

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, September 04, 2017 1:32:32 PM
Last Modified: Monday, September 04, 2017 3:06:29 PM
Time Spent: 01:33:56
IP Address: 98.245.126.215

Page 1: 2017 Candidate Questionnaire

Q1 What is your name?

Mark McIntyre

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)

Boulder is changing and change is hard for almost all of us. We can't wish our way back to some golden era of Boulder's past. We need leadership to guide us to better results – now. I am:

- Practical and driven by data.
- Focused on positive outcomes that serve the greatest good.
- Bold and compassionate.

My interest and qualifications come from my 40 years of living in Boulder where we raised two children, have two grandchildren, and three elderly parents. These deep roots have me invested in the community from the young to the old and from the business community to progressive social causes.

I have a 30 year track record of building a successful business that brings US component manufacturers and US OEMs together in negotiated win/win contracts. This success is due to my abilities to listen carefully and evaluate the needs and goals of multiple parties. Web positions [here](#), PDF [here](#).

Priorities:

Transportation:

Drive if you must, bike, bus or walk if you can. Alternative transport should be seen as helpful, not scorned. I support the Complete Streets Program and complete cycling infrastructure. The Folsom experiment failed, but that should not doom the whole program. Let's acknowledge lessons learned, correct course, and carry on.

RTD is not a partner in solving our daily transportation problems of in/out commuting. A partnership between the city and major employers should be explored to create new commuting routes separate from RTD. Businesses need to contribute. I will work for:

- Citywide EcoPasses.
- Transit systems that are responsive to our needs vs. the RTD agenda.
- A convenient and frequent system that accommodates in/out commuters to major employment centers.
- Working with businesses on all of the above.

Housing Affordability—I support:

- A regional housing plan that shares the burden and benefit with our neighboring communities and includes both public and private developers.
- The work of Boulder Housing Partners (City of Boulder Housing Authority) to increase the number of permanently affordable units in the city.
- Gentle in-fill in allowing greater flexibility by homeowners to build small accessory units, alley houses, mother-in-law apartments, etc.—that allows folks to stay in their homes longer and more affordably.
- Increased density in areas along transit corridors and in mixed commercial districts.
- Adjustment our parking requirements. We accommodate cars, seemingly endlessly, while not accommodating people who use public and non-automotive transportation.

Meeting our carbon goals:

The municipalization project is changing rapidly. My key stated point has been that we need to keep our eye on cost effective carbon reduction – now. Xcel's latest efforts to increase renewables and decrease coal are laudable. I believe in rewarding good deeds. It is regrettable that the vote on the occupation tax will be seen as a deciding factor on the muni because one path forward is to support the tax and simultaneously end the muni effort while redirecting those funds to solar incentives and other worthy projects. For example, the city could create new subsidies for Smartregs. (Initial incentives were exhausted early in the program).

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.

Since the question you ask deals with the structure we have, I don't see many changes that would be anything other than nibbling around the edges of the problem. Boulder has reached a stage where we are a city being run as though we are a small town with a large council. I think we are ready for a council that combines a mix of wards and at-large seats and possibly a directly elected 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?

We should go back to the voters for increased pay and benefits for council members. Conversely, a sitting council could vote this in for the benefit of the next council. As it is structured now, the job is too large for anyone that does not have a flexible work situation and some independent income. We will never have a smart, young, wage earner on council until we reform the compensation system. Boulder is blessed with some of the most educated and experienced people in the world and so are our boards, but does that make for the best representation for the city?

Our boards and commissions are not supposed to replace or even supplement professional staff. They should reflect the people of Boulder – broadly. If elected to council, I would advocate for increasing the number of people on some boards (OSMP comes to mind) to broaden the likelihood of someone bringing a challenging and different perspective.

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.

I support the on-going governmental efforts of BHP to create more permanently affordable units. While not necessarily a PR success, the cash in-lieu-of program is actually effective in maximizing the number of affordable units.

Government will never be able to drive the market; the market is simply too big. So modifications to the rules under which the market operates are key.

A. Give more flexibility for homeowners that want to develop compact compatible ADUs

B. Give greater design freedom to developers that want to innovate by reducing parking and increasing transportation options (i.e. car shares etc.)

C. Encourage second and third level residential spaces above commercial and industrial spaces.

D. Walk our talk on private middle income development. If we can't have small dense units at 3303 Broadway on a thoroughfare on major transit line, where can we?

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

Yes. Many of the locations that are under development now, such as 30th and Pearl, east Arapahoe, Pearl Parkway and old Pearl, and North Broadway could all be, with strong community and neighborhood engagement, appropriate places for additional residential development. While challenging right now during construction, these will all become lively small centers for future residents. These same locations should continue to develop opportunities for additional mixed use, mixed zoning, live work, commercial below and residences above development.

