in the TMP and begin to add more multimodal corridors.

Shawn Coleman:

I think the time has come to scale back the Transportation Master Plan. While the build out is a very exciting idea. We have plenty of time to implement it. I suggest we move forward with what is possible within current budget restrictions, meanwhile invest in programs that have a true fiscal return on investment, such as tourism, the Boulder economic council, and the arts. Since these programs bring in more than is spent on them, investing in these programs will help us bridge the budgetary gap in a way that is faster and more palatable for the residents than ever increasing taxation.

Kathryn Kramer

I am concerned about the aesthetic aspect to make certain it would not visually impact Boulder. I must admit that I am unfortunately not a big fan of the 29th Street mall and find it unpleasant to the eyes. Not only that I have heard many people complain (about 29th Street) that there is no parking close to the stores, that they must walk too far and that as pedestrians they are in danger of being run over by rude drivers, so I hope the Transit Village would not be comparable. Many people I talk with say they liked the old mall better where you could park and then do much or your walking inside (which is great on snowy or rainy days). I am not inclined to like the idea of 5 story structures because they will block out the view of the Flatirons. Also, it would be important that the buildings were not painted in colors that would be annoying and disruptive as has happened elsewhere in Boulder. It would be nice to have trees and not just brick and cement! I talked with so many people who all said the same thing when Crossroads was demolished. "If only this area could be a park".

As for the transportation aspect, first and foremost, the city needs to make the IDEA of having the bus rapid transit and commuter rail service FasTracks appealing to the public so that it is assured that this service will be fully utilized. The best commuter system in the world will not be beneficial if PEOPLE DON'T USE IT! Advertising and favorable media articles are a start. It will be a hard sell because commuters love the convenience of their cars. But it is proven that the people of Boulder also love their environment.

Alan O'Hashi

Boulder's street system is built out. I support implementing the TMP with an emphasis on maintaining the existing infrastructure but as major improvements happen, they happen in light of the TMP and include alternative transportation modes. In addition to busses, my alt mode is an under 50 cc motor scooter. The winter snows created pot holes the size of Buicks! If I'm having trouble dodging the ruts, bike riders must be having unbelievable problems. My anecdotal experience is, street maintenance seems to favor cars. I hope this isn't the case! The main challenge is to encourage residents to get out of their SOV, plan out their trips, and to use alt modes. This can happen through the development plan process in which projects are incentivized to provide more bus passes, telecommuting, flexible work schedules, on-site showers, bike racks, etc. so businesses can "empower" their employees to change behaviors.

Eugene Pearson

Lack of funding for the plan is the clearest and most compelling challenge to overcome. We should put all possibilities on the table including congestion pricing to pay for our transportation infrastructure. I am particularly interested in congestion pricing because it can shift the burden of paying for roadways to those using them most heavily while creating a market incentive to take alternative forms of transportation. This gives transportation consumers a choice while ensuring that citizens realize that there is a cost to the services being subsidized in terms of roadway usage.

Susan Peterson

The biggest challenge that I see to TMP implementation is securing adequate funding to execute on the Action Plan and ideally on most parts of the Vision Plan. I would advocate finding some new ways of funding to generate enough capital to fund the plan at or close to the "Vision" level. Best case scenario would be for the additional funding to come from assessments that promote good behavior – much like the Climate Action Plan does by generating income while promoting less energy use. An example would be to encourage use of mass transportation by assessing a small toll for each car coming into or going out of Boulder

(just 50 cents per day per car could result in \$5-10million per year in additional funding – enough to get us from the Current Funding to Action Plan). Another idea would be to assess a tax at registration on cars that have an emissions rating greater than Super-Ultra-Low, or for those cars that get less than 20 miles per gallon.

Tom Riley

The biggest challenges are 1) 100 million dollars and 2) developing mixed use neighborhoods around transportation hubs. To safeguard open space, we will need to address density and affordable housing. The more people who cannot live in Boulder the larger the number of commuters and the pressure to expand our highways, which run over open space. We will need to plan with local communities so that Boulder employees from other locales will have access to public transit. And, once here we will need sufficient public transit -- bike routes, pedestrian ways -- to get people from light rail/rapid buses to their jobs.

John Welsh

I think a light rail system connecting Boulder to Denver is a fine idea. However, I believe it's too soon to talk very much about it. I believe that other communities would have to be a part of the discussion etc. I support the goal to get cars off the hi-way, and to keep our air clean. I support starting the dialogue as soon as possible.

Ken Wilson

The main objective of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is to halt growth in long-term vehicle traffic and reduce single-occupant-vehicle travel to 25% of trips. The main challenge to the plan is lack of sufficient funding. The plan describes three funding levels: Current Funding level; Action Funding level; Vision Funding level. It is clear to me that the objectives of the TMP will not be reached with current funding levels. I would like to see us fund at the Action level, but get results similar to the Vision funding level through a more judicious use of funds on those areas that are most likely to give the results we want to achieve.

