

From: [Kelly Driscoll](#)
To: [dejo](#)
Subject: RE: Town Engineer Accounting For Deviations
Date: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 3:02:31 PM

Thank you for your comments. These have been added to the public record.

Kelly Driscoll | Planning Manager
Town of Erie | Planning
Phone: 303-926-2774 | Cell: 720-534-1050 |
www.erieco.gov | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

From: debo <debo.eh@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 12:21 PM
To: Planning Commission Board <planning@erieco.gov>
Subject: Town Engineer Accounting For Deviations

External Email: Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi. My name is Robert de Jong and I live in Vista Ridge. I understand that tonight the Planning Commission is hoping to adopt the latest comprehensive plan for the Town of Erie.

I just wanted to voice my support for Matthew Logan's request for the Town Engineer to appear before the Planning Commission on a suggested quarterly basis to account for any deviations in comp plan alternative transportation elements. One example from the past would be the lack of a bicycle lane on Sheridan Parkway, north of Ridge View Dr. (I know that a late decision was made to redirect bicycle traffic to the adjacent and parallel recreational trail.)

Thank you for taking the time to consider my input.

Robert de Jong
2124 Indian Paintbrush Way
Erie, CO 80516

From: [Robert Braudes](#)
To: [Kelly Driscoll](#)
Cc: [Jarod Ballentine](#)
Subject: Fwd: Safety/Standards in comp plan
Date: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 11:41:50 AM

Hi Kelly copying Jarod,

I think we need to take the Planning Commissioners off to prevent open meetings issues.

Thanks,
Bob

Please excuse typos as this was sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Matthew Logan <matt.logan.720@gmail.com>
Date: September 18, 2024 at 10:18:49 AM MDT
To: Jarod Ballentine <jballentine@erieco.gov>
Cc: Emily Baer <ebaer@erieco.gov>, Dan Hoback <dhoback@erieco.gov>, Tim Burns <tburns@erieco.gov>, Martin Laws <mlaws@erieco.gov>, Sherri Booth <sbooth@erieco.gov>, Robert Braudes <rbraudes@erieco.gov>, Christopher Baham <cbaham@erieco.gov>, Delaney Dreckman <ddreckman@erieco.gov>, Ben Hemphill <bhemphill@erieco.gov>
Subject: Re: Safety/Standards in comp plan

External Email: Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jarod,

This discussion is important to couple with the comp plan adoption given the history of Engineering deprioritizing alternative transportation recommendations from the last comp plan. At the very least, there needs to be an accounting before the Plan Commission tonight as to why the last comp plan's alternative transportation elements were deprioritized by Engineering before a decision is made to separate my recommendation from the comp plan.

My recommendation could manifest as a requirement for a quarterly update from Engineering to the planning commission on any decisions to disregard or scale back comp plan elements related to alternative transportation.

Examples from the past might include:

- 1) The decision(s?) to abandon plans for pedestrian underpasses to Erie High School, despite developer willingness to fund the mitigation of water issues.

2) Conflicts with planning staff over intersection geometrics in proposed high pedestrian areas like CLR/EP.

3) The decision to eliminate the bike lane on WCR4/Sheridan even though the streets plan calls for bike lanes on all collectors and arterials.

The items above seem to be highly relevant to delivering comp plan goals in accordance with to the values expressed by the public.

=Matthew

On Sep 18, 2024, at 9:33 AM, Jarod Ballentine
<jballentine@erieco.gov> wrote:

Matthew - Recommendations around broader Town policy, such as those you've outlined, would be best addressed with our Town Council during the open comment section at the beginning of each meeting. Here is a link to the calendar with the dates and times for those meetings: www.erieco.gov/calendar.aspx?CID=14

From: Matthew Logan <matt.logan.720@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 8:16 AM

To: Jarod Ballentine <jballentine@erieco.gov>

Cc: Emily Baer <ebaer@erieco.gov>; Dan Hoback <dhoback@erieco.gov>;

