

EMAIL FEEDBACK RECEIVED 1/14/2016-2/10/2016

Email Date	2/10/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear Members of OSBT:</p> <p>I am writing today on behalf of Open Boulder’s 3,000 supporters and followers, regarding tonight’s hearing on the North Trail Study Area.</p> <p>We’d like to thank you for all your work on the NTSA, and in particular your attention during January’s exceptionally long study session. Although we certainly didn’t agree with some of OSBT’s recommendations, the process was strong.</p> <p>We are concerned with the unexpected turn that process has now taken. Changes were made to both alternatives that were not requested by a majority of OSBT during their study session, at least to the best of our memories. Other changes that were requested were not made. At this point, all of the staff-level “balancing” should have been completed. Either staff did not follow your instructions, or ex parte communications have occurred that have not been made public.</p> <p>Whichever the case, this is unfair to our members, who lead busy lives and cannot follow such unplanned twists and turns as closely as they would want. As their representatives, we did not expect major directional changes to be proposed by staff at this last step in the OSBT process.</p> <p>We recommend that the Board begin tonight by removing all new staff-driven changes from the original Alternative B (from January), and add them back in one by one if approved by a majority. At the end of the session, we request that OSBT make a clear recommendation to City Council as to which Alternative they prefer. Without that piece, the work done by OSBT, the public, and staff to get to this point in the process will have been compromised.</p> <p>Here are some specifics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Temporal and directional regulations are now proposed for Alternative B at Joder Ranch when OSBT asked that they be used only if needed in the future;• The first half mile of the Joder Interim Trail and the loops West of Wonderland Lake have been changed to dogs-on-leash, which was not approved at the study session;• Removing the re-routing of the Joder Interim Trail from Alternative B makes little sense (the trail is a safety and user conflict nightmare with its width and steep slope) and was not requested by OSBT;• We would like clarification on what is meant by “attractive nuisances” at Joder Ranch, a term we haven’t heard before and wasn’t discussed by OSBT;• We object to the sudden removal of access to the riding arena at Boulder Valley Ranch and the removal of potential horse trailer parking nearby. These had been in both scenarios before this weekend, and were specifically supported by the Board; and• We don’t believe the closure of 18 out of 19 Northern Tier Properties was requested by the Board. In fact,

	<p>several Board members supported the staff recommendation for the old Scenario B, which included public access to eight properties.</p> <p>Thank you for your work, and good luck tonight!</p>
Email Author	Andy Schultheiss, Open Boulder
No Staff Response	Sent to OSBT
Email Date	2/10/2016
Email Detail	<p>Open Space Trustees:</p> <p>I support Scenario A for the North Trail Study Area because it balances the interests of the various hiker/biker users and the sensitive natural habitat areas.</p> <p>Scenario A provides a north-south connection that doesn't require crossing multiple sensitive riparian drainages or the construction of numerous bridges in valuable habitat areas. Scenario B, in contrast, would provide a short but exciting ride for bikers at high cost: the significant infringement of critical habitat for imperiled plant and animal species. In fact, wildlife and plant scientists have stated Scenario B is "ecologically unsustainable."</p> <p>I'm a North Boulder resident, frequent user of the Open Space trails (at least 2x/week), and have been a mountain biker for decades. Please protect our foothills habitat by choosing Scenario A.</p>
Email Author	Margo MacDonnell
No Staff Response	Sent to OSBT
Email Date	2/10/2016

Email Detail	<p>Dear Members of the Open Space Board of Trustees:</p> <p>I am an equestrian and I support more access for horses in the North TSA, specifically at Joder Ranch, West Beech, and Boulder Valley Ranch. Please do not support staff's new proposal to close all those agricultural properties in the northern area: I support the original Scenario B distribution of management strategies, leaving a few properties closed but many open.</p> <p>The North TSA is very important to equestrians because of its long history of ranching, farming, open space and trails. I urge you to revise the new Scenario B to reflect these cultural and recreation values and to include my recommendations for this area.</p>
Email Author	Laura Edwards
No Staff Response	Sent to OSBT
Email Date	2/10/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear Board of Trustees,</p> <p>I urge you to please re-consider Scenario A of the Revised NTSA Plans, due to the fragile nature of the area just west of the McGuckins property, along foothills Hwy.</p> <p>Scenario B cuts a new trail right through critical habitat for rare native plant and animal communities.</p> <p>Your maps of the area west of the McGuckins property along N Foothills Hwy indicate that it is designated as a Sensitive Resource area. The NTSA Special Resources section of the NTSA website has extensive information on the unique features and fragile nature of the shale barrens, mixed grass prairie mosaic, wetlands and riparian areas. Please do not ignore all the research that has been done on the species that depend on these ecosystems to survive.</p> <p>We are very fortunate to have over 100 miles of trails in Boulder County to use for human recreation. Let's save some of the last fragments of native habitat for species that cannot survive without it.</p>
Email Author	Dale Ball

Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Email Date	2/9/2016
Email Detail	<p>Please!!</p> <p>I support Scenario A for the North Trail Study Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario A provides a north-south connector trail that does not dissect our critical and sensitive wetlands and natural habitat. • I oppose Scenario B, which would construct a trail across 11 sensitive riparian drainages and require construction of multiple bridges and switchbacks. These drainages are vital habitat for shrub-nesting birds and numerous other species. • Scenario B would introduce invasive weed species into the city's last intact native grasslands, currently habitat to several imperiled species and threatened plants. • Open Space wildlife and plant scientists have declared Scenario B's proposed north-south connector trail "ecologically unsustainable." • Special interest groups will always want more access to our open space, and it is up to the OSBT to 'err' on the side of protecting habitat. • Of the city's 150 miles of trails, over 1/3 are already open to mountain biking, while only 16% of trail users are mountain bikers. Mountain bikers are not an underserved community. • Scenario A would still provide a north-south connector trail for mountain bikers, but would avoid sensitive habitat. The wildlife and plants can't relocate--but we can. • Please don't sacrifice our open space to provide a 20-minute adrenaline rush for bikers. • Please protect our unique foothills habitat for future generations of people, wildlife, and plants.
Email Author	Sandra Renna
No Staff Response	Sent to OSBT
Email Date	2/9/2016

<p>Email Detail</p>	<p>Regarding the North Trail Study Area and the plans being discussed, including tomorrow night, for its management, I have reviewed the documents available, visited the area in question, and talked to numerous users of the area, including a various user groups, e.g. hikers, mountain bikers, naturalists. To this I added my own expertise as an environmental engineer with considerable experience in wetland ecosystems.</p> <p>I conclude that not only is Scenario A the best option (to run the connector from the Foothills Trail over to Boulder Valley Ranch and north up to the Neva Road area before it crosses back to Joder) ,it is indeed the only viable option if Boulder intends to be in accord with the OSMP mission: "...preserves and protects the natural environment and land resources that characterize Boulder. We foster appreciation and use that sustain the natural values of the land for current and future generations."</p> <p>In Scenario B, the proposed trail (through the Beech Property Habitat Conservation Area HCA) would have a significant and negative impact on wetlands and flies in the face of the OSMP mission. In addition, the required mitigation of environmental impacts would be difficult and expensive.</p> <p>The elephant in the room is the mountain bike community's pressure on OSMP and City Council. Apparently gaining access to trails is not enough – the mountain bike community wants "fun and challenge" to be a factor in trail decision making (something Option B apparently offers to them). As an avid user of the OSMP trails system, I am tired of seeing decision makers capitulate to the demands of a well organized mountain bike community. Good organizational and advocacy skills don't trump the original intentions of the founders of Boulder Open Space, existing mission statements, negative environmental impacts, the values of natural wetlands ecosystems, other user group considerations, or science.</p> <p>I encourage you to reject Option B.</p>
<p>Email Author</p>	<p>Rita Klees</p>

Staff Response	Hi Rita, Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan. Kind regards, The North TSA team
Email Date	2/9/2016

<p>Email Detail</p>	<p>Everyone,</p> <p>I'd like to apologize for my rude email yesterday. I was pretty upset to hear that all of our work is likely to go up in flames...again. I won't let my emotions get to me again.</p> <p>However, I speak for the majority of mountain bikers who are angry, disenfranchised, and have given up.</p> <p>It is hard to keep positive in a community that has been unreasonably under attack for so long. I have a lot of people telling me they are checking out of the process entirely because they have no trust in our political process -- they feel the system is built to work against them, despite huge and growing numbers of mountain bikers. Fathers, mothers, kids, all riding, with no voice.</p> <p>It is hard to blame them in a town with the first and longest standing official ban on mountain bikes world-wide. A ban which was upheld by a 5-4 vote of council counter to the recommendation of the Open Space Board of Trustees in the West TSA. At the end of that process, we were in fact told that the North TSA was a better place for us. And what has been recommended by staff is wholly insufficient to provide a quality recreation experience for mountain bikers.</p> <p>I am a Boulder Mountainbike Alliance bike patroller, and see families on the trails all the time. I see wonderful encounters between equestrians, riders, and hikers -- all learning about each other, and enjoying the outdoors. In 6+ years of patrolling I've maybe had two angry hikers -- but they were upset about riders on "their" trail.</p> <p>It saddens me that this political process divides us -- it literally pits preservation **versus** recreation. I am BOTH. When people like me get this upset, it really should be a signal that something is broken.</p> <p>I'd really appreciate some responses to me, as I can't make it tomorrow evening due to commitments with work and family.</p>
<p>Email Author</p>	<p>Chris Echelmeier</p>
<p>Staff Response</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>

