Ryan Schuchard's Response to the PLAN-Boulder 2026 Candidate Questionnaire

Correspondence: ryan@ryanwithboulder.com and 415-283-6711

September 7, 2026

Open Space

1. *This fall, Boulder citizens are being asked to approve a $400 million bond issue to pay for backlogged maintenance on rec centers and fire/police facilities. Unaccounted for in this funding source is about a $30 million backlog of deferred maintenance of Open Space and Mountain Park trails. What priority would you place on addressing this backlog and where should the funds come from? Are there policies that should be passed to prevent future trail maintenance backlogs?*

Priority: High priority. Open Space is what makes Boulder Boulder. And Open Space needs resources to keep it the Open Space we know and love, for rerouting trails with issues, doing drainage and erosion control, building bridges, resurfacing, and more.

OSMP's backlog should be a part of Council's emerging conversation on strengthening council oversight of facilities and infrastructure maintenance generally. We need a better way to track, plan, and prioritize maintenance across the city's entire portfolio, and OSMP is central to this work.

Where the funds should come from: I am not sure yet. My starting point is to seek guidance from staff and OSBT. I would also want to fully understand the perspective of PLAN-Boulder, which has been part of protecting this system since before it was a city program at all, helping establish Boulder's Open Space program in the first place.

A couple of ideas I would like to put to you for feedback: Is there untapped potential to frame projects as having co-benefits (e.g., supporting recreation and fire protection together) that could widen the sources of possible outside funding?

Also, what are the opportunities and limitations around a user fee for non-resident visitors who use and put wear on a trail system that are currently funded by Boulder taxpayers? Or are there other ways to align the OSBT funding with the interests of its users?

One thing I do know is we need to embark on a significant project to protect our community from wildfire, a process that must involve OSBT, and there needs to be a lot of care put into investments that are cost-effective and create the most impact for the money. One of the ways to do that is for the city to lead development of a marketplace of affordable services for home hardening, encouraging private homeowners to invest in their own properties and giving us efficient mechanisms to roll out hardening at a large scale. The less OSMP has to spend on its own wildfire mitigation because that marketplace is pulling in private investment, the more room there is in Open Space's budget for exactly this kind of trail work.

I would welcome the chance to further discuss these and other ideas with you.

Preventing the next backlog: Two ideas. First, make sure OSMP's needs are well-understood to the community in the context of other unfunded needs, both in terms of facilities deferred maintenance as well as a constraint to be mindful of as people look to Open Space to play a bigger role in wildfire protection.

Second, we need a committee or task force that looks at the city's facilities backlog as a whole, and Open Space needs to be part of that process. Alongside that, I want standardized, citywide reporting on deferred maintenance across every department, the same public dashboard for long-term financial health I'm pushing for through council's Long-Term Financial Strategy Committee.

2. *What level of wildfire mitigation funding should be the responsibility of Open Space and Mountain Parks?*

Wildfire mitigation is a distributed, citywide issue, and every department needs skin in the game, alongside private investment from property owners. Open Space is where a lot of that work has to happen, given how much of the wildland-urban interface sits on OSMP land, but

that doesn't mean Open Space should be the one paying for most of it. It's a venue for wildfire hardening, but not necessarily the financial underwriter. As discussed in the previous response, we effectively do not yet have a market for wildfire hardening services, and until we do, it is difficult to put numbers to public investments.

This question is live right now. The Open Space Board of Trustees voted 4-1 in July to recommend asking voters to add wildfire mitigation explicitly to the charter's list of Open Space purposes. Since then, staff has advised council that this work is allowed, and council is now contemplating next steps. I think in practice this will be a conversation for the next council to consider at their workplan setting session in January. More detail is on my wildfire priorities page at ryanwithboulder.com/wildfire.

Open Space has a history of not keeping up with its own maintenance, which is what's behind the trail backlog in the previous response. And its dedicated funding has drawn interest before from people who'd like to redirect it to other city priorities, interest that Boulder voters have turned back each time by choosing to keep it dedicated to Open Space's own purposes. Given that history, piling a new, open-ended wildfire funding obligation onto Open Space's budget on top of its own maintenance needs is not the approach. We need to fund our needs with a approach balanced across the city and thoughtful about pursuing non-city investments and using money well.

