



Mary Young

Website: youngforcouncil.org

What do you see as the vital components to the future of Boulder's economic vitality and what specific strategies would you support as a City Councilmember to maintain a vibrant economy?

A sustainable economy (per BVCP) promotes *a diverse economy that supports the needs of all community members*. Boulder is falling behind in two primary areas that create vitality: 1) Lack of available workers with specialized skills (non-university technical training) and 2) Rising rents for small commercial businesses either displacing them or causing their demise. The city currently doesn't have a way to protect these small businesses from rising rents in privately owned buildings.

To address:

#1 I would: Work with employers, educators and partners to develop and support programs designed to provide workforce training opportunities that also meet the human services goal of economic mobility.

#2 I would: Ensure that in the update of the Economic Sustainability Strategy the city adopt some or all of the strategies recommended in the [ILSR Report](#) among which are strategies that reduce the power imbalance in tenant/landlord negotiations and recognizing businesses at cultural landmarks.

What do you believe are the most pressing human service needs in the City of Boulder and why?

Poverty - Excluding college students, approximately 7,000 residents live in households earning under the Federal Poverty Guidelines (FPG), an annual income of ~ \$24,000 for a family of four; nearly 50 percent of Boulder residents live in households earning < 300 percent FPG, ~ \$74,000 annual income for a family of four.

Equity and Inclusion - The Boulder Community Perception Assessment report identified that non-majority community members and newcomers report a small, but persistent lack of inclusion (local lack of exposure to diversity, micro-aggressions, affordability.) The CPA also identified the lack of affordable housing, access to basic living supplies and representation in local government as factors creating these perceptions of inequity.

Family Homelessness - Single parent households (often headed by women) are more susceptible to economic hardships, especially when fleeing domestic abuse. Fifty percent of homeless individuals in Boulder are families.

What do you believe is the appropriate role for the City of Boulder in addressing human service needs (e.g. housing, food, health care) for low income/marginalized people in our community?

Boulder is one of very few municipalities that taxes themselves for Human Services and has a Human Services Department. That role is usually filled by counties. Boulder's role should be as:

Service Provider – in circumstances involving an expressed desire of the community, a service need that cannot be met through other sectors, or a service that requires such a broad collaborative effort or institutional capacity that it is appropriate for the city to provide.

Funder – awarding approximately \$2.1 million to community agencies for programs and services to Boulder residents that align with the community's most pressing needs.

Partner – funding to community agencies to provide community services and partnering with other organizations, governments and community members to plan for emerging social needs.

The City has spent a considerable amount of money on buying the Boulder Community Hospital site. The site currently sits vacant and debt service accrues. Should this project be accelerated and how should it be developed?

The city purchased the site in December of 2014 with 10 year callable Certificates of Participation (COPs) with a call date of 2026 or after. This means we can call, or buy back, any debt with a maturity date of 2026 or later. To do so, the city would need to pay the debt holders the remaining principal and accrued interest at the time – that number would high (~ \$24 million). Doing the math, other than the slightly higher yield, it would be pretty much a wash to pay off the \$24 million in 2026.

So, in essence, we are committed to 20 years worth of annual debt service dollars (~ \$2.825 million) regardless of process pace and redevelopment time. I support good process and including input from a broad spectrum of community members per the recommendations of the Public Participation Working Group and guiding principles set by City Council in 2017.

Do you support the Transportation Master Plan's goal of increasing the mode share of bicycles from 10% to 30% by 2035 to achieve the community's environmental and livability goals? If so, what concrete steps do you propose to achieve this and how do you anticipate doing that while maintaining safety for cyclists and motorists alike?

Yes. The key to achieving these goals is outlined within the city's Towards Vision Zero. While the vision consists of engineering, education, enforcement and evaluation, I think that real progress could be made through the formation of a Community Advisory Group (CAG) to assist with program implementation. This group could be made up of folks that experience the hazards and barriers on a day to day basis. In 2017, the City Council identified key initiatives (e.g. impaired travel /outreach /enforcement) to be accelerated and allocated \$150,000 to maximize safety efforts. I look forward to the outcome of these particular initiatives and the appointment of the CAG to increase safety and the number of folks on bikes.

What strategies do you support regarding land use, housing and transportation policies and programs to address the impacts of our in-commuting workforce?

Commercial development growth potential outstrips residential development potential per current zoning. More jobs create a greater demand for housing, putting upward pressure on prices. We need to bring this into balance. Employment and thus commuting patterns, are too variable to expect to stop in-commuting through housing all the in-commuters.

We have made a policy choice to be a Regional Job Center (RJC) (BVCP 5.02), with that we destined ourselves to a certain amount of in-commuting workforce. The types of jobs being created are trending toward importing workers from outside the area (vs. creating jobs that satisfy local employment needs.)

Our strategies should embrace a regional approach that optimizes transit links to outlying communities who have housing that is more affordable than Boulder's. The whole region should contribute to the housing pool to support RJC employment.

Tell us your vision for open space moving forward, including specifically the challenges regarding the success of huge visitation. Would you prioritize either protection or recreation on a hypothetical new property?

We have created an asset in our city that both nurtures us and plagues us. Chautauqua currently receives more visitors than Rocky Mountain National Park, with the number of visitors at Mt. Sanitas close behind. This is good for our economy, but bad for the land and the flora and fauna which it nurtures. Add to that the following factors: climate change and fire risk, rise in homeless transients choosing to camp there, diminishing funding for Open Space and you have a wicked problem in formulating a broadly acceptable stewardship plan. My vision for Open Space is to honor the charter and make whatever sacrifices we need to to be truly good stewards of the land.