6. U.S 36 Corridor — The EIS for the Boulder-Denver Turnpike corridor is due for public comment soon. What are your views on 1) High-speed bus transportation on this route; 2) Possible additional automobile lanes into Boulder; 3) Effects on the flood plain east of the Turnpike descending into Boulder; 4) Potential required transfer of OSMP lands in the critical habitat along South Boulder Creek east of the highway?

Matthew Appelbaum

The BRT system on US 36 is absolutely the number one priority for us. It simply must be built as promised, in the time frame promised, and with all the functionality promised. Additional auto lanes are essential too, but only up to Table Mesa, and possibly tolled (although as I noted, I have problems with HOT lanes). As city staff has recommended and council has reiterated, at the very least flood problems must not be exacerbated by the project – and every attempt should be made to help mitigate the existing flood issues, which, after all, are partly caused by US 36 itself. As for OS, clearly any widening of the road will require use of some OS lands; again, as staff has noted and council reiterated, this must be absolutely minimized and fully mitigated, preferably on-site (and not based on some irrelevant and unacceptable payment for the “value” of the land). But specific requirements must await detailed study by OS staff, which is now underway.

Eric Bodenstab

Making the 36 corridor as open as possible is essential to the economic vitality of Boulder. I would want any transfer of lands to transit use to be done as ecologically smart, but as reasonably priced as possible.

Shawn Coleman:

First let's not panic! an EIS (environmental impact study) is a federal mandate for all projects of this scale, charged with exploring EVERY alternative, even if the alternative is unlikely. That being said it would be the position of the city to avoid scenario 4 if it is at all possible, but lets remember that the U.S. 36 improvements don't just effect us, but our neighbors down the turnpike as well, so co-operation with them on these concerns is the best way to come to an amicable solution, but we must also unfortunately be prepared to loose. As for bus rapid transit the more I learn about it the more willing I am to give it a chance. For one thing for a transportation plan that is already so over a budget, it is a much better alternative to building new rail lines along the 36 corridor. But I also think it might be time for more lanes as well. While I certainly do not mean to discount the impacts, social, economic and environmental of adding lanes, there is also the reality that behavior will change, but likely not that much, and we must be prepared for a future that involves less driving as well as one that involves as much if not more. As the pressures to build better, cleaner cars gets stronger, the technology will get better and cheaper as will alternative fuels. As this progress happens, it will be difficult to end America's love affair with the automobile. While we strive to increase alternate modes transit, we must be prepared for other outcomes.

Kathryn Kramer

- 1) I do not think that this route is a good choice for high-speed bus transportation and that another route should be found. It will create too much congestion. I think a study group should investigate other routes.
- 2) Rather than additional automobile lanes I think the City should study overpasses and underpasses. I do agree that the commuter traffic is terrible going north to south and east to west. An idea could be to create "One" lane that would open in one direction for north-bound traffic for the 8:00 am rush hour and then the opposite direction for the 5:00 pm traffic. For example, it seems that the 8:00 am rush hour traffic is heavier Longmont to Boulder at 8:00 am and Boulder to Longmont at 5:00 pm.
- 3) I was at the meeting when the engineers gave their report to the City Council and I have concerns about the "magical berm" that is supposed to keep the CU South campus area "dry" while at the same time the trailer park and other areas near the "Turnpike" will be supposedly in danger thus making it necessary for some homeowners to buy flood insurance. In this day of technology and building techniques I think there needs to be a study on exactly what to do if this area floods and find ways to make certain that any flood waters will be re-directed.
- 4) I think that in determining this we need to make certain that no animal habitats suffer or are impeded. If I am thinking of the right area, much of this is either farmland or wetlands. It would be a shame to see it ruined.

Alan O'Hashi

I read in the paper the other day that the Pecos to Boulder corridor is in the running for a huge grant to enable high speed bus transportation. The scale needs to be evaluated, particularly if the goal is to decrease the number of in commuters. How the DASH and JUMP routes can be improved to transport residents from East County also needs to be evaluated. **2) Possible additional automobile lanes into Boulder** – While on the Planning Board I wanted to discuss this possibility of U.S. 36 being built up to Interstate standards but none of my colleagues at the time were interested when the 28th Street Improvement project was before the board. The regional approach was overlooked in favor of emphasis on an inward look at what happens in

Boulder relative to local traffic generation **3) Effects on the flood plain east of the Turnpike descending into Boulder** – The EIS process includes extensive ecosystem analyses to determine possible impacts on the flood plain hydrology, flora and fauna, from the various alternatives. The EIS process relies heavily on the “precautionary approach” you reference above in that the applicant completes the EIS. The EIS process also includes cultural surveys of the area. It is important for groups like Plan Boulder County to pay close attention to the EIS process to be sure that the “selective science” isn’t used to support predetermined outcomes; **4) Potential required transfer of OSMP lands in the critical habitat along South Boulder Creek east of the highway?** Off the top of my head, it seems like I recall that this process requires participation from the County and State, so keeping other jurisdictions involved will be important, as well.