Tim Burns <tburns@erieco.gov>; Martin Laws <mlaws@erieco.gov>;

Sherri Booth <sbooth@erieco.gov>; Robert Braudes

<rbraudes@erieco.gov>; Christopher Baham <cbaham@erieco.gov>;

Delaney Dreckman <ddreckman@erieco.gov>; Ben Hemphill

<bhemphill@erieco.gov>

Subject: Re: Safety/Standards in comp plan

External Email: Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jarod,

Its interesting that you refer to my "opinions and theories", when the bias I am referring to has been widely written about and observed, including by congress, who not too long ago requested AASHTO begin regularly reviewing their materials to provide better safety outcomes for non-motorized road users. I would say that constitutes an official acknowledgment at the national level of historical systemic bias against those users.

There have also been studies of attitudes of Civil Engineering students, the Public, and Planning Students which clearly demonstrate gaps in knowledge by the Engineering students that lead to biases in policy choices. I have observed on Erie submit several requests for improved pedestrian conditions, and have witnessed how our Town Engineer responds to those requests, opting every time to follow the standard to the letter rather than accommodating the request by a neighborhood. I would also note in the early TAC meetings it was acknowledged that alternative transportation was neglected in the previous comprehensive plan.

Proposed Amendment to Comp Plan for Planning/Council consideration:

Given there is an extremely well documented bias nationally and locally against some of the priorities outlined during the comp plan process, given the limited exposure that Engineering decisions get in front of Town Committees, and the lack of an assurance from you that potential biases are being dealt with, it seems reasonable that some kind of effort to bring daylight to the Town's Engineering decision making process should be part of the comp plan's policy to provide safety and comfort for non-motorized road users. I'd like to see that added to the comp plan's recommendations on providing safety and comfort as related to Engineering's role.

=Matthew Logan
129 Pipit Lake Way
Erie CO, 80516

720-624-9553

On Sep 18, 2024, at 6:50 AM, Jarod Ballentine
<jballentine@erieco.gov> wrote:

Matthew - Public opinion was requested through various methods, including the NSMP focus group and the Engage Erie online project page, where community feedback was actively collected.

Your opinions and theories on the potential biases

in these standards have been noted. You are correct that our engineering and transportation teams' expertise, along with input from other experts hired by the Town, will always play a role in finalizing project plans to ensure decisions are based on the latest data and best practices. It's also noted that you disagree with many of the decisions made by our engineering and transportation teams, and that's okay. Be assured that the Town will continue to gather feedback from the community on projects that impact residents as we move forward.

Jarod

-----Original Message-----

From: Matthew Logan

<matt.logan.720@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 4:20 AM

To: Jarod Ballentine <jballentine@erieco.gov>

Cc: Emily Baer <ebaer@erieco.gov>; Dan Hoback <dhoback@erieco.gov>

Subject: Safety/Standards in comp plan

External Email: Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jarod,

I see in the safety section of the proposed comp plan that Engineering intends to apply "the standards" as found in manuals like the MUTCD and Green Book.

At what point during the comp plan process were those standards run by the public to gauge how well they aligned with the desires of the public in terms of addressing the concerns they expressed about prioritizing safety over speed/capacity?

I ask because the reading I have done strongly suggests there are biases in favor of speed/capacity in those standards, which appear to be at odds with the survey results from the early stages of the comp plan.

Now "the standards" actually make it clear none of

the guidelines contained therein are mandatory, and that Engineering Judgement should take priority. I have also been reading that few engineers take more than two classes on traffic engineering, and that due to their limited knowledge and concern about legal exposure, tend to treat the guidelines as mandatory anyway. So when I see a statement that seems to elevate "the standards" to the level of a policy goal, my conclusion is our engineers are going to ignore what the public wants, and blindly apply guidelines that are biased in favor of rural transportation values.

What assurance can the Town provide that the values of the public will guide engineering decisions as those standards are considered?

=Matthew