Email Date	2/9/2016
Email Detail	<p>Hello Trustees,</p> <p>Last month I attended a County open-house on proposed alternatives for the Boulder Canyon path extension, and I want to make sure that you know about this project due to its precedent relationship to the NTSA.</p> <p>As a result of the West TSA, land was acquired in order to open Chapman Drive to mountainbiking, and a collaborative OSMP, County, and CDOT effort was pursued to create safe mountain-bike access to both Chapman and Betasso bike areas. This will be a huge endeavor, with CDOT footing 4.4 million dollars, and both the City and County paying \$550,000. Jim Reeder said OSMP's commitment is \$500,000 with Transportation paying \$50,000. These estimates will surely go up as they were made a few years ago.</p> <p>This project likely includes three underpasses to be constructed under the SH119 between Four-Mile and Chapman Drive. Even though the County (Matt Wempe, AICP - Regional Trails Planner 303-441-4554 or email) knew of the recent OSBT study session, he said the County is still considering an underpass for Foothills Highway. The Boulder Canyon extension project represents another precedent of OSMP collaborative road projects which improve biker access and visitor safety in general. The Boulder Canyon proposed underpasses and State Highway 93 underpass both relate to previous OSMP Trail Study Areas.</p> <p>It is my opinion that the underpass discussion at the OSBT study session was cut off prematurely, and for the sake of fairness, needs to be put back on the table. Bottom line = there is a huge precedent for OSMP-supported underpasses and, for everyone's safety we need one across from the Joder property.</p>
Email Author	Susan Douglass
Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Email Date	2/8/2016

Email Detail	<p>OK now I'm pissed off. We were under the impression that mountain bikers would have access from the northwest border of the City . Now I've heard that there is a vote on this -- again -- on Wednesday. I can't be there with 2 days notice.</p> <p>Fast track developments like this, a complete disregard for public input together with a perceived hidden agenda, are what turns many away from participating in our local government. Seems the decision has already been made. Dirty Boulder politics at their best.</p> <p>This whole process makes me sick.</p>
Email Author	Chris Echelmeier
Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Email Date	2/9/2016

<p>Email Detail</p>	<p>Thank you for all your combined work on the proposals for the management of this area. I would like you to support Scenario A for the North TSA. Why?...</p> <p>After driving down 36 again today towards Boulder Valley Ranch where I have boarded horses since 1994 I gazed over to the west side of 36. I thought about what would it be like to see a highway of bicycles halfway up that beautiful foothill. At dusk would there be cyclists and headlamps? How will the bear, deer and other wildlife that use those beautiful and wild drainages be effected? Not very attractive to me as a hiker, horseback rider, or simply a person who respects the wildlife and the lands we own.</p> <p>Currently, the west side trail in Scenario B it is a low use social trail, from time to time you see a couple of hiker, runners, and a horse or two (though the flood has caused the trail to be a bit technical in areas for horses). What about the archeological value of this area? There are rock walls, stone circles and and other materials scattered on these hillsides. Why would Open Space even consider putting a trail there?</p> <p>I think that the trail on the east side makes better sense, and it would have less impact on this whole area. It would be more practical for all users (even though I have also seen mountain lions and bear in those drainages in the past too)! The east side trail design would have no steep drop offs, while I wonder about the west side construction. Would the trail be similar to Dowdy Draw which has some very impractical sections for mixed users passing each other.</p> <p>I have read many Open Forum comments on the west side trail and one has always stuck in my mind. It was written by a person who commented about the "user experience" and the "view" while they might be biking on the west side trail vs. the east. I found this a very selfish comment for a cyclist spends little time enjoying a view while cycling, they must focus on what is immediately ahead or they will perhaps fall off the cliff. It also had little respect to the sensitivity of the area it was all about "their" experience. Well it really is not.</p> <p>Any decision made by our Open Space Board of Trustees should first and foremost be about the wildlife and resource protection. We are merely the custodians who are lucky enough to share in this vanishing natural glory!</p>
<p>Email Author</p>	<p>Linda Parks</p>

Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Email Date	2/8/2016
Email Detail	I support the revised scenario B, An off highway route for ALL users is needed.
Email Author	Chuck Gray
Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Email Date	2/8/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear Board!</p> <p>I was distressed to read the staff updates on the North TSA. It was my impression that you sent staff back to give the public input greater consideration in their recommendations. As an equestrian I favored Plan B. Now it appears there are new scenarios as opposed to refinements. The northern tier is totally closed to the public which is unacceptable and arbitrary - some area yes but not the whole thing. The equestrian facilities and trails at Boulder Valley Ranch are closed to public use which is also unacceptable. Access to agricultural areas is important as they provide for future trail connections.</p> <p>As a footnote, I always support horse trailer parking.</p>
Email Author	Gail Matheson
No Staff Response	Sent to OSBT
Email Date	2/8/2016

Email Detail	<p>Open Space staff,</p> <p>I strongly support Scenario B because of the proposed trail from the Foothills Trail to Joder Ranch on the west side of highway 36. Because this trail corridor is located high on the slope up to the foothills, recreational users will have unparalleled access to views of the eastern plains of Boulder County. Experiencing the morning or evening sunlight playing on the array of lakes and reservoirs is breathtaking. This trail allows citizens to get up close to our natural environment and maintain a strong connection to nature. This trail will maximize non-motorized access to the Joder property and help with future connections to Buckingham Park and the complex of trails in Heil Ranch.</p> <p>Please balance the preservation of natural resources and promotion of recreational values by adopting Senario B</p>
Email Author	Tim Downing
No Staff Response	Sent to OSBT
Email Date	2/8/2016

Email Detail

Hello, folks:

I imagine that a number of you are now comfortably installed in front of the big football game, but that's not my sport (it's soccer). I'm going to grab the time to send you a personal letter from me which I hope will provoke a bit of further thinking when you get back to your own sports after the weekend. You do deserve to have some leisure before the real world envelops you again.

So please take a moment to read this pdf when your mind is fresh. It is not long but it is pithy. I'm fond of pithy.

Thanks for your service to the City and the community of Open-Space-lovers, and my best wishes for the final push on the N-TSA.

I believe that I know how you are feeling right now. It has been more than 10 years, but I vividly remember the stress levels that occur when you are in the midst of an intense community discussion about OSMP management. No doubt this is why you rarely see former board members (like myself) coming forward in later years to give input on things like the N-TSA. The burn-out rate is very high!

One thing I also remember is that during these polarized community processes, once you have made up your mind, you feel far less stress. Relief! You've weighed the pros and the cons, and you personally feel rather comfortable with the position you intend to take on the night of a crucial vote.

If you are feeling that way now, I beg you to reconsider, because at least three of you appear to be making a costly mistake.

All my life I've been a high-energy, outdoor-loving person. When I moved to Boulder in 1993, I thought I had prematurely gone to heaven. I jumped onto the Trails Committee; I spent every leisure minute running trails or biking, and I even learned to swim. When the first big battle came along—whether to move the Bobolink Trail away from the creek and possibly to pave it for bikers—I thought that if people were just willing to compromise, it would go so much more smoothly. I thought I could see reasonable solutions. In 1996 I joined the OSBT, still feeling optimistic, and began to learn some bitter lessons. At the same time, I also learned, both there and from

environmental classes, that my convictions about how simple it all was (if one were reasonable) were quite wrong. I learned much about how cumulative and intense human uses changed the recreational context (i.e., the environment). I began to perceive my own impacts along the trails I loved.

Suddenly I and my recreational friends were no longer speaking the same language. They were talking about rocks and root challenges, trees, exciting scenery, trail surfaces and glimpsing the occasional coyote. I was talking about weed invasions, declining bird and butterfly species, threatened endemic plants, and the option to have not just another dynamic cardio experience, but peace in the middle of nature.

I believe that several of you are still in that mindset with respect to trail creation: lots of people will applaud you (it would be so nice to hear happiness, for once), and they'll think a West Side corridor will be fun; no one will miss what they no longer see (the living inhabitants of the area); the enthusiasm for weeding the trail will fade but the weeds will remain; wildlife use will be forced move a hundred meters away (to where? loop trails will surround it; night use will prevent foraging, etc); everyone will accept the new status quo. This would be very unfortunate... and sad.

As you know we have an alternative. It is not quite as sexy, but it is valid. I urge you to re-think your position, listen to the scientists on the staff, re-read the guiding sideboards which have seemed to be just words on paper up to now, and remain true to the mission of a trustee: the environmental resources must come first, because once we have built a "facility," no matter what the impacts are, there will be no going back. We will have, once again, "paved paradise."

Yours sincerely,

Linda Andes-Georges

We don't have an OSMP Holy Book, but we do have Master Plans...