Eugene Pearson

I am a big fan of bus rapid transit on the U.S. 36 corridor because it creates more options for commuters to access transit options while keeping commute times down. It also helps to regionalize some of the issues that workers in Boulder face by providing more options in terms of affordable housing and ensuring that families can spend more time with one and other. More lanes into Boulder is just a huge subsidy to those who are privileged enough to own an automobile and commute into and out of Boulder. The money that would be used to increase lane capacity would be better used to create a more robust transit universe to provide options to middle and low income earners in how they chose to commute. Study after study has shown that road congestion grows to meet road capacity – additional lanes into and out of Boulder would be a regressive transportation choice for our community and a detriment to the entire corridor.

Susan Peterson

Sounds too good to be true, and would be a compelling choice over driving your own car – so sounds good to me! 2) Possible additional automobile lanes into Boulder; Wouldn’t this have the opposite effect to encouraging more mass transportation use? Not a good choice, in my opinion. 3) Effects on the flood plain east of the Turnpike descending into Boulder; I have not had the chance to study this enough to feel qualified to comment. 4) Potential required transfer of OSMP lands in the critical habitat along South Boulder Creek east of the highway? My initial reaction to transfer of any OSMP land is that this sets a really bad precedent.

Tom Riley

I’ve seen a presentation by DRCOG on the rapid bus system. In theory it sounds like a good idea. However, there are some potential side effects. Increasing lanes will add to Boulder’s traffic and congestion. Any development on this would need to mitigate impact on the flood plain and open space. Perhaps Boulder could negotiate a land preserve with CU on its South Campus land.

Given its history, the CU may likely build a South Campus. If we could create a transit system that takes this development into consideration, we could mitigate the environmental impacts on this sensitive area of open space. Right now Boulder has the water rights that CU would need for this area. If we were unable to maintain these rights than planning for the potential development of the area would be of great benefit to Boulder. We could position ourselves to influence CU to consider their actions. If they are successful at their desire to develop the area, then we would greatly influence how they go about it. Tying in this transit issue could lessen the impact of CU’s expansion ideas.

John Welsh

I favor high speed bus lanes, and additional automotive lanes. I am not insensitive to the effects this will have on the flood plain east of the turnpike, nor the effects on the OSMP lands along the South Boulder Creek east of the highway. I am confident that there is an answer, and together we will find it.

Ken Wilson

High speed buses to Denver are essential. I worked in Denver for three years and rode the BX route every day. I do not support additional automobile lanes into Boulder. Studies have shown that building more lanes just increases traffic. In addition, bringing more lanes into Boulder would make no sense since we do not have enough lanes through the City to handle the extra flow in. Increasing the number of lanes into Boulder would also negatively impact the flood plain, creating risks to public safety and protection of property. I am well aware of flood issues on South Boulder Creek through my work on the Water Resources Advisory Board. I would also work to stop any transfer of OSMP land along South Boulder Creek for use as more highway right of way.

7. Growth - What are your thoughts on the value of population growth and job growth to the city of Boulder? How much of each do you support and why?

Matthew Appelbaum

Like many people, I have conflicting views on this iconic issue. Having lived here for 30 years, I'd be quite happy to just keep Boulder the size it now is. But without massive rezoning, it is quite clear that there will be both job and pop growth to come – although, critically, it will be essentially within our current, compact land area, ensuring that we don't contribute to sprawl, we permanently protect our open spaces, and we increase transit effectiveness. Further, there will be continued regional growth that will greatly affect us whether we like it or not. But even given the impacts of growth over the past 30 years, I have no doubt that it has provided benefit as well – we shouldn't forget that our many years of regional dominance and the sales taxes that provided effectively purchased our entire open space system.

That said, we need to manage the growth as best as we can, and try to maximize community benefits – economic vitality, affordable/worker housing, diversity – while minimizing the inevitable transportation, environmental, and financial impacts. Obviously people will disagree about how to best effect that balance. But I think a good example is NOBO – certainly it is vastly preferable to the low-density sprawl it could have otherwise become, and helps attract a vital, creative group of people to town who in turn assist our economic vitality and diversity.

I have no magic numbers to offer, and as you know, I'm not a fan of questionable statistics like jobs/pop balance. Future generations will determine Boulder's size, and pressures on environmental and resource preservation/conservation may well further the concept – supported at least in general by the Sierra Club – that growth, painful as it may be, belongs in already urbanized areas that have the necessary infrastructure. This generation needs to make wise decisions that enhance community sustainability and maintain our high quality of life.

Eric Bodenstab

Again, I support reasonable growth of each. Keeping jobs in Boulder is a priority. This will lessen the need for transportation in and out of the city. Adding 1/2% to the resident population each year for the next 20 years is feasible and can be done without enlarging the city footprint.

