

EMAIL FEEDBACK RECEIVED 2/10/2016-3/4/2016

Email Date	3/4/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear Open Space Board of Trustees:</p> <p>I have recently learned that the "Northern Tier properties" have been moved to Closed Space management under the NTSA project. It is my understanding that this was a very recent change and that the reason for it is undisclosed.</p> <p>I live in the North TSA and for several years I and my family have enjoyed walking on and occasionally riding our horses on these parcels. We have always avoided the properties when they are being utilized for cattle grazing and we have never had a single conflict with any of the local ranchers, or anyone else on them. We simply enjoy the peace and solitude that they offer and would be extremely disappointed to see access suddenly denied. The opportunity to enjoy these open spaces is one of the primary reasons my family and our neighbors live outside of town.</p> <p>Please overturn the new staff recommendation that the Northern Tier properties be closed to all recreation</p>
Email Author	Rob Hacker
No Staff Response	Email sent o OSBT
Email Date	3/4/3016
Email Detail	<p>Hello, Open Space Board of Trustees and Staff:</p> <p>I live in the City of Boulder but my horse lives in unincorporated Boulder County. For many years I have enjoyed trail riding on the Open Space and Mountain Parks system, both on designated trails and off-trail, including well-known equestrian destinations such as Boulder Valley Ranch and Joder Ranch. I also appreciate the agricultural heritage of Boulder County by being able to ride on some of the unimproved OSMP parcels in my horse's neighborhood in the North TSA.</p> <p>Equestrian use is an extremely low-impact activity on natural or agricultural resources, and we respect crops, gates, fences, and livestock.</p> <p>Therefore, I had been enthusiastic that the North TSA process would designate many of the agricultural properties in the North TSA as "open" for equestrian and pedestrian use. I was also looking forward to</p>

	<p>seeing an exciting regional trail system develop in the Northern Tier as additional properties were acquired to make those connections a reality.</p> <p>However, I have recently learned that staff has reversed itself and may now be recommending that all of those properties be closed, thereby adding approximately thousands of acres to the already-extensive Closed Space & Mountain Parks system. Please don't do that! Agriculture, natural resources and passive recreation can coexist.</p> <p>I urge you to designate all of the properties in the North TSA as open to pedestrian and equestrian visitors at this time.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
Email Author	Michelle Goerlitz
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/4/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear Open Space Board of Trustees,</p> <p>I am writing to ask you, for the sake of preserving rare plants and ecological communities, riparian drainages, and diverse wildlife in the area, to please keep the West Beech property unfragmented! As also recommended by the Boulder County Audubon, CO Native Plant Society, Boulder County Nature Association, Friends of Boulder Open Space, PLAN–Boulder County, and the Sierra Club, please designate a north-south multi-use path on the east side of Route 36.</p>
Email Author	Carol Smoot
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/4/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear OSBT Member,</p> <p>I understand that there is currently a plan before the Open Space Board of Trustees to place a major (biking and hiking) trail in the North TSA through critical wildlife and plant habitats. I urge you to keep the</p>

