

## Twin Lakes Stakeholder Group (TLSG)

Wednesday, May 19, 2016

Meeting Summary - Draft

### Attendance

*Stakeholders:* Frank Alexander, Norrie Boyd, Brian Lay, Rolf Munson, Dave Rechberger, Glen Segrue, and Ian Swallow

*City and County Staff:* Dale Case, Pete Fogg, Steven Giang, Michelle Krezek, Dick Smith, Edward Stafford, and Jay Sugnet, Nicole Wobus

*Facilitation:* Heather Bergman and Katie Waller

*Presenters:* Dr. Gordon McCurry

*\*Meeting summaries are a record of what was said at each meeting. A statement's inclusion does not mean that all stakeholders agree to its accuracy or intention.\**

### Next Steps

Glen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Check with BVSD attorneys about sharing the BVSD interest list raw data results.</li></ul>
TLAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Share source regarding an existing sub-designation of open space on 6655 Twin Lakes.</li></ul>
City and County staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide the source material that informs employment studies referenced during discussion.</li><li>• Resend the link to the wildlife study.</li><li>• Provide the most recent hydrology and wildlife study scopes of work to TLSG.</li></ul>
Katie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Make edits to the meeting summary.</li></ul>

### Updates

At the previous meeting, Boulder Valley School District (BVSD) presented the results of a survey stating that over 500 BVSD employees were interested in affordable housing options within the District boundaries. Some stakeholders thought it was necessary to view a more detailed breakdown of the survey participant information and survey methodology to better understand the results. The breakdown of this information was not available at the time of the meeting, as information was gathered from an interest list, rather than a traditional survey. BVSD explained that the interest invitation was sent to 3000 BVSD employees, and 500 responded. Eight of those employees who responded indicated that they were opposed to the Twin Lakes project. The stakeholders representing Twin Lakes Action Group (TLAG) asked for BVSD to provide a spreadsheet of the raw results with all personal information redacted. BVSD indicated that before the results can be shared, it is necessary to check with BVSD attorneys. Glen Segrue will check in with BVSD attorneys regarding this issue and will provide the requested information if allowed.

TLAG also requested that the City prepare maps showing the concentration of affordable housing within the City of Boulder if Twin Lakes were to be developed at various levels. The City indicated that they will have this information prepared for the meeting that focuses on density, as it would be more appropriate for that discussion.

## **Public Comment**

One public comment was submitted to the Stakeholder Group before the meeting. Some stakeholders requested that City and County staff respond to the submitted question. Below is the summarized question and response.

*When the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) mentions community benefit in terms of annexation, staff has indicated that the “community” referenced is the broader Boulder Valley community, rather than smaller sub-communities and nearby neighborhoods. Why is there public engagement with those immediately impacted by annexation when this feedback will not be driving the final recommendation or decision?*

The definition of community varies based on the context. In the case of the BVCP, the definition of community references the larger Boulder Valley community. Some policies, like annexation, have specific impacts on the City, including providing urban or city services.

## **Questions for City and County Staff**

Members of the public not designated as stakeholder representatives as part of the TLSG facilitated meetings had an opportunity to submit questions for City and County staff in writing following the first meeting. Not all the submitted questions could be answered during the meeting on April 27, 2016. Below are the questions and answers that could not be addressed previously. The responses include additional comments made in response to follow-up questions raised during the meeting.

*Why does Boulder County Parks and Open Space feel it is appropriate to allow annexation of open space for Boulder County Housing Authority (BCHA), but not for the Archdiocese? In off-line discussions, the Archdiocese has indicated that they were interested in annexation but did not feel that they had adequate support from Open Space department.*

The Archdiocese had general discussions with Parks and Open Space in 2006 about the development process and procedures for their property. No specific plan or request was presented. The Archdiocese chose not to pursue the situation further. Current staff was not involved in this decision so cannot offer any additional insight as to why this decision was reached. County staff shared a statement from Ron Stewart, Boulder County Parks and Open Space Director, regarding the questions about annexation of the Twin Lakes Open Space and the use of open space for additional annexation in Gunbarrel:

“Boulder County Parks and Open Space Department is willing to recommend that the trail corridor on the south of the lakes be annexed because annexation of this trail corridor would not impact the management of this specific open space land. Whether the corridor is within city limits or in the unincorporated county, the property will be managed under Parks and Open Space Rules and Regulations and will continue to be used for the trail. Annexation of this parcel is different than other Open Space parcels in the Gunbarrel area and around Boulder County. This particular open space parcel is adjacent to land that is developed at urban density and, on some of the property’s boundary, land that is already annexed to the City of Boulder. Almost all of Boulder County’s Open Space, on the other hand, is on the rural side of urban areas where it is appropriate that the land remain in the unincorporated county.”