Shawn Coleman:

As many people are when they first arrive in Boulder, I was very interested in how to keep Boulder "just like it is", I now realize that some change is okay, and that concerns of overnight explosive growth are largely unwarranted. However being on the DMC has certainly showed me that the lack of quality employment is a big concern in the City. Some point to the large amount of in-commuting as a sign of a robust job market and while I can understand the logic of that viewpoint I disagree. While there may be a supply of employment I look at the job market with a higher level of criticism. If people cannot afford to live where they work then there is a problem in the Job market. I believe in the rising tides model. If we got back some of the higher paying commercial jobs that we have lost, those people would live, work, and shop in Boulder, stabilizing the customer base for are smaller businesses that tend to be in retail, and bolstering the incomes of our service industry employees. Where ever a persons stand on growth is, we can all agree that traffic is bad, if we could make commutes local as opposed to regional we would get a much greater rate of return on our alternate modes investments. This may mean at the end of the day we have net more people living in the city but the city will "feel" smaller as a result. Growth is a reality of healthy economy. (let's remember the city has actually lost population in the past 5 years, while traffic has gotten worse). If you want to have a great place to live you must have a healthy economy to support it.

Kathryn Kramer

It all boils down to this – YOU CAN'T have it ALL. Life is about choices. And living with the choices that you make. The same can be said of a city. You can't have it both ways. Either Boulder grows and puts up tall buildings that block the mountains; and mansions that block other people's views or we keep the height restrictions in place and work, much as the county is doing, on restricting the size of new construction. I believe that balance is the key word. We need SMART GROWTH.

If Boulder continues to grow and grow and grow there are several things to be considered:

1. Crime: None of the questionnaires I have received during the campaign even lists crime as an issue. We don't have crime in Boulder, at least not the kind you read about elsewhere. But the crime rate has increased as the population has grown and will continue to increase. Do we want Boulder converted to a big city with big city problems ala Denver?
2. Water: In this time of concern over climate change and less rain and snowfall, do we must plan for the future so that future generations will not have to succumb to water rationing.
3. Environment: The more people, the more impact on the environment as well as wildlife.
4. Traffic/Transportation: The continuing nightmare of driving in down town Boulder or commuting north and south or east or west
5. Housing: Bigger and bigger is not better. Do we want people crowded on top of each other in buildings that get taller and taller – like Bear Creek or Williams' Village? Up, UP and Away doesn't have to be the way it will be.
6. Air pollution: Ties in with the traffic and will surely become worse as people drive their cars. Even the number of busses will have to increase with the population.
7. Jobs: More and more jobs will be needed to support the increasing number of people. More competition for the jobs that are here.
8. Electricity and gas useage: Will increase and create problems for the environment, taking us back to number 3.

Alan O'Hashi

Balancing jobs and population has been a public policy for at least the past couple years. Rather than regurgitate them the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan policies

1.18 to 1.21 deal with the disparities between housing and jobs and population and jobs. I agree with the city organizational commitment to realize the limitations of physical expansion, and mitigate the cumulative impacts of growth by requiring that projects contribute significant

“community benefit”

Eugene Pearson

I support smart growth in both residential and business sectors. Citizens who contribute to this community by way of their careers have a right to also live here if they choose. This does not mean that Boulder should grow to accommodate all in commuters – to do so would be a detriment to our quality of life. We should focus efforts to develop the next generation of businesses that will ensure a robust economic future – the natural products industry and the renewable energy industries are primary examples. Boulder has an opportunity to lead the nation and indeed the world in a “green” or “sustainability” revolution that will be far greater than any reduction in greenhouse gas emissions we could ever hope to achieve. Through cultivation of the industries that will change the marketplace over the next 20 years and reverse the resource consumption trends of the past century, Boulder can well position itself as an international leader in sustainable business.

I support residential growth where and when it serves a purpose. Our barbell demographics in terms of wages trouble me. The reality is that we may never be able to regain our middle class, but we should look to neighboring communities to partner with to combat the lack of affordable housing within our city limits. By taking a regional approach communities can better accommodate the individual tastes of residents while still providing a housing portfolio that accommodates everyone.

Susan Peterson

Al Bartlett has convinced me that the connection between either job growth or population growth and value is a myth, particularly for Boulder. When I ask the question, “What do you like most about Boulder?” of citizens and business people alike, I consistently get answers like, “the open space”, “the bike trails”, “the Flatirons”, and “the openness”. Since undue growth of both population and jobs threatens all of these City assets, I would advocate that we limit both. How much of each do you support and why? I support limited population growth, and paying a Living Wage for the jobs we have here already so that both economic and cultural diversity can truly thrive here. Right now, 14% of our City population is below the poverty level (that’s relative to a national average of 12%) – not due to lack of jobs, but due to lack of willingness to pay a fair price for the goods and services that our lowest paid workers provide to allow them to rise above the poverty level.

Tom Riley

Boulder seems to be especially close to its carrying capacity, and our water needs have competing interest down the line As population grows so will our water demands and water treatment demands will grow. Limiting housing development seems a needed policy. Limiting population growth also provides the motivation to be more eco-friendly. If growth is to happen, we could allow it based on the idea that we should not gain any net carbon emissions, nor increases in water consumption, nor increases in energy consumption. We seek to be lower than our current levels of consumption and emissions. Enacting a rule that say that growth must not increase emission, water consumption etc it would provide the impetus for the city to promote conservation, renewable resources, increased recycling programs, energy efficient technologies (lights, appliances, solar, wind, insulation, etc). This would set us on the right path toward the goals of the Climate Action Plan.