Wildfire Mitigation

3. *Given our high risk from wildfires and limited resources, what 2 or 3 measures should Council prioritize in the city's code, staffing and financial resources, and the council bully pulpit? Who should be responsible and where should the money come from?*

Priorities, in order: First, set an explicit citywide goal for collective hardening of Boulder's buildings, landscapes, and grid, at a scale that protects the community from a fast-moving wildfire that comes in on a red flag day and outpaces what our emergency responders can handle. That's a ratcheting, probability-driven approach, the highest-risk, easiest wins first, then raising the bar in stages, the same approach I'm applying at my own house. We've already expanded the wildland-urban interface hardening zone from about 4,600 to more than 16,000

properties and adopted new construction and landscaping standards. Next is holding the whole city to that same standard.

Second, build the wildfire hardening services marketplace itself, since it's the mechanism that makes hardening happen at scale. Boulder's free home wildfire risk assessments, one of which I recently got done at my house, tell residents what to fix, but there's no standard service or workflow yet where a single provider picks up that assessment and leads the work through to completion, and under 1 percent of assessments so far have been for rental properties, a gap worth closing. PLAN board member Karen Hollweg has already done some of that legwork herself, tracking down what may be the only local provider offering that kind of full turnkey service and pointing me toward them. They recently came out to evaluate my own house and are putting together a bid now. With that workflow in place, private capital follows the public groundwork, so public money and regulation aren't carrying the load alone.

Third, fix Boulder's power reliability problem with Xcel. Wildfire mitigation and grid reliability have to be solved together, since a shutoff meant to prevent a fire can itself put people at risk if it's not calibrated to actual conditions. But we have a long way to go with this issue. I think it is one of Boulder's most important problems that lacks a sufficient approach between council and staff to have us heading in the right direction. I hope to make real progress on this in my second term.

Responsibility: The city's role is building the shared systems and market infrastructure that individual property owners can't build alone: assessment tools, a vetted contractor network, financing options. Owners and the private market do the work of hardening their own buildings and landscapes.

Funding: Start by building the workflow and user experience that encourages homeowners to make their own investments before committing to a large public spend upfront. From there, take a portfolio approach: outside grants where they're available, Open Space carrying its fair share of wildland-interface risk, and for broader public funding, the facilities bond and the same diversified approach to the city balance sheet that's already working for pavement. This is personal for me. My family left the Bay Area after summers of unlivable wildfire smoke, and my wife worked as an executive at PG&E during their wildfire response and public safety power

shutoffs. California is roughly a decade ahead of Colorado on this, and that experience is part of what drives me here. Full detail is on my wildfire priorities page: ryanwithboulder.com/wildfire.

Environment and Climate Change

4. *What is your understanding of the reliability of Boulder's long term water supply? Do you view it as prudent to carefully match the demand for more development with the ability to provide water into the future? What concerns, if any, do you have about this?*

On reliability: I've toured Boulder's alpine watershed, and seeing firsthand where our water comes from is part of why I want our answer here grounded in science. Two days before our July 31, 2025 study session on water supply, a session I pushed to get on council's calendar, I sent a hotline memo laying out what I wanted covered: how climate change mechanically affects our supply and whether any scenario could show it increasing; Boulder's share of the watershed relative to other users and rights-holders; the split between agricultural and municipal demand, statewide agriculture runs around 87 percent of use against 6 to 7 percent municipal, and what that breakdown looks like for Boulder specifically; and whether there's a known upper limit on the population our watershed can support, since the 2015 BVCP's growth projections were never clearly tied to water supply constraints to begin with.

At the session, staff walked us through Boulder's current picture: about two-thirds of our supply comes from the North and Middle Boulder Creek watersheds, about a third comes from Colorado River headwaters through Northern Water, current demand runs around 17,000 acre-feet a year, and staff tested four 2050 climate and growth scenarios against the reliability standard Boulder set back in 1988. Three of the four scenarios show enough supply to meet current demand through 2050. The fourth, the most severe warming scenario, shows meaningful risk, but it also describes conditions that would upend water availability across the entire western United States.

I pushed for council to move forward on a new Integrated Water Supply Plan to replace the city's 2009 Source Water Plan, calling water one of the most basic and important inputs for life and worth investing in accordingly. Council was unanimous. I also asked staff to build four things into its scope: guardrails on data center water demand, since that's a fast-growing use with

almost no policy in place today; the analytical capability to verify, at a finer scale than a citywide average, whether compact housing delivers the water efficiency we assume it does, a question I'd raised in my hotline memo too, since more infill housing could mean more individual water users in town even as the system runs more efficiently overall, with the net effect depending on how well it's managed; a way to weigh Boulder's own legal water allocation against the wider regional system, tied to the same DRCOG regional housing needs work I'd flagged in writing before the meeting as a place for watershed-wide collaboration; and a standing mechanism for tracking emerging water-cycle science so future councils aren't caught working from outdated assumptions. Water touches nearly everything else I work on, how we plan housing, how people get around, and how we harden this community against wildfire, so I've made a point of staying close to it, not treating it as a side issue.

