

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, September 04, 2017 4:36:21 PM
Last Modified: Monday, September 04, 2017 5:31:16 PM
Time Spent: 00:54:55
IP Address: 71.237.71.54

Page 1: 2017 Candidate Questionnaire

Q1 What is your name?

Jan Burton

Q2 Why are you running for City Council and what are your top three priorities for the coming term? How are you qualified to represent the residents of Boulder? (500 word limit, links to your website(s) encouraged)

I'm running for Council because I have had two years on the Council to learn, and I now have a better view of what needs to be done to improve governance of the City and accountability to our citizens. I hope to win a 4-year seat so I can make a difference in the Council and in the City. I will bring a practical, common-sense approach to solving the problems of this community. In addition, my entrepreneurial background gives me that kind of mindset to opportunities within the city, whether it be economic, environmental, housing, transportation, or the arts.

My top 3 priorities for the coming term are a) housing b) governance and accountability; c) environmental initiatives, based on results of municipalization vote and the potential need to go a different direction.

How I am qualified: I have spent the past 2 years on Council, and I've learned a lot about City operations, budget, and processes. I have spent many years in the business world, managing large high-tech sales and service organizations. I have had to make difficult decisions, manage large teams and large budgets. I am a proven leader and manager, and I have managed and led change. I have also served on non-profit boards locally and co-founded a company and have expertise in housing and the arts. Please find more information at www.janforboulder.com.

Q3 Currently, the Boulder City Council is composed of nine members, elected at large, in most cases for a four year term and term limited after three terms. The Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem are chosen by the Council from among Council members (i.e., not directly by voters). Given this structure, what changes, if any, would you like to see? Please be specific and explain why you favor these changes.

In the 2016 Community survey, residents gave us a 48% rating in "confidence in city government". A recent community work group, making recommendations about engagement with citizens, recommended that we do much less. The biggest issue is the amount of time required for Council members. The community has voted down pay increases several times, and I have only recently been thinking they don't want us to be full time! So, I am in favor of scaling down Council's involvement in many issues. We should be a part-time governing Council, not an operating group, and concentrate on what the community has told us are the highest priorities. If and when the community supports a full-time Council, with pay, we should take it to 5 full-time Council members, with commensurate salary, and consider making representation by wards. At that time, we should consider a full-time Mayor.

Q4 How would you make our City government – whether serving on Boards or Council, or participating in the City organization’s outreach - of greater interest to younger generations, minorities, families and others that currently find it hard to engage in City affairs?

In order to scale back Council's time, we will need to push more community involvement to our Boards & Commissions, and we will need to let them make more decisions. We will need to stop micro-managing so much and social engineering ordinances on the fly (examples include the co-op ordinance, the annexation of the MJ businesses on 55th, the sugary drink tax, etc). I believe that by limiting the overreach of Council, we will motivate more people, especially those who work, to get involved. Council members needs to go out more to local schools to hold Town Hall meetings. Many people serving on boards don't think Council or the City staff listens to them. We need to make them more important to the process of public engagement, and we need to listen to them. It's important not to put evangelicals on the Boards, but to put people who listen well and are reasoned in their thinking. I'd like to begin a mentoring program for younger people and minorities.

In the meantime, it's very important that organizations like Open Boulder continue their mission to improving our governance through recruitment of Board & Commission members, etc.

Q5 What is your opinion on the current state of density in Boulder and the concerns of many residents regarding the cost of housing? Please include your views on government vs. private sector approaches to address these concerns.

The Danish Plan promoted a dense urban core, surrounded by green space. We surrounded our city with green space, and we have controlled our height limits, but we have since allowed zoning laws to decrease density and allow for larger homes on bigger pieces of land. We should take environmental issues more serious regarding the built environment, allowing for light in-fill (like ADU's, duplexes, triplexes, split lots), which will allow more people to bike, walk, and take the bus. We should build more mixed use and higher density developments on our major transit roads like Arapahoe and Broadway, and we should encourage smaller living quarters like micro-units. We need to do more education about the original strategy of a "dense urban core" and get more buy-in to the concept of density.

I support both public and private solutions to housing. With skyrocketing land values, we should buy existing properties or land, and we should create incentives for building of affordable housing. Incentives can include faster approval cycles and waiving of fees for 100% affordable projects.

Q6 Are there areas of Boulder that could support increased residential density, and if so where?

The entire city should be considered for light in-fill (ADU's, duplexes on corners, and split lots). Major thoroughfares like Broadway and Arapahoe should be the highest priority for densification, as well as the next phase of Boulder Junction. CU should be building more housing on their properties, both for staff and for students.

Q7 What is your current position on municipalization of Boulder's electrical service? Has your opinion changed since municipalization was first debated seven years ago?

I am an environmentalist, and I supported our goals for municipalization (and voted to explore it), but we've spent over \$13M of real cash and have no tangible results.

This fall, the community will vote on a \$16.5 M ballot measure to continue the Utility Occupation tax for municipalization. If it passes, we'll continue our legal battles with Xcel, and that will only get us to a "yes or no" decision, likely in 2020. This will put our financial reserves at risk, due to spending the money before the UOT revenue comes in. IF we win our legal and regulatory battle, we will then need to invest +\$250M to separate, condemn Xcel assets, and pay for stranded costs. We will be lagging Xcel's own timeline of 55% renewables by 2026!

Q8 The tax on City electric bills that funds the City's municipalization efforts is due to expire the end of 2017. What is your position on renewing the tax in this election year?

