



Jan Burton

Website: www.janforboulder.com
Email: jan@janforboulder.com
Facebook: facebook.com/janforboulder/
Twitter: [@janburtonco](https://twitter.com/janburtonco)

Besides being in love with Boulder, tell us who you are and what the most compelling reason is for why you're running for City Council?

My name is Jan Burton, and I moved to Boulder 9 years ago after the death of my husband. I became involved in several music non-profits, and I was encouraged to run for City Council in the last election. I'm an environmentalist, an outdoors person, a business person, a gran, and a life-long learner.

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, transportation, or the arts. Plus, I'll be the budget watchdog.

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?

We are blessed with a dynamic, diverse economy and employment base. Our employers are environmentally-conscious, committed to the ethos of Boulder, and tolerant of our demands. I would stay out of the way of the Chamber, the Boulder Economic Council, and our businesses, and let them get on with what they are doing in this strong economy. I would continue with the economic vitality programs we have done as a city to encourage our start-ups and businesses. I would continue to focus on developing the Hill and supporting our businesses.

Sales tax is the biggest source of revenue for the city. YTD, we are growing at .9%, as opposed to a 5.11% growth across Colorado municipalities. So, we have reason for concern. A large source of our

decline is retail grocery. Part of this is the exit of Walmart, but it may have to do with the sugary drink tax, or with our neighboring cities building more shopping for their citizens (our commuters). Whatever the source of decline, we need to monitor our sales tax revenue and budget accordingly.

One of the biggest issues for our employers is the cost of housing for their employees. Regularly, their employees travel from outside the City and even the County to afford their housing. In addition, cost-of-doing-business has increased, and those costs must be passed on. This is a concern that must be dealt with. City fees and taxes must generate value to the community to justify their costs to our businesses.

One of my priorities is to improve cost-of-living issues for all income levels. With the recent exit of Walmart, we lost a grocery provider to lower income levels. I have asked the City and the Chamber to recruit Aldi as a lower cost, environmentally-friendly alternative. The City must always consider that we need shopping choices for everyone.

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

The cost of housing, transportation, and overall cost-of-living are the biggest concerns from a human service perspective. Many people on lower or limited incomes have trouble making ends meet, even working multiple jobs, and 7000 of our residents live under the Federal Poverty level. This disproportionately impacts our Latino community. Homelessness is on the rise, caused by the fact that we don't have enough low-cost housing. Mental health care is also an area of huge concern. We've seen our Police force become our de-facto social workers.

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?

We have learned that there is trickle down to our affluence and skyrocketing housing costs. The City of Boulder must allocate more money (and we have authorized it) to our excellent regional service providers to provide more services to our citizens. In addition, we must get more serious about increasing affordable housing. We should ensure we alleviate our own taxation and fees that get passed down to renters and businesses, which then get passed down to the ultimate consumer. We need to recruit an affordable grocer like Aldi to replace Walmart.

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?

Debt service is \$2.825 million/year. This is a considerable expense. However, the Boulder Community Hospital is the tenant there through 2019, so they are paying the utilities and rent through that time (utilities are \$1M/year). We need to do full and complete community involvement to determine the best use of the land and draw up the best plans for the entirety of Boulder. It should be a high priority, and I believe it should be a model “mixed use” area where people can live, work, shop, and go to school, and it should be tied in to the entire Broadway corridor plan. Affordable housing for all levels should be the highest priority, and we should be creative about addressing different housing types: micro-units, coops, co-housing, etc.

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?

I would have to see the trend lines to determine if 30% is achievable. We’re currently at 10%, and more men than women/families commute by bike. There would need to be more north south routes, preferably not on main car thoroughfares, for families to feel safe. We should make this a bigger priority. The promotion of electric bikes could be beneficial for everyone, especially older people and women. It will be interesting to see what happens with the current e-bike promotion going on in Boulder County (I plan to buy one, and two of my friends have already purchased). Safety concerns are real. As someone who has recently been hit while on my bike, I have become very observant. We need non-distracted and considerate car and bike riders, and we need to ensure the left-hand turn lanes are protected at key intersections. I would consider a small bike licensing fee, educational programs around laws and safety, and using Community Cycles or another organization to promote safe biking. Oh, and if we could just get rid of some of these beastly hills, we might get more riders.

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

Coming right out of our Transportation Master Plan: “Three ingredients work together to provide the fertile ground necessary for a Transportation Demand Management Plan to be effective in providing individuals with transportation choices. These ingredients include 1) land use with a sufficient mix and density of land uses in the right places; 2) place making and attractive urban design which integrates with our transportation system, and 3) a comprehensive transportation system that provides multiple choices and

is seamless between modes of travel.” We have begun to execute this plan at Boulder Junction, and I believe it will be a fine example of land use, housing, and transportation (when we really make it a hub). Some of our biggest employers are located along Arapahoe, but we have done nothing to execute against the vision. In fact, the planning of transportation and land use within the City are still separate. We need to demonstrate action by completing a plan for the Arapahoe Corridor (into the County and neighboring towns) that truly integrates land use, housing, and transportation. Rtd needs to get on-board, but we need to be open to consider more flexible transportation options than buses, and we need to acknowledge that cars are still most people’s choice. Picking on car drivers in non-productive. We need to be open to density along the corridor, limit or charge for parking, and offer transportation alternatives.