Some reminder notes to follow (from the over-arching policy document, the Visitor Master Plan – or are these just "words on paper," as a former USFS employee famously said about their own management guidance documents?):

-- N-TSA designated HCA in 2005 (p 54, VMP)

	<p>-- Open Space and Mountain Parks shall be careful to protect and preserve environmental resources when there is uncertainty about their conservation status, the impacts of visitor use, and/or the effects of management actions. P 30</p> <p>-- Open Space and Mountain Parks will use the best available information to assess and weigh the benefits and impacts of the various management alternatives (including no action) and then select the best overall management action in order to achieve appropriate resource protection. P 30</p> <p>-- When there are conflicts between resource protection and visitor use, management priorities will be established by considering the context provided by the underlying management area designation [in this case, HCA]. P 30</p> <p>-- Monitoring results: will especially expensive trails be closed? “No more than 1-5% decrease in baseline cover or abundance” in native plants; “0% loss” in sensitive species individuals—and how many personnel resources will be needed to determine this? Related “non-native species cover” standard will also be impossible to adhere to...</p> <p>-- all visitor travel is required to be on-trail in Habitat Conservation Areas (unless approved through an off-trail permit). Requiring and encouraging on-trail visitor access is a key strategy for resource protection. Will a 3 to 5 mile expensive trail be closed if significant off-trail use is occurring?</p>
Email Author	Linda Andes-Georges
Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Email Date	2/8/2016

Email Detail	<p>Hello Board Members,</p> <p>I am a mountain biker and I have studied this issue. I want to urge you to follow the recommendations outlined in Option A This seems to be “by far” the best route.</p> <p>My neighbor is Pat Billig and she has studied this in-depth. She has been a wetlands and land use authority for 40 years. Please choose Option A</p>
Email Author	Harvey Wellman and Bev Bien
No Staff Response	Sent to OSBT/City Council
Email Date	2/8/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear OSBT,</p> <p>I support Scenario A in the North Trail Study Area. It provides a connector trail that does not dissect our critical and sensitive wetlands and natural habitat.</p> <p>Above all, the OSBT’s role is to be stewards of the environment, making judicious decisions around recreational use while sustaining natural habitat. It is an important balancing act, and requires strong backbone. In my mind, when pushed, the OSBT should stand tall for protecting the environment. Special interest groups will always want more access, and it is up to the OSBT to ‘err’ on the side of protecting habitat.</p> <p>Thank you for protecting our unique foothills habitat for future generations to enjoy.</p>
Email Author	Lucy Buckley
No Staff Response	Sent to OSBT
Email Date	2/7/2016

Email Detail	<p>I am a resident of Westminster but use Boulder Open space a lot. I have not commented or participated in the NTSA as I am not a Boulder resident. But I do pay for a parking permit, belong to Boulder Colorado Native Plant Society, Audubon Society, Nature Association, and Bird Club. I volunteer for Abert's Squirrel monitoring and Rabbit Mountain shrub monitoring with Dave Hoerath aka dave3.</p> <p>I see more and more open space taken from undeveloped habitat and used for human recreation. Developed property should be reverted to non human use. ie. I really would like Boulder to be ecologically aware and not become known as just another suburb of Denver.</p>
Email Author	Jeff Carter
Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Email Date	2/7/2016

<p>Email Detail</p>	<p>I see you have invited comments on the revised scenarios, but don't see those scenarios posted online?</p> <p>I am interested whether my comments (in several forums) have been considered, on running more water in the Silver Lake Ditch east of Broadway along Degge and Pleasant Valley trails.</p> <p>See attached from our advocacy group, and appreciate any further information.</p> <p>Our Mission: Promote Silver Lake Ditch as an amenity for all residents of the City of Boulder. Connect our community to the natural watershed in which we live.</p> <p>Integrate the ditches into new residential and commercial development. (Pictured is an example off of Silver Lake Avenue near Foothills Community Park.)</p> <p>Keep the ditch path above ground through the new Armory Development. The Silver Lake Ditch is a community owned resource. Many private landowners and small farmers in Boulder have rights to the water flow. But the City through its Open Space program also has acquired some water rights.</p> <p>The City-owned water rights currently are used to fill the Mesa Reservoir wetlands preserve East of Route 7, and the ditch runs above ground along the Degge and Pleasant Valley trails.</p> <p>The North Boulder Subcommunity Plan recommends daylighting and enhancing existing ditches to be used as natural amenities.</p> <p>In the longer term, the Silver Lake Ditch could be used to periodically refresh Four Mile Canyon Creek, which runs east along a public mixed-use path. An overflow connection from the Ditch to the Creek already exists.</p>
<p>Email Author</p>	<p>Don Dulchinos</p>

Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Follow-up Staff Response	<p>Hi Don,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the North Trail Study Area Plan. The updated refined scenarios can be viewed here: https://bouldercolorado.gov/osmp/north-tsa-updated-refined-scenarios</p> <p>To address your interest in the Silver Lake Ditch I have forwarded your letter on to Todd Doherty who is Open Space and Mountain Parks' Water Resources Administrator. You may also contact him directly at DohertyT@bouldercolorado.gov</p> <p>Thanks and I look forward to your continued participation in the process.</p> <p>Kind regards, Juliet Bonnell North TSA Associate Planner City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks</p>
Email Date	2/7/2016
Email Detail	<p>OSMP, Thank you for the opportunity to continue to comment. Both plans have evolved smartly. Please record my continued support for Plan B -- West side connector. Also important is opportunities for future trail connections and support of long trail corridors.</p>
Email Author	Bob Manthy

Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Email Date	2/5/2016
Email Detail	<p>Hello Open Space and Mtn Parks Board,</p> <p>After reviewing the differences between the proposed scenarios I saw the comparison with current usage.</p> <p>I find it incredible that 5 to 6 currently open would be CLOSED to Public Access. That is insulting and and not at all in the spirit of recommendations were made for creating northern connections.</p> <p>It clearly appears that staff is gerry-mandering the process to focus on some rather small issues to the North and West while assuming there is no interest in trails and access to the North and East.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to "change" the listed Northern Properties from Generally Open Access to "Closed to Public Access" as part of a Trails Planning process. If you don't want to build new trails there, so be it, but do not deminish access which has been paid for and allowed up until this point.</p> <p>I am surprised that there was so little creative thinking after proposals were made many months ago.</p> <p>The process of "closing public" spaces to people is insinuating that people are not "natural beings" and do not deserve to be in the ecosystem.I agree that there should not be housing developments, but to simply close space to public access, space which has been purchased for open space and public access, is simply wrong, and indictment of real extremism which does not have a place in our community.</p> <p>Thank you for your understanding.</p>
Email Author	Landis Arnold, Boulder Native

Staff Response	<p>Thank you for your interest and participation in the North TSA planning process. Your comments were received and will be considered during development of the plan.</p> <p>Kind regards, The North TSA team</p>
Email Date	2/4/2016
Email Detail	<p>To: Steve Armstead, Tracy Winfree cc: OSBT</p> <p>Thank you for providing us with advanced notice regarding the Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) meeting of Wednesday, Feb. 10. We are writing now to let you know about our concerns with respect to important considerations that were not addressed during the January 13-14 Study Session and that, in our minds, must be addressed in the Feb. 10 meeting before asking for a vote of the Board.</p> <p>The Sideboards for the NTSA Plan, revised and adopted in June 2015, https://www-static.bouldercolorado.gov/docs/15-0615-NTSA-OBST-memo-1-201506170859.pdf, are to provide “critical guidance” for this process. In the widely distributed document “North Trail Study Area Plan Scenarios”, #1 of the three criteria for “What makes for a successful scenario?” is: “Consistency with the North TSA Plan Sideboards.”</p> <p>A review of the Compendium of 277 comments submitted from Dec 10, 2015 to Jan 3, 2016 shows that, as early as mid-December, public comments submitted to OSBT and staff pointed out the need to pay attention to the NTSA Plan Sideboards and questioned whether the two scenarios were equally consistent with the Sideboards. Nevertheless, as far as we know, staff has neither done a thorough analysis of the Scenarios with respect to the Sideboards, nor did the Board and staff discuss this at the January study session meetings. Since this is the #1 criterion for success, we hereby request that, before the Feb 10, 2016 OSBT meeting, staff prepare a comprehensive analysis of the provisions met by Scenario A and by Scenario B based on the following Sideboards:</p> <p>Boulder City Charter Sec. 176 – n.b., the purposes of open space Open Space Long Range Management Policies - regarding long-term viability and health of natural ecosystems. North Boulder Valley Area Management Plan – n.b., specific guidance re West Beech and East Beech properties; the spread and introduction of invasive plant species; effects of recreational development on rare species, communities, and potential habitat. Visitor Master Plan – n.b., guidance regarding recreational opportunities; management strategies for Habitat</p>

	<p>Conservation Areas; no-dog opportunities. Grasslands Ecosystem Management Plan – guidance re West Beech/North Boulder Grasslands and blocks of grasslands and shrub communities of this size and quality; undesignated trails in HCAs; dog management in areas of special conservation value or sensitivity. If this analysis cannot be completed in time to be included in the OSBT meeting packet, Friday, Feb. 5, please e-mail it to us prior to Feb. 10.</p>
Email Author	<p>Allyn Feinberg, Co-chair, PLAN- Boulder County Raymond Bridge, Conservation Chair, Boulder County Audubon Society Kirk Cunningham, Conservation Chair, Sierra Club, Indian Peaks Group Linda Jourgensen, Chair, Friends of Boulder Open Space Erica Cooper, Colorado Native Plant Society, Boulder Chapter President Sue Cass, President, Boulder County Nature Association</p>

Staff Response

Dear Allyn,

Thank you for sharing your interest and concerns about the consistency of the North Trail Study Area (TSA) scenarios with the established sideboards for the planning process.