On matching growth to water supply: Yes, it's prudent, and it's a question I pushed on directly in that pre-meeting hotline memo: how population and housing, as opposed to agriculture and other industrial uses, factor into total demand, both for Boulder and the wider watershed, and whether there's a ceiling on how much population our water supply can support. My view is that there is a ceiling, and I want a specific method behind it, not a guess: take average water use per household, weigh it against the supply scenarios staff walked us through in July, and back into how many households, and how much added population, our supply can support at each reliability level, then test development plans against that number as conservation and climate data evolve. I share the concern that this kind of water-constrained ceiling hasn't been built into our development planning so far.

Boulder's current direction already reflects the right instinct on the housing side: the growth we've legalized is concentrated in compact, infill development near existing infrastructure, a more water-efficient pattern than sprawl, but I don't want to rely on that as a citywide assumption forever. That's part of why I pushed at the study session for staff to build the capability to verify compact housing's water efficiency at a finer scale, confirming it's working as intended, not simply assumed from the unit type, and why I want the next BVCP update to tie housing strategy and growth projections to water supply explicitly, not leave that link implicit the way it's been since 2015.

Concerns: My main concern is that we get ahead of this, and that we do it regionally, not alone. Boulder sits in the South Platte Basin, where demand already exceeds supply, and almost nothing we do on water happens apart from neighboring water users, agriculture, or the

Colorado River system that feeds a third of our supply. That's why I pushed staff to build an analytical way to weigh Boulder's own allocation against the wider regional system, tied to the same regional housing work already underway through DRCOG, a connection I flagged in writing before the meeting as well as during it, and why I value Boulder's existing collaborative watershed stewardship work. It's also why the 2026 renegotiation of the Colorado River Compact, a process historically decided without input from the tribes and communities most affected by it, deserves sustained council attention, not a wait-and-watch posture alone.

On environmental stewardship more broadly: PLAN-Boulder has been Boulder's advocate of last resort on environmental protection and clean water for a long time, and I've come to appreciate that role more over my time on council, especially when it comes to holding a high standard while Boulder juggles growth, wildfire, and water pressures at once. As Boulder considers new industrial water users like data centers, that same vigilance matters. Growth and energy demand can't become the reason we lower our guard on water and air quality.

The city, with pushes from advocates and the community, including me, has made meaningful progress on climate action. Going forward, a big part of that work is holding climate initiatives and traditional environmental conservation together as one commitment, not two, holding the line against industrial pollution and the pressure that comes from Wall Street and other institutional capital looking to profit from Boulder's growth at the expense of clean air and water. Core environmental protection can't fade into the background while the city chases newer priorities. It has to stay visible, and the city has to keep its eye on it.

Governance

5. *How do you see your responsibility as a council member versus the responsibilities of the City Manager and city staff?*

Boulder's council sets policy and direction. The City Manager, who we hire and who reports to us, runs day-to-day operations and directs staff. So my job is to work with my council colleagues to set clear priorities, ask the right questions, and hold the Manager and staff accountable for results, while staff bring the expertise and continuity that make good policy work.

I try to bring that model to every priority: listen first, build a coalition on council since nothing moves without four additional votes, direct staff clearly through the workplan and budget process, not by trying to manage them directly, and use council's oversight tools, memo packet standards, workplan check-ins, budget review, to make sure direction turns into results. There's a part of this that's easy to overlook, and it has less to do with the council-staff interface than with council's own ability to function as a body. No matter how good one councilmember's idea is, it takes a majority to adopt anything, and time for the full council to meet and decide together is scarce. So one of the most important skills for a councilmember is teamwork, and a willingness to build relationships and help the full council find consensus.