Job growth may be looked at a little differently. As economies and industries change we will need to have a fluid job environment, so as certain sectors move out of Boulder or technologies change we will need to balance declining job sectors with newer growing sectors. Science, technology, energy, retail and services seem to be our major players. Technology can fluctuate a lot, as seen in the dot-com bust; and service industry has some of the lower paying

jobs. A healthy economy and policy will seek to strike a balance with diversity amongst the above fields.

John Welsh

I will continue to support slow, well thought out growth. I believe in the small business man, and recognize the need for larger corporations. Both bring revenues and jobs to sustain our community in Boulder.

Ken Wilson

Some job and population growth in Boulder are inevitable due to infill and increasing density. This is not all bad if our goal is to stop urban sprawl in the region. We also have little control of the growth plans of CU, though I am committed to working with them to minimize their growth. We should consider strategic growth of some types of businesses such as organic foods, recreation equipment and other businesses for which Boulder is noted. We should focus on smart, sustainable growth for population; a key element of which should be that population growth encourages commuters to become residents such that automobile traffic and the carbon footprint of the City are reduced.

8. Revenue stabilization – Over one-third of the city's sales tax is set to expire over a period of eight years commencing in 2011. Do you support earmarking of dedicated sales taxes for specific programs? Are there other revenue sources that should be explored?

Matthew Appelbaum

Since one of the goals of the revenue stabilization committee on which I serve is to diversify away from our strong dependency on sales taxes, it would be nice if we could implement some new sources of revenue – but few other sources raise as much money or are as politically palatable.

But whether it is sales taxes or other sources, I generally support earmarking only for capital purchases and construction. Our current arrangement is simply too inflexible, causing us to make some poor decisions in times of limited revenue. And remember, this can work both ways – while the permanent Open Space tax of .4% may seem essential in order to assure continued maintenance of the system, it can limit funding as well, and leaves the department vulnerable to a very volatile and probably insufficient in the long run to keep up with needs.

That said, there may be some specific user fees/taxes that are tied to programs and that thus may well be effectively earmarked. We of course already do this with, for example, rec center fees, but we may need to examine additional techniques.

As for new sources of revenue, there are many that the committee has and will examine. None are startling, and many have a variety of logistical and political complications, but here is a starting list of ideas I think we need to look at:

- diversifying away from dependency on volatile sales taxes as possible, although that is difficult given Colorado's taxation mechanisms and limitations on municipalities
- reexamining development excise tax methodology and charges, and assessing the DET against pops and scrapes over certain size thresholds (also see question #1 above)
- targeting taxes/fees to those users who benefit from certain services
- increasing flexibility and resiliency by not earmarking funds for non-capital projects and by increasing reserve funds

- de-Brucing the city's property tax revenue stream (as we've already done for the county)
- reauthorizing several sales taxes that will be expiring soon unless equally valuable substitutes can be found, and allowing the revenues to be used for general governmental purposes
- examining new taxes and fees, including such controversial concepts as "head" taxes (which are understandably disliked by the business community, whose acceptance will be critical), some sort of transportation tax and/or expanded "carbon" tax
- uncovering and reexamining "hidden" subsidies to user groups, age groups, or businesses
- considering charging non-residents for certain city services (yes, that might include open space access if feasible)
- seriously considering regional revenue sharing
- working with allies to allow local voters to impose a real estate transfer tax, and to create a equitable system of taxing mail-order/internet purchases
- increasing the pie by attracting more tourism and, if financially feasible, building a small conference center
- attracting some key, missing "value" retail merchants
- doing a better job of prioritizing expenditures, with a goal of being able to fund key new initiatives and programs, especially when we can leverage our contributions

Eric Bodenstab

Most other traditional revenue sources are already spoken for, Uncle Sam has the income tax, and the State gets some, too. The property taxes are more or less fixed. Other fees, such as from licenses and permits, can't be adjusted much higher. We may have to do the best with what we've got, choosing to renew many of the expiring taxes to continue to support the current level of services we enjoy.

Shawn Coleman:

I would be interested in having fewer earmarks in the city's budget to give the council more flexibility in economically trying times. I feel that if the council and the city manager had more flexibility to move money between funds it would have the result of having fewer emergency shortfalls. That being said, voter approved earmarks are a great way for city leadership to really know what the public wants done with their money. I don't necessarily think the current wheel is broken so much as it just has a flat and needs to be fixed. Sales tax is the way cities in the west fund themselves and I think it works. Let's remember that in the east where property and municipal income taxes are in place, they are subject to the same economic realities. However in the east the individual shoulders the brunt of the downturn, more so than the city, which is why their economic recoveries are always so slow. If you follow, when an eastern community hits a slump, spending is down as a function of flat to declining income, to compensate property taxes, and municipal income taxes rates increase putting further downward pressure on the market, as the crisis ends for the municipality rates stabilize but it takes several additional years for income to catch up and get ahead of inflation. So consumerism remains down, forcing smaller businesses to close and people to loose their homes, because they can no longer service the taxes. So while our downturn has had real consequences on City services and housing market, they are not as bad as would come about it some new taxes where to come online.