Staff has been shouldering a heavy lift to research, analyze and prepare the materials necessary to support the aggressive pace of the North TSA plan. The current work load includes an unforeseen return to the Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) next week with updated revised scenarios following up from the January OSBT study session. With the amount of work staff is managing to prepare for the upcoming Board meeting and the ongoing work to have a draft plan ready in March, we are unable to do a detailed analysis as requested of scenario actions and consistency with the guidance from plans referenced in the sideboards. However, staff has kept the sideboards and plans in mind throughout the development of scenarios when vetting ideas to identify proposed actions that are not consistent with the sideboards. Staff will prepare examples of how the various sideboard documents were used as guidance for the development of specific recommendations contained in the scenarios. These examples will be included as part of the staff presentation to the OSBT on Feb. 10.

Generally, guidance from the different plans and policies are compatible and provide clear guidance for determining preferred management actions. However, there may be situations encountered in developing TSA plans where the guidance or objectives from different plans have competing purposes and require reconciliation in the plan. Trail Study Area plans have been identified by the Visitor Master Plan and the Grassland Plan as the planning process to reconcile contradictory policy guidance affecting visitor access. There may be different opinions on how well the scenarios honor the various existing plans and guidance; however, staff has developed the scenarios such that they can be supported and compliant with the charter and other guiding documents. If there are specific examples of actions that are included in the scenarios that explicitly conflict with guidance from a plan, we're interested in understanding more about these instances. Please feel free to contact me with questions or specific examples of where the North TSA refined scenarios are not consistent with sideboards.

Regards,

Steve

Steve Armstead
North TSA Plan Project Lead
City of Boulder
Open Space and Mountain Parks
armsteads@bouldercolorado.gov

Email Date	1/20/2016
Email Detail	<p>I would like to give you my recommendations for the Joder Connector trail. I was on the Trails Committee for Open Space when Jim Crain was in charge. Also, I live in the N.W. corner of the central area and I am very familiar with all of the trails in this area.</p> <p>I think the trail on the west side of U.S. 36 connecting north Boulder to Joder Ranch should be hikers only. Hikers do not disrupt the biodiversity of the area as long as the trail is kept narrow and rugged, as it is now. For persons that would want a wide trail, there could be an East trail, that could also be used for the bikers. Hiking on the same trail with bikers is not pleasant unless it is as wide as a road, and you dont have to jump off the trail, if they are coming toward you, or are coming up behind you.</p> <p>Hikers should access Joder Ranch from the West side (no bikes). This trail uses the existing railroad grade, and the social trail that is already there. There is a fence, at what I think is the McGuckin Property. It didnt say, "private", but we didnt climb over it.</p> <p>I think you should also have a trail on the East side of U.S. 36 for the bikers so they can also access the Joder Property. The road up the Joder Property to the top of the Hogback is wide enough for hikers and bikers to both use it at the same time. Over the top would be another place you might need two trails, one for bikers to go down to Old Stage Road and one for the hikers to go north along the Open Space fence to Buckingham Park. One walks across private property there, and the owners dont mind, but they dont want bikes going through their property. It is a social trail now, with a "no bike" sign. So, I think two trails would protect the land and we could all use it. Thank you.</p>
Email Author	Suzanne Birkeland
Staff Response	<p>Hi Suzanne,</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback! Your input is appreciated and will be considered as we work to develop a draft plan for the North TSA.</p> <p>Thanks for your participation and I hope you will continue to engage in the process.</p> <p>Kind regards, North Trail Study Area Team City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks</p>
Email Date	1/25/2016

Email Detail	Will you please tell me what the Comment Compendium from November 9 to January 3, 2016 includes? ... and how it was put together?
Email Author	Karen Hollweg
Staff Response	<p>Hi Karen,</p> <p>Sorry for my delayed response- it's been a couple days full of meetings! Thanks for letting me know my phone message was so out-of-date, I'm glad to have that current again!</p> <p>To answer your question, the Comment Compendium from November 9 to January 3, 2016 includes all of the verbatim emails that were received from community members during those dates as well as the staff responses to these emails. Some of the staff responses are noted as "pending" because we had a tight turn-around and wanted to provide this compendium to the board and public prior to the board's January 13 Study Session, but responses are still forthcoming.</p> <p>This document is an accompaniment to the feedback on North TSA Refined Scenarios document which includes all of the emailed feedback we received as well as the feedback on the Refined Scenarios that we received at the December 10 public meeting in a slightly different format. And finally there is a Summary of Refined Scenario Feedback document designed to summarize the feedback that we received in a more concise format.</p> <p>I hope this helps. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.</p> <p>Kind regards, Juliet</p>