A document was provided by Stakeholders that stated that the Archdiocese approached the Parks and Open Space director and was told that the department would not be supportive of annexation through open space. The Archdiocese has thought about using this site to construct an assisted living home for the elderly.

*What does the existing sub-designation of open space on 6655 Twin Lakes mean?*

Staff needs additional clarification before being able to answer this question. Twin Lakes Action Group (TLAG) will find the source listing a sub-designation for 6655 Twin Lakes and provide it to the Stakeholder Group to better inform the future discussion.

*How can Boulder Valley School District (BVSD) limit eligibility to the property at 6600 Twin Lakes to only BVSD employees when it partners with Boulder County Housing Authority (BCHA) and Boulder Housing Partners (BHP)?*

There are numerous models around the country of school districts providing housing for only their employees. BVSD has already consulted with their legal counsel and identified the only obstacle as equal housing laws, which will not be an issue if the demographics of residents match the demographics of the area. Equal housing laws are meant to ensure that protected classes of people are not being discriminated against, and affordable housing opportunities are not disparately impacting one class. For example, senior housing is allowed because it does not create a disparate impact on a protected class of people. The laws exist to avoid excluding certain communities. Before any affordable housing can be offered, a large study must be performed as part of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) application. Telluride has been able to successfully implement a similar program, although it is different than what would be implemented in Boulder Valley School District regarding property and ownership types. Roaring Fork School District is also working on a similar program but has experienced some delays due to financing.

*How is the latest, very great increase in density in Gunbarrel as a whole evaluated, reviewed and considered when possibly creating additional density? How large of a surrounding area is used to create an "average" density for a particular lot? How is density defined? How do these questions relate to a change in land use designation as part of the BVCP?*

Density will be discussed in-depth at a future meeting. Zoning defines density using the measurement of dwelling units per acre. Density, measured as dwelling units per acre, is based on the size of the parcel and not any surrounding area. City staff will calculate net density for any proposed land use changes as they apply to the BVCP. These calculations will be completed in a manner consistent with any future site review or annexation processes.

*What types of community benefit have previous annexations supported by staff included?*

The most defined and explicit community benefit of annexation in the BVCP is affordable housing. Community benefit can include many considerations, such as historic preservation, open space dedications, or public trails. Considerations for community benefit will be examined not just at the time of annexation, but also during the site review process.

*If the developer were to construct a natural open space buffer, would the City be interested in owning and maintaining the open space buffer as a public amenity or would they prefer the developer to own and maintain, or is this open for negotiations? If the developer were to construct a park of two acres or more, would the City be interested in the developer making a public land dedication for the City to own and maintain, or would the City prefer the developer to own and maintain, or is this open for negotiations?*

It is too early to tell but this issue will be assessed further in the process. Typically, the City does not want to have many scattered parks throughout the City as it increases costs to maintain, and it is most likely that the developer would own and maintain any public open space. There are different examples in Boulder. The City will maintain the Boulder Jewish Commons Open Space. Northfield Commons has been managed using a public-private partnership; the City typically will manage open space if it has larger community benefits.

*What specific studies would be required of the applicant during an annexation/initial zoning/site plan review process?*

The site review process and criteria are available on the City of Boulder website - [https://www2.municode.com/library/co/boulder/codes/municipal\\_code?nodeId=TIT9LAUSCO\\_CH2REPR\\_9-2-14SIRE](https://www2.municode.com/library/co/boulder/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=TIT9LAUSCO_CH2REPR_9-2-14SIRE).

*When were the last hydrology, traffic, employment, wildlife, and infrastructure studies completed, and what were the results?*

All future studies will be discussed at a future meeting; this information is still being collected and will be presented when it is available.