Kathryn Kramer

The City Council should continue exploration of revenue options – reauthorizations of expiring levies, alternative options, diversifying of the revenue stream, and examination of the challenges/solutions to implementation so as to establish a long-term, balanced and stable

revenue stream. And yes, I support earmarking of dedicated sales taxes for specific programs according to priority. I am NOT in favor of a raise in property taxes. Also, I think there should be special sales taxes on alcohol and cigarettes. Also I think fund raisers and events could be beneficial.

In reading the Blue Ribbon Commission Update Presentation I noted that among other issues, the aging of the Baby Boomers is listed as a major contributing factor affecting taxable spending and that it is hoped that the income demographic may offset age. I am concerned about age discrimination in the work place which complicates this situation. It is a real, not an imagined problem, particularly in this day of company mergers. All too often those over 50 are targeted for layoffs due to rising healthcare costs particularly for that age group. Changes in savings, government policies, the economy and the structure of pension plans are all fueling a trend for many Americans to delay retirement and for many retirees to re-enter the workforce. I think it would be beneficial to explore incentives for businesses to employ older workers who bring a wealth of experience to the workplace.

Alan O'Hashi

I support funding "rainy day" accounts as a hedge against the roller coaster economy. I think the "revenue sharing" approach holds some merit in that it allows the cities in the county to leverage their economic diversity to offset some of the revenue shortfalls that may occur over time. Essential services like law enforcement and fire protection wages should be paid by general fund revenues and not by taxes subject to the periodic vote of citizens. Are there other revenue sources that should be explored? There are grants available, but not to be relied upon to fund general operations. If residents are anything like me, I want to know what we're getting and how much does it cost. I support continual evaluation of public services and facilities to determine if they continue to be needed, do they serve those intended, what unintended externalities may arise, and if the service be provided more cost effectively by other options.

Eugene Pearson

I mentioned congestion fees earlier as a source of revenue for transportation. In general I do not support the earmarking of taxes; however, the political reality is that the community likes dedicated funds. People elect officials to represent them and part of that process is a building of trust that exists between city officials and the public to make fiduciary policy that takes the entirety of the budget into account. That said, with TABOR restrictions undedicated tax increases may be a thing of the past.

I do think that comprehensive reform is necessary to change the mix of taxes. I would suggest greater reliance on property taxes as a more stable revenue source for the community with a corresponding decrease in sales taxes on many goods and services used by locals. Sectors of the economy that rely more heavily on out-of-towners could support the dedicated sales taxes for Open Space and other services that visitors utilize while in the community.

We should begin laying a foundation beyond our borders to talk about revenue stabilization with a regional perspective. Any attempt to pass a "head tax" should have a regional component as to not place ourselves at a competitive disadvantage with respect to our neighbors. We should also talk more broadly about revenue sharing and include not just sales taxes, but property taxes.

Susan Peterson

Yes – in moderation. The number of earmarks currently on the books seems to have gotten out of hand. Are there other revenue sources that should be explored? I am a big proponent of finding revenue sources that encourage the behavior we'd like to see in our community – see my answer to Question 5, above. Another example of such a revenue source would be to

implement a “neighborhood sustainability assessment” on large homes or pop-ups to offset the environmental, infrastructure and open space impacts that such building have on our community.

Tom Riley

Dedicated taxes limit our ability to fund other areas of need. It has worked well for open space, but should be considered carefully. As a city with values, we have earmarked to mirror our values. Time-limited earmarking may give the funds needed to start a program. For instance, setting a percentage of the budget to go toward public transit issues can give it the funds it needs to get started. But at some point, it reason to say that public transit should be able to be self-sufficient, perhaps even, be able to pay back start-up funds.

John Welsh

I support the continuation of the earmarking of sales tax revenues for specific programs. I am sure there are many more ways of generating revenues in a city our size, and if elected, I'll do my best to find some.

Ken Wilson

Earmarking of dedicated sales taxes eliminates any flexibility the City might have to spend money on its highest priorities. On the other hand, earmarking is sometimes the only way to get taxes approved by the voters. We will have to address this issue in the next few years as several of our taxes, including taxes that support Open Space, are set to expire. We should explore all types of revenue sources including a head tax, taxes on pops and scrapes, and a variety of use fees. We should also vigorously explore more efficient ways to deliver services. I helped AT&T reduce its capital expenditures by \$2 billion over four years with additional savings of \$200 million per year in expenses. I think we can be more economical in our delivery of services in a variety of areas.

9. Economic Vitality – What are your views of the City’s economic vitality program, including the Council’s authorization last year of incentives to retain and recruit primary employers?

Matthew Appelbaum

I think it is generally off to a good and necessary start. I'm not fond of incentives/bribes to businesses, both on principle and also because they are of questionable value. But in this case, for Boulder, a very limited amount of money may provide significant psychological benefit, and in the existing environment, where we are no longer the dominant and essential business location, we really have no choice. But we should investigate revenue sharing as a way to perhaps lessen the self-defeating competition among cities. I also fully support the new city position that works closely with businesses to help them through city processes and targets appropriate industries. And I think we can assist employees – and thus their employers – via affordable housing and improved transportation/transit. Boulder can't compete with other cities' bribes, or their lower land and lease costs, but we can continue to attract creative, entrepreneurial residents – and companies who need them – by maintaining our enviable quality of life.