Coal ash is a good example. It came on my radar during office hours, when PLAN board member Cindy Warren raised concerns about the cleanup at Xcel's old Valmont plant. The more I looked into it, the more I saw she was onto something: monitoring standards for the cleanup were thinner than the community deserved, and the permitting process alone wasn't going to close that gap. That turned into a collaboration. Working with staff, I sent a hotline to council laying out the case, helped get independent, real-time air quality monitoring written into council's formal letter of expectations to Xcel, and pushed the same standard into the city's coordinated advocacy with the county and the legislature. I took the initiative to show my council colleagues why this mattered, and staff did the work alongside me at every step to turn that into something adopted. What it shows, in part, is that good policymaking takes more than a good idea. It takes knowing how to move one through the mechanics, hotlines, council correspondence, intergovernmental channels, staff partnership, that turn a concern raised at office hours into something the city acts on.

I've also come to value PLAN-Boulder's own role in this system, watching and weighing in on the big, consequential calls this council faces, from the DDA to the airport. That kind of sustained outside attention is part of what keeps council honest about giving the biggest decisions a full public process, not a shortcut.

6. *As a council member, what basic considerations will you apply to your appointments to city Boards and Commissions? And what value would you place on advice to the council from those boards and commissions?*

Appointment considerations: I look for diversity of background and sound judgment, since these are important roles with influence, little day-to-day oversight, and no easy way to recall someone once seated for what can be a long term. I also want appointees whose experience aligns with the decisions our boards and commissions will be asked to help make in the coming years, not a general resume fit.

The value of their advice: This has been one of my top areas of interest since I served on the Transportation Advisory Board myself. Boards and commissions exist to advise city council, but they're widely underused, and most have little direct interaction with council members. I've led the effort to better align annual board and commission recommendations with council's own work planning, and we made progress on that last year. There's still much more to do, and I want to keep building a process where resident expertise on these boards reaches council and shapes what we decide.

City Finances

7. *How do you see the Council's responsibility in setting and reviewing the budget? What changes in process or budget allocations you would actively pursue if you were elected and explain why?*

Council's role: Council's job is to set the direction the budget serves, adopt it, and hold staff accountable for the results it delivers. I take that seriously, and I serve on council's Long-Term Financial Strategy Committee, where I'm working to build a transparent, actionable long-term strategy so major costs are visible years ahead, not discovered mid-crisis, including a public dashboard for the city's long-term financial health to guide decisions as we go.

Changes I'd pursue: Yes, four areas where I want to keep strengthening how we budget.

First, that long-term health dashboard, paired with a stronger, more diversified revenue base consistent with Blue Ribbon Commission recommendations, including gradually rebalancing away from heavy sales tax reliance toward a greater share of property tax. Done right, that shift is revenue-neutral for cost-sensitive households, with guardrails like relief for seniors and lower-

income homeowners, not a tax increase dressed up as reform. I also support repealing TABOR so Colorado communities can invest in what residents need.

Second, holding big decisions like airport obligations, a downtown development authority, or metropolitan district financing to that same dashboard and a long-term-impact evaluation before the proceedings get too far along to change course easily.

Third, better timing and sequencing, so council has a meaningful say at the key junctures for big decisions, including a more organized, deliberate process for considering new directions, one that learns from what's worked and hasn't and methodically culls what no longer serves the city, without making the process so unpredictable that nobody can plan around it. That also means weighing investments against each other for their co-benefits, favoring the ones that deliver multiple outcomes at once over judging every line item in isolation.

Fourth, budget documents that are legible to an average resident, building on the Blue Ribbon Commission's principles, so the tradeoffs behind Boulder's spending are visible to the people who fund it, not only to finance staff. We're headed in the right direction with outcome-based budgeting, and I'm working to support developments planned for release this fall that should be a good step toward translating that framework for the public. Full detail is on my budget priorities page: ryanwithboulder.com/budget.

8. *A citizen group has developed a proposal for the city to hire a Performance Auditor (different than a financial auditor) plus a small supporting staff and an Audit Committee that would report to City Council, with funding in the 2027 budget? Do you support this proposal? Would you make it a high priority for 2027?*

Position: Yes, and I'd make it a priority for 2027.

Rationale: Performance auditing is only as good as how you define the performance you're measuring, and what I'd want this initiative focused on is how council is doing on the transition to outcome-based budgeting, a process we've been moving toward for a few years now through standardized evaluation criteria in council memo packets and a broader shift toward judging

programs by results, not by whether a plan got adopted. A council-based Performance Auditor is a natural extension of that work. My sense is the biggest opportunities this uncovers won't be about waste. They'll be about service quality, achieving more for residents in day-to-day experience, permitting is a good example, focused on outcomes and lessons learned, not compliance for its own sake. I'd want the office's reporting lines and the Audit Committee's composition and independence worked through carefully as it's designed, so the scope of what gets audited is clear enough to be useful from the start.