- Prior to the meeting staff provided a compilation and summary of hydrology-related information from County records related to development of the subdivisions in the Twin Lakes area. There is currently more information on the hydrology of the surrounding parcels than the BCHA and BVSD parcels specifically.
- There have been routine traffic counts completed for Twin Lakes Road, but the effects or impacts of development on traffic have not been analyzed at this point.
- Boulder County does not complete employment studies as they do not deal with employment as it pertains to land use designations. There are available employment figures that were developed by City staff for Boulder Valley that show current and projected employment numbers. Additional studies are needed on this issue, as the available information is based on assumptions of City and County capacity through 2040. Pete Fogg with Boulder County can share information prepared by the City as part of the BVCP update process.
- The most current information related to wildlife within the Boulder County's Twin Lakes Open Space area was documented in Boulder County Parks and Open Spaces' Twin Lakes Open Space Resource Evaluation and Management Plan completed in 2004. The Boulder County Comprehensive Plan's Environmental Resources Element was updated in 2014 and the Twin Lakes parcels were not included in the updated maps as having species of concern. County staff originally sent a partial version of the Plan in pdf form in response to a separate question. Nicole Wobus will resend the link to the entire study.
- There have been no infrastructure studies done on the Twin Lakes property, as the City would only be assessing the possibility of providing urban-level utilities.

*How does City Council/Planning Commission ensure development is compatible? What are their discretionary tools?*

The City Council and Planning Board both have a fair amount of discretion when making a decision. The site review process is very extensive, and criteria must be met but both the City Council and Planning Board have the option to say what they want to see and what they want the developer to do. The County would not be included in site review for a City development.

*What are the Regional Transportation District's (RTD) long-term plans for the Diagonal Highway Corridor?*

RTD has funded a study for future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) to begin in the fall for the Boulder-Longmont corridor. The corridor is a top priority, and they have allocated \$3.5 million for preliminary engineering and the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) analysis. Ideally, the BRT on this corridor will have portions of dedicated right-of-way so the bus does not get stuck in traffic.

*What happens to the properties after any potential developmental tax incentive expires, such as the sunset of the low-income tax credit in 15 years?*

When the low-income tax credit sunsets in 15 years, the ownership will change, and the property will be refinanced. However, the property must remain permanently affordable no matter who is the owner. Deed restrictions are covenants that move with the land, so they will always apply. In regards to the Twin Lakes parcels, the specifics of financing have not yet been decided, although low-income tax credits are likely to be used. They typically require a 40-year covenant and permanent affordability restrictions. The City also would require these guarantees to move forward with the annexation process.

*What are the precedents of BHP and BCHA to create the “in the City but owned by the County” relationship?*

The County owns something within every jurisdiction within the County. Typically, the two parties will sign a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or similar agreement. The same process is followed each time land is annexed from the County into the City.

### **Additional Questions**

Some stakeholders had questions related to items that were discussed at the previous meeting; below are these questions and answers.

*Why is it not possible for the costs of development and maintenance to be offset with a large voucher program? Is it possible for the City or County to have similar voucher programs?*

The voucher program through HUD is a federally subsidized program and receives its funding through federal allocations by an act of Congress. Increasing the voucher pool does not provide actual housing units, and there are concurrent processes the City and County must follow to take advantage of the federal vouchers. There are local, short-term vouchers available, but they do not have the same fiscal availability as a federal voucher program. Even with federal vouchers, housing is still challenging to find due to increased costs. Vouchers cover the cost of housing up to a certain amount, but there is no longer housing available within the allotted budget, and those using the vouchers are not allowed to make up the difference with their own funds.

*Are the benefits in the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) referring to benefits to the City or benefits to County residents?*

It depends on the context. Annexation is specific to City benefits; however, the City looks at broader benefits when it comes to policies and land use designations for the larger Boulder Valley. As an example, with Palo Park, testimony from County residents was considered equal to City residents.

*It is often said that Gunbarrel and Twin Lakes are unique. What prevents another “unique” annexation to create an enclave through contiguity?*

There is no checklist for what makes a property or parcel unique. Twin Lakes is a specific site with specific characteristics. There is nothing technically preventing further annexation of open space from happening, but City and County decision makers would use their professional judgment and would reference currently existing policy and criteria when making those types of decisions. There is no cascade event attached to any singular event or annexation. Each situation is examined and judged on its own merit. Regarding the circumstances around Boulder County Parks and Open Space’s acquisition of the Twin Lakes open space, Boulder County Parks and Open Space’s Twin Lakes Open Space Resource Evaluation and Management Plan provides specific information regarding why Twin Lakes was acquired initially.