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 all love our Open Space. We have sufficiently surrounded our City with a stunning moat of environmental, recreational, and agricultural value of 45,000 acres (before the recent acquisition of the Boulder Valley Farm). Open Space Mountain Parks (OSMP) is commencing a Master Plan, something that has never been done before, to address the future strategy and use of the most valuable asset in the City of Boulder. It is time to begin spending more money on management of our assets rather than acquisition. We need to protect the land from fire, inappropriate use, and potential over-use. As an OSMP volunteer raptor monitor, protection of land and species is a very high priority for me, but we must balance that with recreational use of all types in areas where the land can sustain it. I believe that by getting people on the land, especially when they are young, they will respect it, value it, and help to steward it. Let’s not get in religious battles; let’s listen to each other and truly come up with a balanced plan.

The skyrocketing usage associated with the huge population increase on the Front Range is a concern, so we must plan how to manage that. We should look at spreading usage among multiple properties, plan with the county and other cities/counties, and put the right management plans in place, including the possibility of charging out-of-city residents for parking or usage.

I can’t respond to a hypothetical property usage, but I can say that for the recent acquisition of the Boulder Valley Farm, it has been a long-term ranching operation. There is wetland; there are eagles and other species that we should protect. But, it has been an operational ranch for many, many years, and it has oil and gas operation on-site, so let’s be realistic. Should we get in a fight to make it a Habitat Conservation Area? We should use an operational ranch to educate young people (and adults) about where their food comes from*, and we should run trials to grow sustainable crops for people, rather than animals. We should encourage recreation on the site, and we should tie it in to a coordinated county and city-owned Open Space paths that can be used by all, without having to drive. (*16 Million Americans think chocolate milk comes from brown cows. I’m sure none of those people live in Boulder).

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?

Climate change is the biggest problem faced by humanity. Moving to the use of 100% clean energy is of paramount importance for Boulder, Colorado, the U.S., and the world. I have supported the goals of renewable energy and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and I have supported the goals of the muni project. However, I am a realist and have not been satisfied with our progress. We have been slowed to a crawl from legal and regulatory challenges, and in the meantime, we are not progressing toward a more energy-efficient future. I support the community being able to vote on the three ballot measures, so we can see if they still support spending the kind of money we need to spend to continue this effort. I will be closely watching the PUC decision in September to see how difficult and time-consuming the effort will continue to be.

We've spent 7+ years and close to \$20M, and we're asking the voters for another \$16.5M to get to a "go/no-go" decision. Then, we'll have hundreds of millions of dollars of separation costs, stranded costs, and condemnation. Will other cities be able to model what we've done? I doubt it and question if the solution to clean energy for the country will be accomplished by each city municipalizing. If we get a discouraging decision from the PUC or if the voters decide not to support the utility occupation tax, I would encourage the City of Boulder to work with Denver, Aurora, and other cities in Colorado on a common solution that could have a greater impact on climate change. We should also encourage our legislators, and the entire state legislature, to apply pressure to Xcel to switch to clean energy much faster to encourage the PUC to make renewables a higher priority. This is much more realistic approach, at a lower cost, to achieve REAL change.

In addition to working with other cities and the State of Colorado on our electric generation, we should look to solar farms, the transportation sector (see below), and our buildings, and land use as ways to improve our emissions targets.

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?

We haven't seen an increase in bus ridership in over 20 years, and my discussions with potential bus commuters aren't fruitful. We will need to work with our largest employers with in-commuters to develop some creative alternatives for their employees: Uber, van-commuting, driverless cars, etc. I believe we need to widen some roads like Arapahoe to accommodate current needs, and we need more park 'n ride options for those who would ride a bus. Of course, we need Rtd bus routes to operate more often, but we won't get that until we get more density. So, land use reform is a key to the puzzle.

For Boulder, I am a huge fan of electric vehicles. We need to put a priority on them as gasoline cars become a greater and greater percentage of our emissions. We should set an aggressive goal of eliminating gas vehicles by 2040 and put the plans and metrics in place to accomplish it. Things we could do include: 1) convert the city's fleet; 2) build more charging stations; 3) educate the public about electric vehicles, ranges, etc.; 4) engage with automobile dealers and manufacturers to get more models stocked in Boulder; 5) work with local businesses to get them to adopt and promote EV's, encourage them to build charging stations for their employees and customers; 6) promote shared EV's by providing central charging depots for Uber, Lyft, etc. I would recommend one full-time employee to manage this, and I would encourage the Environmental Advisory Board to become more engaged and accountable for the success of the program.

Also for Boulder, we must continue to invest in safe biking. I would build more north-south bike routes and encourage electric bikes. I would do a PR campaign on e-bikes, featuring older residents and women and promote safety.

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?

The Danish Plan promoted a dense urban core, surrounded by green space. We have surrounded our city with green space (Open 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 seriously regarding the built environment, allowing for more dense 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.

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?