Eric Bodenstab

Good idea. We need to help Boulder help herself, giving us as many business opportunities as possible. I think there are many empty office buildings, still.

Shawn Coleman:

I think this is an idea whose time has long since come, as someone who has worked for a small local business the majority of the time I have lived in Boulder, and as a person who works in the arts, I can tell you that primary employers are an important part of the economic food chain. These companies provide the customer base for my business as well as the funding for the arts to a much greater rate than small business can. I welcome this change and hope that we can begin to show that Boulder really does mean business.

Kathryn Kramer

The best way to attract and retain businesses is by the city helping the businesses that are already established here so that those businesses prosper and are successful. Good news travels quickly. Create more programs that help small business owners and entrepreneurs (the City of Boulder began as an entrepreneurial town supplying the gold miners). Stop unnecessary building of office buildings (until such office buildings are needed) when there is already unused office space all over Boulder.

That being said, I think this is a solid plan to maintain a healthy, vibrant economy and at the same time to help to further provide for an entrepreneurial spirit. The City of Boulder's Business Liaison that will listen to concerns, questions and be responsible to the community needs is "right on". As for the authorization last year for incentives to retain and recruit primary employers, I think this is a good idea, but needs to be monitored to make certain these are the "right" employers. For example I don't think it would be in Boulder's interests to bring in big-box stores.

Alan O'Hashi

I believe that revenue streams based on fluctuating sales taxes can be stabilized by providing a regulatory framework that encourages a economy not reliant on the retail sector, but on diversified public/private sector primary workers who create dollar-turnover in the retail and service economy. A goal is to turn each dollar over seven times before it leaves Boulder. The "revenue sharing" plan holds some promise as a good way for the regional local governments to equitably leverage their economic diversity to help stabilize one another's revenue streams. Economic development should continue to be based on primarily helping existing for-profit / non-profit businesses and public agencies grow; and identifying promising and compatible entrepreneurial opportunities to be incubated from within. Boulder should plan "exit strategies" for the likelihood that businesses might out-grow our town.

Eugene Pearson

Boulder needs to attract businesses that are congruent to our city's values. Businesses that are philanthropic, environmentally friendly, and socially just. We must recognize that in today's global economy we cannot stand on past laurels to attract and retain the business that will change the American Consumer from being resource intensive to resource conscious. Economic vitality efforts should compliment the resources we have in the community by partnering with the national labs, the university, and the burgeoning natural products industry. By participating in the business discussion, Boulder can achieve the goals expounded in *Natural Capitalism* by hitting each rung of the triple bottom line – the environment, the economy, and social responsibility.

Susan Peterson

I really can't imagine any better incentive to doing business in Boulder than our Open Space, our casual work culture, our inspirational setting, our educated workforce, our clean and green community, our bike paths, our school variety, our University... need I go on? I know that we need to make it a friendly environment for business, but we shouldn't undervalue the fact that

employers come here for the inspiring energy, quality of life, and the access to the forward-thinking people that this area attracts. We're a premium market, and I think that we should have the confidence to market ourselves that way. And by the way, if I were going to provide benefits to "home-grown" businesses, I would focus on establishing a pool for providing affordable health care first – as this is important for every individual in Boulder, and is a huge and growing expense facing both small and large companies.

Tom Riley

Our ability to retain and recruit primary employers is extremely important. Towns across America have experience hardship at the loss of quality employers. That said, we should not compromise our CORE values: I believe that Boulder needs long-term investment in accessible housing. When I say accessible, I mean it in the broadest of terms. Housing should be financially, physically, and technologically accessible. We are at an important time in history; our technology is catching up with our ideals for energy efficiency and renewable resources. Environmentally we should work with energy companies to promote intelligent uses of energy. Also we should promote better use insulation, solar, and renewable resources. And, Boulder should work in partnership with its local businesses to maintain cooperative and sustainable business environment and solid revenue without compromising our CORE beliefs. Such standards will attract the types of employers Boulder hopes to enter into partnership, the kinds that hold our values and who can show that they are invested in Boulder's future.

John Welsh

I totally support the city to give incentives to retain and recruit primary employers! Boulder can no longer sit back, and watch businesses move one or two towns away.

Ken Wilson

Economic vitality is essential for the health of the City. Healthy sales tax revenues are a key to maintaining and expanding City services. It is essential that we retain and recruit good, green employers. The City needs to continue its economic vitality program to keep key businesses in the city and attract strategic businesses to move here.

10. Community Sustainability – Since 2004, City Council has created a new emphasis called “community sustainability.” Please describe your views of this initiative and any ideas you have for it.

Matthew Appelbaum

Here's what I say about sustainability – which of course can be defined in many different ways – in my campaign flyer:

The key issue is sustainability – ensuring that we maintain our high quality of life and high level of services by creating long-term, flexible, and resilient strategies in the critical areas of environmental protection, resource conservation, revenue stabilization and diversification, economic vitality, carefully managed growth and redevelopment, diversity, affordable housing, transportation, and human services. Understanding that these are all interconnected, a comprehensive and often regional approach will help ensure continuity, stability, and equity, allow for innovation, and avoid unintended consequences.