*There have been many questions for City and County planning staff, but this facilitated dialogue was designed to also ensure that staff will be informed when working with and responding to the four bodies. Is staff getting the information they need to make a well-developed recommendation?*

Once all stakeholders are on the same page regarding the available information, it would be ideal for the Group to begin to think about the options in a larger and more creative manner, particularly as it comes to possible development scenarios and how they impact the previously-identified interests. The level of detail in this request is unprecedented and is requiring a significant investment of time and resources to answer all the questions being asked.

*How is the information from this process being fed back to staff?*

There is a team of City and County staff who meet weekly regarding the BVCP. Staff has additional meetings to address all the land use requests, specifically. This is new territory and staff is still learning and trying to figure out how this facilitated dialogue will inform the staff recommendation to policy makers.

### **Hydrology at Twin Lakes – City and County Perspectives**

City and County hydrologist presented information about the current understanding of the hydrology of Twin Lakes and surrounding areas. Below are highlights of these presentations.

- A more detailed analysis will occur later in the process.
- There are many issues that must be considered when talking about hydrology.
- The City regulates surface water and storm water heavily; they do not have utility or regulations for ground water as it pertains to various regulations on development.
- Private engineers and geologists would perform an in-depth study regarding hydrology later in the process to better inform the development process.
- Any analysis associated with the BVCP process would be at a high level in regards to surface water and storm water.
- The annexation process does not require extensive studies on hydrology, but rather looks for large problems that would have no engineering solutions.
- The site review process is more detailed regarding hydrology, and focuses mainly on storm water and surface water; there is not much focus on extensive groundwater modeling as it is not a City utility.
- Issuing building permits allows the City to create requirements that the developer must meet, such as sump pump requirements and foundation types.
- City hydrology staff has input for land use changes during the BVCP process and works closely with BVCP staff when technical issues or questions arise.
- When a property is given a new land use designation with a higher density, there are no guarantees that the development density is going to be allowed at the highest level; the development density recommendations can be changed as more information becomes available.
- The City has not yet adopted the International Building Codes (IBC) for 2015 and still relies on the 2012 IBC; it is an extensive effort to adopt new building codes, and it is more likely that the City will adopt the 2018 IBC.
- Proposals for density or footprint size originate with the applicant at the times of concept plan and site review; City engineers and staff work side by side and are reactive to the proposal that has been submitted.
- If the Twin Lakes parcels were to be annexed to the City of Boulder, the role of County engineers or hydrologists is unclear since the property would be under City control.

- There must be an annexation for any current County property to receive City services or utilities; Red Fox Hills is an exception to the current rule, and it is not possible for any County property to receive these same services without annexation in the future.
- If annexation of Twin Lakes does not go through, an extension of City services and utilities to the property could be problematic.
- City water is currently available in this area because there has always been interest in the annexation of Gunbarrel since 1978.

### **Hydrology at Twin Lakes – TLAG Perspective**

Dave Rechberger presented information about TLAG’s interest in and perspective on hydrology in and around Twin Lakes. Below is a summary of his presentation.

- TLAG’s charter is to protect the zoned, rural-residential look and feel of their neighborhoods and adjacent land.
- There have been ten water main breaks in Red Fox Hills in the last three years, and TLAG is concerned about who is going to pay to maintain this infrastructure.
- There is divided ownership and responsibility between the City and the County for roads close to Twin Lakes; this raises the issue of who will maintain the infrastructure below the roads when the ownership is divided.
- The roads are already in poor condition, and additional development will negatively impact infrastructure in the area – an issue complicated by multiple ownerships.
- A change to mixed-density residential (MXR) at Twin Lakes contradicts parts of the BVCP, specifically code 3.28 that references surface and ground water.
- The conversation about development at Twin Lakes should be based on science and fact, particularly Building Codes 7.02 – 7.05, 7.12, and 7.13, and City Code 9-3-9.

TLAG provided their own hydrologist, Dr. Gordon McCurry, P.G., to weigh in on the issues at Twin Lakes. Below is a summary of his presentation and the clarifying questions asked by the Stakeholder Group.