My highest priority was to get the Utility Occupation Tax on the ballot. I support the community being able to vote so we can see if they support spending the kind of money we need to spend to continue this effort. I will recommend a "no" vote on the ballot measure and recommend that we seek partnerships with Denver, other cities, the State, and Xcel to make a real difference in climate change. While I will not vote for the ballot measure, I will honor the community vote.

Q9 Which is closer to your view and why: (a) It is the primary goal of the Open Space program to preserve and protect lands under its authority, and public access should be allowed mainly when it can be done with minimal or no impact; or (b) Public access is a good in its own right, and therefore access and preservation should be considered equally balanced goals.

I believe that when we get people out in nature, using it, they fall in love with it. Then they become stewards of the land and the species on that land. We must have strong policies and education about how to treat the resources, but it's better to get people on board through their use and involvement. The City of Boulder OSMP Volunteer organization and rangers are best-in-class, and their programs teach appreciation.

OSMP has nine designated Habitat Conservation Areas (HCAs) as a way to protect areas that provide habitat to some of Boulder's rare plants and animals. When land or species are endangered or need protection, we should designate it as such. In addition, I support temporary closings to support species during mating season.

I must add that I do worry about over-use of our most popular open spaces like Chautauqua and Sanitas.

Q10 Can you see yourself supporting a cap, in some form, of the number of people using a specific Open Space resource? What sorts of considerations would justify that type of policy?

I am an Open Space advocate, volunteer, and user. Like all Boulderites, I love and respect our Open Space. When we see over-use, we should consider first trail modification and promotion of other properties. Chautauqua comes to mind. Only 40% of the users come from Boulder, and we allow outdoor expedition companies to take groups. Perhaps we should encourage them to go to other places or increase their fees. The CVB and the City should promote revolving trails. We should consider charging outside-of-city cars to park and encourage people to take buses to the properties. I'd love to see connectors with all our properties and those of the County to encourage more bikers to ride between properties.

Caps should be a last resort, done once we've tried everything else, and I would support caps on people outside the county, if that could possibly be operationalized. The people of Boulder have paid for their Open Space through sales tax dollars, and it's important to give them priority.

Q11 The recent success of the City's economy has created jobs and vibrancy throughout the City, as well as increased tax receipts, but can also be seen a different way, as creating stress on limited resources available to our residents – traffic, demand for open space, and some would say a reduced quality of life. How do you see it, and how would you seek to address these stressors on our community?

This is a tough one. We are seeing the downsides of our incredible success as a community, and the stressors are evident to all of us. However, we don't want to close the doors on new people coming in, or we won't be a diverse community. Here are a few ideas:

- Encouraging more people to bike and walk rather than using their cars (and put in more north-south bike routes)
 - Encouraging people to put an ADU in their back yard
 - Encouraging the use of electric bikes and cars and pilot projects with car sharing and driverless solutions
 - Create connectors from Open Space properties to encourage more people to bike to properties
-

Q12 Do you have any ideas for how to expand the City government's relationship with Boulder's entrepreneurial economy?

Let's work with them to solve specific problems, like traffic, in-commuting, and trialing unique transportation programs. We should be leading the nation on driverless cars, car-sharing, etc., and our entrepreneurs could help us get there. In addition, there are plenty of consultant companies who could help us tackle our carbon goals...once we get off the "muni-is-our-only solution".

Q13 It is undisputed that Boulder has a growing problem with homelessness and transiency. What are your thoughts on how the City should address these two distinct populations? Do you support increased funding to address these issues, and, if so, how would you propose to use such funds?

For transients: We should do everything we can to disincentivize them from coming here through education campaigns aimed at our residents. We should not give money to panhandlers (I've heard one claim he makes \$50K/year), and we should limit our services for transients to only a few days.

For homeless: We should increase our funding for all areas of human services, homeless shelters, and ultimately less expensive housing. Working more closely with our human services agencies is critical to our success.

Housing, however, is the ultimate answer to homeless people. We need to adjust our high expectations for housing that costs \$300K per unit.

Q14 Each working day, tens of thousands of commuters pour into Boulder from elsewhere on the Front Range, causing traffic jams, high carbon emissions, and burdens on City services, but also adding customers for our retail businesses and therefore benefitting the economy. Would you strive to accommodate that traffic, reduce it, or channel it to other modes? Whatever your answer, why?

All the above. Transit: With the exception of the FF buses from Denver, percentage bus ridership hasn't increased in 25 years. It's too difficult making the first and last mile connections, and it takes too long to commute by bus. We should work on the first/last mile by encouraging car-sharing services to be subsidized by businesses and electrify our buses by working with BVSD, CU, Via and RTD to replace diesel buses with electric buses. We should down-size buses on local routes to smaller, more frequent options.

We should build more lanes on Arapahoe for today's cars and encourage the use of EV's by working with the Chamber and large employers to put in charging stations. We should encourage CU to become car-free and encourage ride sharing with Lyft/Uber for parents driving kids to school. We should build more density on Arapahoe to allow workers to live closer to their places of work in "15-minute" neighborhoods.

Q15 The City has a policy of limiting parking spaces, especially downtown, to encourage the use of alternate modes of travel for residents and employees. Do you agree with continuing this policy? Why or why not?

I have mixed feelings on this. While I realize many workers and shoppers need parking, it is very expensive to build, and it may not be necessary in 10 years when newer transportation solutions become mainstream. Perhaps building more housing in a couple locations downtown (current parking lots) would encourage more workers to live downtown. I'd love to know if there is a parking building option that can then be turned into housing after 10-15 years. Maybe that's a project for our entrepreneurial community!