

Up to 140 Word comments optional for the first six yes/no questions

In early 2025, the Boulder City Council passed an ordinance called Family-Friendly Vibrant Neighborhoods to make it easier to build duplexes and triplexes in single-family home neighborhoods. Would you have voted yes or no on that ordinance? [If you were on city council when this vote occurred, did you vote to make it easier to build duplexes and triplexes?] **No. If higher density is part of the solution, I believe it should be focused in areas of the city that provide more benefits.**

Would you vote to reduce minimum lot sizes (or eliminate minimums entirely if you can meet all open space and set back requirements) in low-density zones to allow for greater housing density? **No**

If higher density is the best solution, we should focus on areas that provide the highest level of services.

Do you agree with this statement:

In most circumstances, 3 traffic lanes (one each direction and a center turn lane) can carry as many cars as 4 lanes (two each direction with no center turn lane)? **Yes.**

Yes, if the costs are reasonable relative to the benefit, traffic throughput is maintained, and neighborhood cut-through does not grow.

Are you committed to the build out of the Core Arterial Network? **Yes.**

The build-out should proceed if the outcome is positive, the cost is reasonable, and lessons from completed projects are incorporated.

Do you support the plan for Iris Avenue? **Yes,**

Key risks to be monitored are cut-through traffic on Grape & Hawthorn and increased traffic volume from Broadway onto Iris.

Up to 300 word responses for the below

The 10-year Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan update will be complete in weeks. What do you think of the plan? Do you think there are any missed opportunities or shortcomings? What 2-3 parts especially please you about the plan? How will you lead on implementing these important pieces of the plan?

From a 30,000-foot view, the “destination” of the plan is largely admirable. The key is what route will be taken to get there. How do you manage the contradictions within the plan? For instance, at full implementation, housing stock could increase by 40%. Does that increase present a flood risk by reducing natural surfaces that can absorb stormwater? If significant changes to water distribution from the Colorado River occur, does that create risk to our water supply? What parts of the built environment would need to be modified, and how expensive would that be if we significantly increased the number of housing units?

It would be helpful if the report addressed potential impacts from its proposals. It addresses how it meets certain expected needs, though it fails to discuss the impact of those, whether they are achievable today, and how to measure them. I understand, as the report states, that goals can’t be measured solely by numbers; however, providing a framework would be helpful.

The two areas that I am pleased about are Transportation and Agriculture & Food.

I would be pleased to be in a leadership position for all transportation-related items. I am a transportation omnivore, utilizing RTD, walking, biking, and driving as ways to get around the community. This is an area that I am passionate about, and my pragmatic common-sense approach would be valuable. I understand the relationship between transit options, equity, and economic vitality.

By population, the city dominates the pie chart for the BVCP, though by acres, it is the county and specifically Open Space, including Food & Agriculture. These areas are so important to the fabric of the community, and it is great that it is incorporated into the plan.

The City is exploring the creation of a Downtown Development Authority (DDA) to increase investment in our downtown area. Is this the right path for revitalizing downtown Boulder? What do you view as the pros and cons? Are there alternative approaches to improving the economic vitality of downtown Boulder that you are interested in exploring? In general, I do not believe fragmenting the city into siloed revenue sources and spending pools is the best approach. A dedicated tool for downtown improvements is a plus, as is a board of interested parties to efficiently allocate funding.

Fragmenting another slice of city revenue and funding, which reduces the city’s ability to prioritize spending from a single perspective (this already exists) is a concern. Another concern is measuring success: how much of any future change in sales and property

tax revenue would have happened without the DDA? That is challenging, though far from an impossible thing to measure.

More work is needed to resolve several areas of uncertainty, including: 1) the baseline tax year (post-Sundance) 2) whether the sales tax baseline is adjusted for inflation; and 3) how property tax valuation changes are indexed from the baseline year to ensure an apples-to-apples comparison from year to year.

A city-commissioned study from December 2019 identified that occupancy costs for downtown merchants ran 25% higher than outside the studied area. How can that cost be reduced to attract the “missing” concepts that could survive — and ideally thrive — downtown?

Boulder launched its Affordable Commercial Grant Pilot in 2024 to make below-market retail, office, and industrial space available to small businesses. The funding, however, was one-time from ARPA funds. Was this program successful? If so, should funding be sought to continue it?

Simplifying regulations should be a goal regardless of the program. This reduces cost, saves time and makes Boulder a more attractive place for a small business to open. For new & small businesses, Boulder could provide free commercial-lease support, perhaps staffed by volunteers. This type of program could help businesses negotiate lease terms, understand build-out, and efficiently navigate the permitting process.

Title 9 of our city code is our land use code. Some council and community members are advocating for a complete rewrite of this title. Do you support or oppose this, and do you think now is the right time to undertake this? I support modernizing Boulder's Title 9; however, I would be cautious about committing to a complete rewrite before Council clearly defines the problems to solve, the policy guardrails, the budget, and how success will be measured.