	<p>West Beech property unfragmented, thereby preserving the rare plants and ecological communities as well as the ten riparian drainages and the diverse wildlife that depend on this area.</p> <p>A reasonable alternative would be to vote in favor of the multi-use north-south trail on the east side of Highway 36, a trail that is supported by Boulder County Audubon, CO Native Plant Society, Boulder County Nature Association, Friends of Boulder Open Space, PLAN–Boulder County, and the Sierra Club.</p>
Email Author	Jessie Goldfarb
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/4/2016
Email Detail	<p>I recommend that all of the Northern Tier properties should be left open for pedestrian and equestrian use.</p> <p>Closing these spaces precludes future use for regional trail connections. I feel that these connections are very important to the future of our trail system.</p> <p>Connecting folks to the out of doors nourishes the appreciation for open space and excessive restrictions run counter to that goal.</p> <p>Staff's original recommendations for Scenario B were well-balanced. What happened here?</p>
Email Author	Gail Matheson
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/4/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear Board of Trustees,</p> <p>I would like to lend my voice to those that are alarmed at the recent development of the Open Space staff's removing the possibility of several of the properties to a more closed space – thereby denying the possibility of some of this space being used for passive recreation – ie, pedestrian and equestrian, and the ability of the area to have useful trail connections possibly in the future.</p> <p>I would like to urge the board of Trustees to overturn the staff recommendations for the closures of the Northern Tier properties and to consider that much of this land has traditional been enjoyed for these kinds of activities. To close the land would deny the Boulder community of a historic use. Additionally, pedestrians and equestrians have minimal environmental impact, and do not need trailhead amenities. Further, these low impact activities would not negatively impact the limited agriculture in the area, or the natural environment.</p> <p>Our local history in this area has been rich with equestrian use, and decisions made for the future of that area should include the desires and rights of the local equestrian community.</p>

Email Author	Sara Martinelli
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/4/2016
Email Detail	<p>When I moved here from another state, I selected Boulder County as a place I wanted to live because of the commitment to open Space. I wanted to be assured that I would always have a place to ride my horse. It concerns me that Boulder County Parks and Open Space my not acted on leaving all the Northern Tier Properties open for both Hikers and horses which has always been part of the historic mix of uses for agriculture in the Northern Tier.</p> <p>I also recommend that OSMP and BCPOS acquire additional properties in the Northern Tier to fill in the gaps as soon as possible so that these regional trails may become reality. Over the years it seems to me that there is less willingness to create open space that can be enjoyed by the horse community.</p> <p>I close with stating once again I moved here because of the commitment to buying and creating open space for all to enjoy, not just hikers and bikers.</p>
Email Author	Lynda Dehn
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/3/2016

Email Detail	<p>Dear OSBT,</p> <p>I live on Nebo Road and have for 12 years. There are several properties off Nebo Rd., 35th St. and Nimbus Road that are open space properties. Some are used for grazing a few months of the year and hay production from lease holders. A couple of the residents on Nebo and Nimbus road enjoy an occasional walk with our dogs when the cattle aren't on the land and when the grass is low, sitting by one of the ponds and just enjoying nature off the roads and without the constant traffic. Before the grass gets growing and when the cows are gone I have occasional enjoyed the vast openness to ride my horses on one of the parcels that aren't locked although most of them are locked and can't be used by horses.</p> <p>Please, please, please leave these parcels of open space OPEN! In all the years I have lived on Nebo Road I have actually never seen another person on the properties except the people that count bats! Although a couple of neighbors have said they walk their dogs on the open space I have never seen anyone, so I don't understand why you would close them for all public access. People are respectful of the farmer's hay production and cattle.</p> <p>Further, I would request you to consider opening the Stratton property for public access. This property has been closed since you bought it but an occasional neighbor walking or riding their horses and taking their dogs on the part where cattle is not grazed would not hurt anything. I used to walk there when the Stratton's owned it and since then, the thistles and prairie dogs have dug in. The only people now allowed are open space staff that fish on the ponds. It hardly seems fair for our tax dollars.</p> <p>Since I have lived in Boulder County, 42 years now, I have watched every public arena become more restrictive, more expensive and less amenable to the public, and now staff has recommended to close the limited access open space? We don't need parking on these properties, we don't need formal trails, not many people go there but the few that do should be able to continue!!!</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>
Email Author	Catherine Corona
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/2/2016