9. *Do you support the $400 million tax measure and associated bond issuance that will total $650 million, known as the Recreation and Safety Bond, to address deferred maintenance of seven city buildings that will be on the ballot in November? Why or why not? For incumbents: Has your position changed, and how?*

Position: Yes, I support it, and I'll be voting yes myself. Of the more than $500 million in deferred maintenance across Boulder's public buildings, more than $400 million is unfunded, hitting our police station, fire stations, and recreation centers hardest. Mark Wallach and I put that number in front of the community earlier this year in an op-ed for Boulder Reporting Lab. That's a bill we're already paying through breakdowns, patchwork fixes, and rising costs that get worse the longer we wait.

The measure would fund a new South Boulder Recreation Center with a lap pool ($65M), an upgraded North Boulder Recreation Center with a co-located Age Well Center ($72M), Fire Stations No. 1 and No. 5 ($7M combined), a rebuilt Public Safety Center and 911 dispatch ($170M), a Municipal Services Center for fleet and emergency operations ($100M), and renovation of the Penfield Tate II building, which will keep housing council and gain new community gathering space ($30M). Full project details are on the city's Recreation and Safety Bond page.

This measure gives voters the option to take care of these facilities citywide at the lowest overall cost over time, and avoid pitting the police station against rec centers in a fight over scraps. There is no savings fund nor padding to cut at a scale that would take care of these buildings on its own, so absent the measure, conditions will keep worsening and eventually show up as service cuts. Voters are approving a ceiling. The measure does not obligate all

$400M to be spent, and each capital investment still comes back to council for approval, project by project, before it happens.

If the city borrows the full $400 million, the owner of a $1 million home would pay about $400 more a year in property taxes over 20 years. Borrowing less, or spreading it out over time, would mean a smaller impact in the early years. Residents can look up their own address with the city's property tax impact tool.

Nevertheless, one thing I advocate is for council to develop a committee or task force to ensure good long-term stewardship of and budgeting for our facilities. My colleague Tina Marquis has raised this idea too, and I support building it out, feeding into the same public dashboard on the city's long-term financial health I'm pushing for through the Long-Term Financial Strategy Committee.

Has it changed: No, my position hasn't changed since I supported referring this to voters on August 6.

Rationale: As a member of the Long-Term Financial Strategy Committee, I led the charge, alongside Mark Wallach and Nicole Speer, to bring this backlog into the public's eye, including co-authoring that op-ed, with the goal of making the public part of the decision, not leaving it for a future council to inherit. The measure builds on the city's 2021 Facilities Master Plan, adopted not long before I joined council, the first time Boulder had a complete, expert view of its entire building portfolio.

I understand the sticker shock residents are feeling. I feel it too, which is exactly why I helped bring this forward as soon as possible, before it kept compounding. The $400 million figure wasn't staff proposing the maximum amount. It was a unanimous recommendation from the Long-Term Financial Strategy Committee, which wanted to bring forward the approach that saves the community the most money over time while taking care of everyone, not the smallest number that could get by for now. That's still the right approach today, which is the other reason my position hasn't shifted. I've also been clear, including from the dais, that a measure this size has to come with accountability, cost efficiency, useful reporting on how the money is spent, and a budget process residents can follow, and the city is on track for that.

Public Safety

10. *How do you view the city's current state of public safety? What 2 or 3 specific things do you think council needs to change?*

Current state: It's inadequate, and it's improving under this council. We're not where we need to be yet, but the direction is right.

What needs to change: I want to keep building out problem-solving policing focused on root causes, the thinking behind investments like the day services center and a safe-systems approach to street design. I support moving the day services shelter forward so people experiencing homelessness have an alternative to the street, and I'm working with colleagues on a bicycle security and parking initiative so theft and safety concerns don't keep people from using one of Boulder's most affordable ways to get around.

I also want Open Space held to that same standard. As we build out day services and other supportive infrastructure, we have to watch for policy that ends up pushing encampments toward Open Space while leaving the underlying problem unsolved. Open Space needs to stay safe and orderly for the people who hike, ride, and get outside there, and city policy shouldn't create incentives that shift encampments onto it.