Title 9 has grown complicated through decades of amendments. A careful overhaul could make Boulder's land-use rules clearer, more predictable, and easier for residents, businesses, and city staff to use. It could also better align development rules with Boulder's goals.

What specific policy changes and incentives would you support to increase the supply and affordability of market-rate homes for middle-income households in the City of Boulder?

I support increasing housing affordability for Boulder's middle-income households by expanding practical, cost-effective housing options — without treating higher density as the only solution. Housing policy should also account for second-order effects on infrastructure, traffic, parking, tree canopy, and neighborhood character.

Boulder should continue to streamline approvals for projects that meet clear, objective design and infrastructure standards, reducing the delays and uncertainty that drive up housing costs. We should clearly identify which populations are best served by each type of housing and work to increase its supply accordingly, with a stronger emphasis on transitioning existing housing stock to permanently affordable status where appropriate, rather than relying solely on higher-density development.

Increased density, if part of the solution, should be implemented in core areas of the city as opposed to on its edges where services are less robust.

Do you think the current inclusionary housing fees used to produce permanently affordable housing are too high, too low, or just right? What changes would you make, if any, and why?

This is a measurable question. The city should compare the number, type, location, bedroom mix, and delivery timing of housing created with cash-in-lieu v. the on-site option.

If cash-in-lieu is underperforming, the fee should be adjusted or the on-site option strengthened. If it produces more units more efficiently through Boulder Housing Partners or other qualified providers, do not make any changes.

Powerful e-bikes known as “e-motos” have become popular with many community members, particularly teenagers, but some concerns have been raised about their safety on the streets and multi-use paths due to their speed and weight. Should the city be regulating their use more? What type of regulation would you propose?

For Level II e-bikes, and especially Level III e-bikes (along with those modified to exceed Level III performance), the speed differential compared to human-powered bikes & Level I e-bikes can be substantial and create dangerous interactions.

Boulder's multi-use paths have a 15-mph speed limit (8 mph in crosswalks), while Level III bikes can reach 28 mph with no pedal assist.

I think it is prudent to consider banning Level III bikes from multi-use paths and stepping up enforcement in areas most sensitive to e-bikes exceeding multi-use path speed limits. The city should also consider an age requirement for operating Level II and III e-bikes to reduce the chances of serious injuries like those that recently occurred in North Boulder.

Acknowledging that the job of governing requires skillful navigation of competing priorities, what do you think are the city government's current top three priorities? What do you think their top three priorities should be?

I believe the city's current top three priorities are: 1) long-term financial stability; 2) wildfire and public-safety resilience; and 3) housing policy.

I agree with the first two and would replace the third with resident-centered stewardship. We should focus on delivering essential services and infrastructure in a pragmatic, cost-effective manner.

What are three areas of the city budget that you think are ripe for cutting? Are there changes in process or budget allocations that would you actively pursue if you were elected?

Before cutting the budget, we should look for efficiencies — can we deliver the same or a higher level of service with fewer dollars? Are there multiple departments delivering the same or similar services that could be combined? Do we have the right mix of players (staff) to coaches (managers)? Should that be changed?

Over the last 15 years, based on data from the city's CAFRs, the number of FTEs grew 26% while Boulder's population grew 5.7%. Are we seeing a commensurate increase in services?

I would identify duplicative services across city departments and consolidate them and, over time, manage headcount to be consistent with population and revenue.

Boulder County and their use of the Priority-Based Budgeting (PBB) process is a pragmatic approach that makes prioritization especially explicit. Should a PBB

approach be the final layer to Boulder's outcomes-based approach? I believe that would be a valuable way to provide a fiscal overlay to the current approach.

As you've watched Boulder's Council over the past five to ten years, among the hundreds of decisions they've made, which one do you most celebrate? And which one do you most regret?

Wildfire resilience is the decision I most celebrate. When the wind picks up over Boulder, there is a distinct rise in anxiety — and a periodic glance west to check for smoke. Taking prudent, cost-effective action to harden the city against fire is exactly the kind of decision-making I applaud.

The decision I most regret is CU South. I recognize the need to provide flood mitigation; however, the “price” paid in this case was too high.

Is there anything else you want us to know about your candidacy and how it relates to Better Boulder's mission? [OPTIONAL]

Yes, as mentioned in answering the questions, I am in broad agreement with the goals of Better Boulder. If elected, I would seek consensus through a pragmatic, common-sense approach and not out of any specific ideology.

I would work to gather community input much earlier in the process. Recently, it has felt as though council has already made up its mind on an issue and then asks staff to develop three to five “options.” After sitting through extensive and passionate public comment, Council ultimately selects Option 3 with minor changes. The process can feel less like a genuine response to community input and more like an illusion of choice.

Thank you for considering me for your endorsement.