I do support the inclusionary housing requirements, at the level Council agreed on earlier in the year (12%). I feel it’s the right balance of adding cost to development (which will get passed on) and building a fund for affordable housing. I have my doubts about including it for middle income housing. I fear it will add too much cost to a normal person’s dwelling. I call it “clearing out the middle” because new middle income workers won’t be able to afford it. We will have people on the extreme high income level and on the very low. Wiping out the middle: is that what we want?

You want data? From the study: “A 5% middle income inclusionary housing obligation represents an additional cost of \$9-\$12/square foot for most project types, which would represent an increase of 37-54% over the cost of satisfying Boulder’s existing 20% inclusionary requirement.” Folks, that is real money. Who will pay for this? Some people think the developers will pay. No, that will not happen. The developers will pass the cost to the renters, thus making housing even more unaffordable for our workers. The study went on to say: “A new 5 percent requirement could be absorbed by a 10-15% decrease in land values.” Who here thinks land values will decrease by that amount?

The report cautions that if developers are not able to afford sites, housing production could be constrained for a period until values recover. There you have it. Supply and demand does impact housing prices. So, I am not supportive of adding more cost to our workers who are already burdened by high cost of living.

One more thing: we could do a simple thing to expedite affordable housing through the arduous planning process. If we cut the process from 1.5 years to 3 months, the carrying costs and risk would be lessened, and the developer could pass the cost savings to the renters/homeowners.

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?

ADU’s are a great in-fill option for our community. They add incremental housing in smaller units, managed by homeowners on their own property. For the property owner, an ADU can provide income, helping many people stay in their home. In addition, for older homeowners, they can rent to someone who can help them on the property or even move into the ADU and rent their main home (or let their kids move in). For the renter, they have an opportunity to live in a neighborhood setting, and the renters typically integrate successfully into the neighborhood. Studies show that car usage is lower among ADU dwellers, so parking and

traffic do not become issues. Environmentally, they are a dream, driving up density slightly without the negative side effects of large developments.

62% of our citizens supported ADU’s in the Boulder Valley Comp Plan study. They are absolutely an appropriate affordable housing tool that should be mainstreamed into the community. And for those people who suggest they should be deed-restricted, I don’t understand that concept at all. This country was founded on individual property rights. Let’s not screw things up by making it too complicated.

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

As with everything, there should be balance in growth and development. We all feel negative about the current level of development, but it was at a standstill during the 2009-2012 economic downturn. On balance, we have still grown .7% over the past 10 years (housing units), under our growth limit of 1%.

The City has done an admirable job in controlling growth, as dictated by the Blue Line, the Danish Plan, and by City charter. It’s why we all love Boulder so much. Surrounded by Open Space, limited by growth and height limits, it still feels like a small town (albeit growing in the past few years, and strangled with traffic at times). But, compared to surrounding communities, we have managed the growth superbly.

The downside of our excellent growth management is that we are unaffordable and completely non-diverse. So, we must decide what we want to be. Do we want to be an elderly, wealthy white community or a thriving diverse community? If we want to become more diverse and affordable, we will have to make decisions that increase the availability of housing. But in a balanced way.

Regarding the jobs/housing imbalance, I believe most people support having jobs in our community, as evidenced by our Community Surveys. We are lucky that we have businesses that can still afford to base their operations in Boulder.

We just spent \$4M developing the 2015 Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan. We need to prioritize activities to move toward execution of that plan. It should be a measured, well-thought-out plan, executed over time. And it should include a view of the entire county and beyond regarding housing and transportation.

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?

I just met with PLAN Boulder to review their Housing Strategy. While I didn't agree with everything in the plan, we came to a large degree of consensus. I will request the City to analyze some of their recommendations, and I hope to support them in making something happen. While I know they will not endorse me in this election, there is no reason we shouldn't work together to accomplish what we do agree on.

The City recently hosted a group to analyze public involvement. While I don't agree with all their recommendations, I can find some things to latch onto. We really must work together if we're going to achieve our environmental goals (especially).

Finally, I'd like to address the notion of "change". Most people detest change. All of this is about change management. It's a tough cultural and social issue that is not easy to solve. We should involve some of our best leaders in the community and try to get more broad representation from people who don't normally participate in the process.

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

Housing is the most important issue. I will continue to study the subject, read books, meet with all sides on the issue, and try to become more knowledgeable. I will try to get Council to simplify our codes and processes, and I will support initiatives and developments that focus on affordable housing. I am passionate about providing "housing first" for our un-housed, especially families with kids, and I will be looking to clear the roadblocks.

As a Boulder City Council member what kind of legacy will you look to leave?

After two years, it's very difficult to say what my legacy could be. I try to listen actively more than talk. I act on citizen issues and try to hold the city accountable. I am a budget and expense watchdog, and I believe in good governance. I will continue to focus on using our tax dollars to pay for the basics: firemen, police, fixing the roads and bike lanes, flood and safety plans. I will push that we become more efficient in our operations and that we spend money on the right things. I support the arts and want the arts to become a bigger priority for the City. I will commit to putting in the work, being a balanced and common-sense thinker, acting with 100% integrity, and mentoring any young person who gets on Council. I won't overstay my welcome.