Business

11. *What is your view of the issues facing downtown and what would you advocate to address these issues?*

The issues: Downtown's economic downturn is part of a national pattern that hit downtowns hard after COVID. Downtown and University Hill have seen economic decline, rising vacancies, falling property values, and sales tax revenue that hasn't kept pace, and BVSD has lost roughly

3,600 students citywide over the past decade, part of the same broader strain on families staying in Boulder.

Council recently split 4-4 on referring a downtown development authority (DDA) to voters, so it didn't move forward this cycle. I voted no, and I stand by that vote.

The DDA is interesting theoretically. It proposes to make investments that lead to higher city revenues, which grow the pie for the whole community. It then takes a share of those benefits for new dedicated purposes downtown, while keeping the wider budget whole and ideally better off.

But this approach requires serious standards, two of which we did not meet. First, an evidence-based change model or investment thesis that spells out more concretely what investments are going to be made and why we think they will lead to higher revenues. Key questions, which I raised at council on August 6, need to be answered before approving such a plan: how much revitalization should concentrate on commercial vacancies versus the wider public realm, what role private building owners, managers, and investors should play and what moves them, how much public investment should go to public amenities versus refurbishing private buildings and inducing private deals, and what tools exist besides spending money. These are foundational questions that need to be addressed at the city council level to authorize the work.

The second standard is buy-in from voters representing the whole city, and from other key partners like the county and the library, whose citywide dedicated taxes the DDA's tax increment financing would have reached into. The idea of the DDA is that it would benefit them. That's part of what drove so much of the opposition, though. Open Space, transportation, and parks are all funded through their own voter-approved dedicated taxes, and a DDA's tax increment financing could have pulled future growth in that revenue toward downtown instead of the purposes voters approved it for. Protecting Open Space's dedicated funding from that kind of diversion matters on its own. And the DDA also creates a lot of questions and potential concerns, including how one sets the baseline year (and the risks involved and the extent to which stakeholders trust this will be done right), and what safeguards are in place in case things don't turn out as theorized. For a DDA that impacts voter-approved dedicated funds to the extent this proposal would have, it needs a really meaningful measure of community support.

What I'd advocate for: We have to improve and revitalize downtown in a way that complements our wider city efforts. My current focus is on three things.

First, I want governance for economic improvement built around Boulder's whole citywide system of shops, services, and public spaces. Downtown and the Hill carry the greatest concentration of today's challenges, and we need to make sure Boulder Junction, North Boulder, and South Boulder, other eastern neighborhoods, and corner cafes and other businesses spread across the rest of the city are a part of this work.

Second, that work needs to include a full range of stakeholders, especially workers. I'm glad to see the restaurant task force my colleagues Nicole and Matt are leading start to dig into what's possible there, and I want to keep lifting up worker cooperatives, building on the work I led to make them a city program area, as a path to local ownership downtown and citywide.

Third, there's a lot of practical work we can do now. I want to pursue permitting and fee reform, work with the Downtown Boulder Partnership on activation initiatives, create a cross-departmental customer service line for businesses, simplify zoning under Title 9, and pilot investments like public restrooms and a transit circulator. And ending Xcel's power outages belongs on this list too, since they've cost downtown businesses revenue and inventory.

Will the DDA itself ever get to a place I'd support? I don't know yet. If something like it, a proposal to reallocate the upside of citywide tax increments to part of the city on the bet that it grows the whole pie, comes forward again, it needs to meet the standards I raised above. And as council and others think about next steps, I will be advocating that whatever we do, we be clear about those end goalposts before making major new commitments of council and staff time.

Transportation

12. *What would you advocate for to address the huge number of in-commuters driving in to Boulder to access their jobs?*

We need better transit, and we need to keep pairing it with gentle increases in infill housing near the jobs and transit people are already using, so fewer people have to commute at all. I want that infill built in ways that serve the people who already live here, including seniors looking to downsize within their own neighborhoods, as much as it serves new arrivals. That means getting Boulder's key multimodal corridors right, which is why I serve on the Colorado 7 Coalition working to improve non-car travel options between Boulder and Brighton and ease congestion on Arapahoe Road at Boulder's edge. I also want to keep exploring novel on-demand transit models, including pilots for on-demand shuttles, so commuters have options beyond a fixed-route bus or a car.

Questions for Mayoral Candidates

13. *What is your view of the role of Mayor versus the role of the council members? What changes would you propose to improve the role of the Mayor without going beyond the limitations in the Charter?*

N/A

14. *What is your view of the relationship between the City Manager and the Mayor?*

N/A

(end)