As for the hypothetical, I need more information regarding location, qualities or provenance of site to provide a thoughtful opinion.

Do you support Boulder's drive to municipalize its electric utility? If so, what are the limits on taxpayer dollars and time you are prepared to spend to achieve that goal and, if not, how do you propose to achieve Boulder's renewable energy goals?

Yes. The municipalization project is everything in our ability to achieve Boulder's Climate Commitment (100% clean energy by 2030, 80% emissions reduction by 2050.) It also proves whether any municipality, in practicality, really does have the constitutional right to extricate itself from a regulated monopoly. Boulder's effort will determine which way the whole state goes. Council was careful in crafting the Utility Occupation Tax, being careful not to diminish the reserves for very long, an indication of unwillingness to spend from the general fund and an indication as to limits. If we cannot municipalize, the effort moves to change things at the state level and gains momentum through support of all the other municipalities within the state that have been carefully watching the outcome of Boulder's effort. I would support municipalizing if the PUC rules in our favor. If not, I would support a strong effort at the state level.

What transportation solutions would you suggest to ease congestion, especially resulting from 49,000 in-commuters, specifically those that drive alone? Would you favor solutions to improve roads and parking; bus or other transportation; cycling and walking, or some combination thereof? How would you fund transportation improvements? Do you favor higher parking costs and other disincentives to driving?

See Transportation section of #6 above. Some combination. Transportation improvements should be funded through development impact fees. Yes on higher parking costs, but should be mindful of low wage workers who have no choice but to drive.

Despite Boulder's reputation as a "green" community, our per-capita carbon footprint is pretty high. How can we shape our built environment and transportation systems for lower impact?

Wealth begets bigger houses, higher resource consumption, more driving, more flying; hence resulting in a bigger carbon footprint. It can be mitigated by constraining consumption (house size), constraining driving (both in reducing road access and constraining parking), enhancing transit (both the network, dedicating bus lanes and by eliminating barriers with programs like EcoPass), electric car infrastructure and enhancing biking and walking options. Mixed use development and densifying in certain areas like major community transit network corridors (under the backdrop of sub-community, area and/or neighborhood planning) are also appropriate approaches. And critically, a municipally owned electric utility predominantly powered by renewables would take the biggest bite out of the Boulder's carbon apple. And, of course, building energy efficiency measures.

Do you support Boulder's inclusionary housing ordinance requirements to produce permanently affordable housing? Should the requirements include permanently affordable middle income housing? And, what do you think is the appropriate mix of permanently affordable rental versus ownership units?

The IH program is an important tool for addressing housing affordability, but it is insufficient. Relying on creating 80% unaffordable housing units to provide 20% affordable does little to maintain the percentage of affordable units relative to overall units. The percentage IH should be expanded to also include middle income (in process.) Real strides could come from preservation of housing that is already affordable to middle income households (currently mostly rental.) To accomplish this, the city should outright buy or facilitate residents buying their apartment complexes, mobile home parks etc.

There isn't a universal advantage to owning a home over renting when considering all the costs of ownership including maintenance and opportunity costs. Transactions costs alone require a minimum of 5 years recovery. Low and moderate income households have less stable jobs, are more likely to move and may not own a home long enough to recover their original investment.

Accessory dwelling units – otherwise known as “granny flats” – have been considered as one option for expanding affordable housing options in established neighborhoods. Please explain your position on whether or not ADUs are an appropriate affordable housing tool for our community?

Yes, ADUs are appropriate, with two caveats, size should not exceed 1,000 sqft (average house size in 1950 was 983 sqft) and should be deed restricted to provide true affordability over time.

What's your vision for Boulders growth and development over the next 20 years?

It is 2037. Boulder's neighborhood planning efforts have been completed for 10 years. Neighborhood plans have served as vehicles for evolution. Because of these plans, change has occurred at a pace that has kept residents satisfied. The development process, modified nearly 20 years ago, works well. Every redevelopment proposal that has received height exemptions provides community amenities highly valued by the community. Solar powered autonomous vehicles have reduced traffic by nearly 80%. All residents are very mobile and can get to where they need to go easily and affordably (low cost municipal solar power!) thanks to forward thinking policies on driverless cars. The vast majority of parking structures have been adaptively re-used as storage units. Storage units have been remodeled to serve as housing. Boulder is still very desirable, but so are all other communities along the front range thanks to smarter land use policies throughout the United States.

What are your specific strategies for promoting civil public discourse around growth and development? Please indicate what level of commitment you would have in regards to collaboration, consensus building and joint problem solving to address this issue?

The Public Participation Working Group spent the better part of a year developing recommendations for good public engagement: A clearly defined problem, thoughtfully planned public engagement, all voices are encouraged and included, public contribution and civil participation are fostered, process is trustworthy and transparent process. These core principles should be applied to conversations around growth and development. I have a high level of commitment to collaboration, consensus building and joint problem solving and worked at bringing both sides to the middle on one particularly contentious issue last year. We must all unbury our heels for good public discourse to occur.

What is the most important issue to you in Boulder and what kind of leadership will you provide for addressing it?

Throughout the last few years I have spent much time cultivating relationships with communities that do not feel welcome in this town. They include people of color and low income folks. I have spoken up for these communities in many ways and on the many issues that come before council. I have learned that, even though the city of Boulder strives to be inclusive, it is often not. This was confirmed in findings of the Community Perceptions Survey. This work has raised my awareness on how our slice of the world here in Boulder could be improved. A million little things will add up to making our city truly more welcoming and inclusive. I will continue to lead on this work and welcome any and all allies.