I've come to believe and understand that complex systems, whether they be natural systems or cities, can be sustained only by understanding the interconnectedness of their component parts. That doesn't mean that every program and initiative must be applicable to and improve every component – sometimes I think we try a bit too hard in that regard – but certainly the major

issues must be dealt with in a comprehensive manner. That clearly leads to some trade-offs, but I think that can be done while remaining true to basic values and principles, and we have significant experience in that regard with our Comprehensive Plan, which lays out our vision for the future but clearly acknowledges the interrelationships and inherent conflicts we need to confront.

Eric Bodenstab

Wherever, we can keep our spending and economic focus within the city limits we should pursue it. At the same time, many of our citizens shop at Target, because of the low prices. We need to be reasonable in terms of what we can expect the majority to do. Large economic factors like this are outside Council's control.

Shawn Coleman- no response to this one.

Kathryn Kramer

I am very much in favor of this initiative because it will be a tool in bringing the community together and also give a voice to some of the voiceless whose needs and concerns are all too often ignored. I would also like to bridge the gap between the generations who live in Boulder. The young can learn a great deal from the older citizens and the older citizens can be invigorated by the zest for living that our young people possess.

Alan O'Hashi

Rather than regurgitate the pages out of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive plan I'll just reference General Policies 1.01 through 1.08. I have a BVCP always on my hard drive. I was a member of the Planning Board when the community sustainability components were included in the BVCP and was the board liaison to the Human Services Master Plan update committee that dealt specifically with the community sustainability "people component". I'm firmly committed to walk the talk and apply the community sustainability in how I live my daily life.

Eugene Pearson

Community sustainability will involve a greater emphasis on regionalism. We are approaching a point that as a community we must decide which community goals will take precedent – affordable housing and low population growth is a primary and classic example in our community. We may not be able to meet every goal in the comprehensive plan because some goals are antithetical to one and other. We can better serve community members though by looking to our neighbors to see where we compliment each other. Given good transit options, it may make more sense to achieve affordable housing goals via Longmont or Louisville. We could possibly continue to specialize in small and medium size firms and ensure that growing businesses can find space in neighboring communities. Boulder should lead in cooperating with our neighbors to address issues of responsible growth within the urban boundary, retail development that meets the needs of citizens, and ensuring that less fortunate members of the community have opportunities to raise their standard of living.

Susan Peterson

I applaud the Council for looking at sustainability from a number of different perspectives, and encourage the community survey that is currently underway. In my opinion, the City Council, staff and the community at large has good policy underway with regard to land planning, Open Space, Parks and Rec, affordable housing, and transportation. I would encourage the City Council to monitor the staff implementation and results of these policies, and to now turn their sights to other issues that will face future generations such as access to good health care for all, reducing economic and social disparity, and having access to abundant, clean and renewable

energy resources. I would advocate that the city get back to a slower growth policy as the most straightforward way to impact community sustainability, from all perspectives.

Tom Riley

The idea that Community is a three-legged stool is an important concept. Economic, Social and Environmental are indeed the legs that allow our community stability to stand up and provide us a place to sit in community. If we lose site of any area, our community loses its balance and ground to stand on. We should make policy based on the idea that every policy has an economic, social and environmental effect on our community. Every decision affects multiple areas of our community.

Boulder should engage in Integrated Decision Making: Housing, transit, stable revenue, environment, business climate, essential services and open space are interconnected. I believe we should tie them together when making decisions. Integrated decisions have more power to affect lasting and positive change. For example, tie development rights to energy efficiency, affordable housing and public transit. Affordable housing near public transit will lessen environmental impacts. Working families and individuals will have shorter commutes, business can retain employees, families will spend more time together, and future generations will be prepared to promote Boulder's values of community, livability, sustainability, education, recreation and renewable resources.

John Welsh

Everyone who has lived in Boulder wants to see their lifestyles continue, or get even better. The best way to achieve that is through balance. You elect officials to find that balance. By researching the tough questions, and having an open dialogues, we will be able to enjoy all the benefits that Boulder has to offer.

Ken Wilson

Community sustainability addresses the interrelationships of economy, our social fabric and our environment, forming a stable tripod. Virtually every policy issue in the City of Boulder impacts each of the three legs of the tripod. Community sustainability should continue to be a cornerstone of our city government's policy. In terms of my ideas for community sustainability, I would like to see Boulder take a leadership role in the use of renewable energy as part of our community sustainability effort. Within the city we should encourage the use of photovoltaic collectors and solar thermal hot water heating on residences and businesses. In the next few years Stirling Engine technology will bring a new and better alternative for solar energy to businesses and could be considered by the City for larger applications. We should also look to partner with rural areas, using their wind power, solar power and biofuel resources. Community sustainability also reminds us to look at the economic impact of an environmental policy. In the examples above, I believe the impact will be quite positive if Boulder is a leader in this area.