- Dr. McCurry has over 30 years of experience in hydrology, has done a significant amount of work in the City and County, and teaches classes on groundwater at University of Colorado, Boulder.
- The Twin Lakes parcel slopes gently to the southeast, receive about 18 inches of rain a year, and is influenced hydrologically by infiltration from nearby lakes and ditches.
- Local hydrological features include the Twin Lakes, irrigation ditches, the Boulder Feeder Canal, nearby wetlands, and an ephemeral stream.
- There is water leakage on and near the property from several of the local hydrological features.
- Nunn Clay loam (NuB) and Longmont Clay (LoB) are both present on the site in roughly equal amounts; both are low-permeability soils with high shrink-swell capacity.
- The data used to locate the soil types on the Twin Lakes property is provided by the National Resource Conservation Survey (NRCS) and has warnings regarding the scale on which it should be applied.
- NRCS specifies that the data is intended to be viewed at a scale of 1:20,000. While it can’t give exact GPS-coordinated data, it can give a general idea of the soil types and locations until a more specific study can be conducted.
- The error bar associated with the NRCS soil data is unclear, but some Stakeholder stated that it is most likely closer to 10 feet than it is to a quarter mile.

- The water table is shallow on the property, most likely only a few feet below the surface.
- The site has poor drainage and often experiences significant and visible flooding.
- The Red Fox Hills storm water system was developed to collect runoff with an assumed upstream drainage area of 15 acres, including the Twin Lakes parcels.
- The system was designed to handle runoff from a 100-year event and allowed for overtopping curbs an encroachment into private properties.
- The system was developed for runoff timing under undeveloped conditions; development will impact this timing.
- The storm runoff system has an open inlet located on the BCHA property, and will make property development more complex.
- Development on the Twin Lakes parcels could lead to a rise in the water table, therefore increasing the risk of home flooding for any new houses and those already located in Red Fox Hills.
- Currently, normal water events cause significant and visible flooding in the Red Fox Hills neighborhood.
- Soil compaction, reduced soil water storage, new localized groundwater flow directions, and increase recharge from landscape irrigation could all cause a rise in the water table.
- An increased risk of home flooding increases costs for homeowners, especially those of existing homes if they have to buy a new sump pump or run the existing sump pump for longer periods of time.
- Increased discharge from sump pumps will increase the load on the storm water system.
- There are fiscal and emotional costs associated with increased risk of home flooding.
- Any new structures will cause soil compaction, which decreases porosity and causes water levels to rise; a future geological study focusing on soil compaction in this area is important for any future development.
- Soil compaction caused by development of the Twin Lakes parcels is most likely going to force the increased water levels to flow southeast and create a dam-like effect at the juncture of the NuB and LoB soils; this would greatly impact the Red Fox Hills neighborhood.
- The damming effect at the juncture of the two soil types would be permanent, and would force water flow to change from its historic norms.
- Any densification of this property will require a high level of paved and impervious surfaces, and will change the historical runoff pattern; runoff after an event will happen quicker and at a higher level.
- Unless an appropriate storm water system is built, there is a higher risk of flooding in downstream areas, particularly Red Fox Hills.
- Development on this parcel will alter groundwater levels, cause changes in the timing and amount of runoff, and impact the quality of water due to human proximity.
- The risk of destroying the wetlands brings to light significant engineering challenges that must be explored further.
- This presentation is not meant to provide solutions, but rather ensure that the issues associated with development's impact on hydrology are visible and addressed.
- The 2013 event exceeded the highest metrics available to judge such events but exceeded the data for a 1000-year event; it raised the water table in such a way that it will take decades to drain and return to normal.
- Between 2012 and 2013, students in the CU Groundwater Class measured a six-foot increase in the water table at Sawhill Ponds; this increase is likely higher in areas with less porous soil.