Follow-up Email	<p>Thanks for your response, Juliet.</p> <p>I have looked at the additional documents you mentioned, and the concern with which I wrote my initial e-mail is only heightened. Nowhere in all of these docs do I find reference to the e-mail that I sent on Dec. 21. So, I am wondering how complete your compendium and other summaries are? Specifically, why is my doc not included and what other comments are not included in your compendium?</p> <p>My guess that there are other comments that are lost is based on the fact that I know of organizations that submitted comments that I did not see when I was reviewing your compendium.</p> <p>Since I don't know the process by which you created your compendium, I cannot possibly venture a guess re what has gone wrong or how many comments may have been missed.</p> <p>I'll be eager to learn what happened.</p> <p>Karen</p>
Follow-up Email	<p>Juliet,</p> <p>Since I first wrote about the Compendium on Monday, I have talked with several others who have not found their comments in the "Comment Compendium" raising my concern re the completeness of the public record that has been published on the website.</p> <p>I know that you and your colleagues are working full time to meet the NTSA deadlines, but since I consider this a very important part of the process I want to make sure that it does not get lost. Have you been able to figure out how many comments are missing from the "Comment Compendium from November 9 to January 3, 2016"?</p> <p>In case you want to reach me, I will be out at meetings all morning, back in the early afternoon, and then in and out for the rest of the day, but will be checking my v-mail periodically.</p> <p>Karen</p>

**Staff Follow-up
Response**

Hi Karen,

Thanks so much for bringing this to my attention. The feedback we receive from the community is extremely valuable and essential to a successful TSA plan and I have definitely tried my best to ensure that it is all included in our documentation. I apologize that your comments as well as several others' comments were not included in the compendium.

We receive email comments through various channels: directly to the North TSA email address, directly to Steve or Tracy, and sometimes comments are sent only to the OSBT or to Council. I believe that most, if not all, of these emails were eventually forwarded to the North TSA email address for inclusion into the compendium, but (as you can imagine) a few may have slipped through the cracks. In looking into which comments were missing, I did notice that your 12/21 comments as well as some of the letters we received from stakeholder groups were not originally included in the compendium. Your comments and those that we received from all of the stakeholder groups should now be included in the Comment Compendium from November 9 to January 3, 2016 on the North TSA website. If you know of other specific individuals whose comments were not included here, please have them contact me or send me their names and I will remedy the situation as soon as possible.

Although your comments and several stakeholder groups' comments didn't appear in the compendium, they were included in the Refined Scenario Improvements Summary which appeared as Attachment C in the Jan 13 OSBT Study Session North TSA Refined Scenarios Memo.

I have also updated the feedback on North TSA Refined Scenarios to include your comments. The stakeholder groups' comments were already included here at the end of the document.

Thank you for your on-going participation in the North TSA planning process!

Best,
Juliet

Follow-up Email	<p>Juliet, Thank you for including my comments in the department’s record of public input... and for finding at least 8 others that had been lost. I have no idea whether in fact, the record is now complete – and needless to say my trust/faith in the completeness of the record has been undermined.</p> <p>I hope that your finding these errors will lead you and your colleagues to an assessment and review of your process for compiling public input comments so that future Compendia will be more accurate.</p> <p>Karen</p>
Follow-up Staff Response	<p>Hi Karen,</p> <p>Throughout our process we have continuously been evaluating what has worked, what hasn’t, how things can be improved and done our best to implement our lessons learned in the subsequent phase and will apply this approach to our public feedback compilation methods.</p> <p>Best, Juliet</p>
Email Date	1/14/2016
Email Detail	<p>Unfortunately I was unable to attend the North TSA Plan meeting last night. I have attended all the previous meetings so I wanted to express my preferred 'scenario.' SCENARIO #4: Joder connector trail in HCA, west side of Hwy 36, albeit I believe horses on Hogback Tr is a bad idea - too dangerous. I would like to see a loop trail off Foothills TR that connects the existing trail that the para-gliders presently use, near Wonderland Lake.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
Email Author	Allan Engel

Staff Response

Hi Allan,

Thank you for your feedback! Your input is appreciated and will be considered as we work to develop a draft plan for the North TSA.

Thanks for your participation and I hope you will continue to engage in the process.

Kind regards,
Juliet Bonnell
North Trail Study Area Associate Planner
City of Boulder
Open Space and Mountain Parks