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 believe reaching our climate goals is urgent and important. I supported the city's efforts to municipalize in the first two elections.. My current position is: municipalization is not a goal it and of itself – carbon reduction is our goal. The muni effort has not moved us very far toward our goals and in fact may have soured some segments of our electorate. We need to do whatever is most cost-effective and timely in reaching our goals even if it leads us away from the muni. I do think that Boulder's efforts to municipalize did contribute to Xcel's latest decision to reach 55% renewables by 2025 and we can take heart in that and count that as a win in our efforts to reach our goals.

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?

I am struggling with this decision. First, I will tell you what I think we should have done differently. Council should have broadened the wording of the 2017 ballot measure to include something like, "The occupation tax will support the city's effort to create a municipalized electrical utility, or upon a vote of council, these funds could be used to support other efforts at emission reduction, renewable energy production, and energy conservation." If the muni fails, this would allow the City to subsidize further carbon reduction programs like incentives for solar systems.

Because the measure is worded narrowly, supporting the muni only, I predict it will be defeated. If defeated, we will lose a year minimum of valuable resources and time toward reaching our carbon goals. A more broadly worded measure would have the potential of having full support from all of council and a broad range of the electorate.

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 fall squarely behind the B statement. In my Sierra Club interview and questionnaire answer, I state that the Sierra Club, as an example, was founded on the idea that recreation (re-creating ourselves) is required for conservation and vice-versa. We would not have an Open Space program without fulfilling the desire of our citizens to visit the lands they own and for which they have paid.

I also reject as false the dichotomy of recreation vs. conservation. Better recreation infrastructure, trails that are durably constructed and well maintained, trails that take people where they want to go, will in the end actually increase conservation values.

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?

"A cap" can mean many things, so I will answer generally by pointing out that under specific circumstances and for specific time frames, yes we can and do have limitations on visits to our Open Space properties. The nesting raptor program with support of the climbing community is the best example.

I would be opposed, unless under some extreme circumstance, to a simple numerical cap on visits. I would consider temporal or spatial separation by use if fair and equitable. I have long contended that the OSMP department is too heavy in FTEs dedicated to publishing studies and preparing plans and far too light on staff dedicated to visitor infrastructure and maintenance.

Our Open Space system is a key element of what make Boulder, Boulder. It is also an economic engine that attracts innovators, entrepreneurs, artists, and athletes. We need to maintain it like the asset it is.

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?

I view this as an opportunity to lead; lead, rather than try to turn back the clock and raise the draw bridge.

If we don't like the traffic, let's support those that choose to ride their bikes, walk or take the bus. To reduce the number of cars on the road, let's be open to adding some density in our employment zones.

If we want to see fewer people on Open Space, let's build a few more trails that connect to other open space systems (county, state, and Forest Service) and disperse people more widely. Let's grant recreational access on properties that are closed to public access now (there are many).

Let's innovate with ways of moving people to popular areas. The Chautauqua shuttle is a success. The Skip is an overwhelming success.

Finally, let's build a culture of polite accommodation with each other.

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

The city has a lot on its plate right now and the entrepreneurial economy seems to be doing just fine. I am not suggesting that we neglect this element. It is part of what makes Boulder vibrant and exciting and economically healthy. Rather I am suggesting that we simply make sure that our local government is not impeding it with unnecessary obstacles.

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?

Our community must have the moral conviction to help those that truly need and want our help. We should not fear "the other". We also have a right to enjoy our community and public spaces confident that we will not be harassed or threatened. We cannot criminalize being human. But we can fairly and firmly enforce and adhere to our current laws against behaviors that are detrimental to our community.

We must also differentiate between the homeless and "travelers", those choosing to live on the street for a season. I think we must give serious consideration to implementing a legal seasonal camp that gets people off our open space and off the creek paths and allows for stricter enforcement of the camping ban and cleanup of our public spaces. This could also keep some of these people out of the most expensive bed in town, the county jail.

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?

We do not have the land or money to build our way out of our in/out commuting problem with more lanes. These commuters follow the same paths every day. We need transit solutions for non-auto modes.

RTD has proven to not be our friend in solving our daily transportation problems of in/out commuting. A partnership between the city and major employers should be explored to create new commuting routes and bus systems separate from RTD. Businesses need to contribute. We do not need Google busses running unless they are available to all. I will work for:

- EcoPasses for all of Boulder.
 - A transit system that is responsive to our needs vs. the RTD agenda.
 - A convenient and frequent system that accommodates in/out commuters to major employment centers.
 - Working with businesses on all of the above.
-

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 support the limitation of parking as part of reaching almost every stated city goal: walkability, carbon reduction, traffic reduction, a healthy citizenry, and overall livability. When we think about Boulder we think about the downtown mall, about our open space, our educated populace, our parks, etc.— we don't think about cars and parking. We are a city of people - not cars.

The way people move and arrive at destinations is rapidly changing with shared ride services, self-driving vehicles, electrified bikes and other yet to be developed solutions. We need to look forward at these solutions and not back at a 1950s and 60s vision of free on street parking.