- Current residential landscaping recharges the groundwater system and elevates the water level, especially since people tend to overwater.
- The storm water system was designed to deal with the runoff of water from a five- to 10-year event.
- It is typical for storm water systems to utilize encroachment on property.
- It is typical to not increase post-construction flooding past current levels; detention could be used to decrease flooding if it also decreased infiltration.
- Many of the stated problems have engineering solutions, but some of the solutions may be very costly.
- The impact of development on wetlands will be a very challenging problem for which to engineer a solution.
- Development could mitigate some of the previously mentioned concerns, but it is hard to imagine a development scenario that could improve ground water in a way that would not be detrimental to the wetlands.
- Mitigation efforts can make conditions no worse than current conditions, but they will likely not be able to greatly improve current conditions if they are coupled with significant development.
- LoB soil has a current runoff rate of 80 percent, which could increase to 99 percent given development; this increase would be challenging to avoid unless pervious asphalt or other similar solutions are explored.
- There should be additional studies on the utility systems currently in place (water, sewer, etc.) before there is increased use.
- The City and County (as the developers) could be liable in perpetuity if there are significant homeowner damages due to infrastructure failure.
- The City has set a precedent related to payment to citizens for infrastructure failure.
- The change to MXR on the Twin Lakes parcels changes hydrology for the entire neighborhood.
- TLAG has created a concept plan that will provide open access to the whole community and would add recreational use to the property; ideally, the area would be undeveloped open space, and create lots of opportunity for City involvement.

### **Request for Proposals for Hydrology Study**

Moving forward, TLSG will be making joint recommendations for the scope and selection of experts as it pertains to any future studies. However, BVSD and BCHA have hired a hydrologist to complete a hydrological study as part of the site review process. Some members of the Stakeholder Group expressed concern about the selected firm and the scope of work. Below are the highlights of this conversation.

- The selected firm, Martinez, is not going to complete on-site slug tests or standard penetration tests; however, some of the other firms who responded to the RFP and were not selected included the completion of those two tests as part of their scope of work.
- Martinez is not completing as many soil tests as some of the other firms who responded to the RFP.
- It is critical to do more monitoring of the wells and conduct more soil tests across the whole property to understand the hydrology and possible impacts of development.
- While Martinez was one of the more inexpensive firms to respond to the RFP, Boulder citizens usually understand the cost of good and progressive science.
- BCHA incorporated TLAG's feedback into the scope of work for Martinez.

- The first geotechnical report is preliminary and will be followed up with more intensive studies as required by the site review process.
- There will be fewer borings now, as there will be many more borings required in future studies.
- The scope of this study would not pass the proposal process and was not designed to do so.
- The images used to discuss density at this point are not realistic for what BCHA and BVSD would ever imagine building on the property; they do not want to build a high-density development.
- The purpose of this study is to address preliminary conditions to see what needs to be assessed in more depth during future geotechnical studies.
- Each boring will be permitted as a monitoring hole to evaluate the depth of groundwater across the site, and general direction of flow; each hole will be used to collect as much data as practicable.
- BCHA will be purchasing pressure transducers for the monitoring holes to help see potential changes in groundwater.
- Slug tests will not be completed during this initial study, as the results are not useful for the type of development that is anticipated.
- The final report will show all the gathered information, and will be publicly available.
- BCHA will be using the final study to choose foundations types that are most suitable for the hydrological and groundwater characteristics of the site, and do not negatively impact neighboring households.
- Many of the other TLAG concerns will be addressed in studies during future stages of development; this study will impact the firm and scope of work for these future studies.
- It is expected that any development would use foundation systems that are appropriate for a typical one-, two-, or three-story dwelling unit such as spread footings, reinforced slab with no crawl space, or drill shaft and grade beam system; there will be no consideration for foundations requiring deep construction sunk into the ground.
- A wetland delineation will be conducted, and BCHA will be working with engineers to assess the wildlife corridor.
- Geotechnical engineers will be conducting all their work in a manner that minimizes wildlife disturbances.
- The proposal can change based on what is discovered in this preliminary study.
- BCHA will provide the new scope of work to TLAG.
- Boring will occur in the next month, and BCHA will tell the group when this work begins.
- It is best practice to bore and monitoring holes during peak water runoff from May to June; BCHA will have to wait to bore holes as to not disturb owls on the property.

### **Next Steps**

TLSG agreed to meet again to create scenarios for each of the proposals – current density, higher density, and open space. This conversation will occur around maps so that all options can be explored. The Group agreed that the maps should not include hydrological information so that the interests are discussed, rather than site specific. The entire conversations will address how various contexts and designs impact the previously-identified interests. Staff will provide the ten maps of the parcels for the next meeting from 3:00 PM – 6:00 PM on May 25, 2016. Staff will also work to have density maps showcasing the impact on density spread throughout the city with various levels of development on Twin Lakes.