Email Detail	<p>Dear Members of the Board,</p> <p>I am writing to you to request that the agricultural properties known as the Northern Tier be considered for passive recreation as part of the NTSA.</p> <p>Keeping these areas open will provide accessible open space recreation to surrounding neighborhoods which currently have no designated trails. They would also serve a vital role in the creation of a regional trail system for northern Boulder County.</p> <p>Many of these areas are currently in use today by pedestrians and equestrians with minimal environmental impact and no formal trail system. Why not keep them open for continued recreational use and realize the potential for a world class regional trail system?</p> <p>I ask that you please consider both the short and long term implications of any decision to close these properties. The future of accessible open space in northern Boulder County depends on it.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
Email Author	Wendy Fortin
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/2/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear Open Space Board of Directors,</p> <p>I'm a City of Boulder resident and an outdoor enthusiast who loves to run, bike, climb, ride horses and just be outside!</p> <p>I'm writing to let you know how disappointed I am to find out that the Northern Tier Properties might remain closed to recreation.</p> <p>I just can't understand why we need to keep agriculture and recreation divided when there is so much to gain as a community when we can use our resources for shared interest.</p> <p>Sharing our open space builds good will in a community, increases value to residents and shows Boulders commitment to being an amazing place to live for our ever growing population.</p> <p>I think a lot of Boulder residents share my enthusiasm for a regional trail system and would feel especially disappointed when no reasoning is provided for the closure of such a key and beautiful area.</p> <p>Please allow the Northern Tier Properties to be enjoyed by the many outdoor enthusiasts like me.</p>
Email Author	Renee Nowicki
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/2/2016

<p>Email Detail</p>	<p>Good evening, Please consider these comments supporting preserving agricultural use of City and County owned open space.</p> <p>We concur that the Schooley and Johnson properties are good options to open to the public but that the remaining Northern Properties should be closed to the public. Steve Armstead was trying to make the point to the Trustees that OSMP staff went through the Northern Properties inventory and identified properties that were least likely to have implications for either agricultural or sensitive resources and decided that the Schooley and Johnson properties met those criteria.</p> <p>The Boulder OSMP Charter & Mission States - Sec 176, Item D: Open Space Purposes: "Preservation of agricultural uses and land suitable for agricultural production". The Northern Properties are made up of mostly leased, irrigated agricultural properties. Long-time farmers and ranchers are lessees, growing crops or raising livestock for their livelihood. Public access to or through these properties invites conflicts. Northern Properties are historically agricultural and should stay that way, without public use. As policies and development matters are considered, it is important to maintain the support of agricultural use of open space. The plans for trails should prioritize preservation of agricultural use, and look to develop trails & trailheads on open space that is not productive agricultural ground.</p> <p>Thank you for your anticipated attention.</p>
<p>Email Author</p>	<p>Kristy Anderson</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>
<p>Email Date</p>	<p>3/2/2016</p>
<p>Email Detail</p>	<p>Dear Tracy and Steve:</p> <p>We would like to confirm that the commitment made by OSMP in the staff memo for the February 10 OSBT board meeting that both Scenario A and Scenario B will be included in the OSMP staff memo sent to the Council for their consideration of the NTSA Plan (the memo stated "The scenario not selected to be advanced for developing the plan will be included in materials provided to City Council as an alternative that was assessed and considered in developing the draft plan"). Since OSBT's action on the NTSA is a recommendation to the City Council, it will be important that the Council have all the relevant information for their deliberations regarding this issue. Would you confirm our understanding by responding to this email?</p>

Email Author	<p>Allyn Feinberg and Pat Billig PLAN Boulder County</p> <p>Ray Bridge Audubon Society</p> <p>Sue Cass BCNA</p> <p>Kirk Cunningham Sierra Club</p> <p>Erica Cooper Colorado Native Plant Society</p> <p>Linda Jourgensen Friends Of Boulder Open Space</p>
Staff Response	<p>Hi Allyn,</p> <p>To answer your question: Yes, staff will include in the materials provided to City Council the North TSA Draft Plan and the alternative scenario not selected to be advanced for developing the plan.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Steve</p> <p>Steve Armstead North TSA Plan Project Lead City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks armsteads@bouldercolorado.gov</p>
Email Date	<p>3/2/2016</p>

Email Detail	<p>To the Board of Trustees:</p> <p>I am a concerned citizen writing in support of recreation access on the North TSA Northern Tier properties. I recently learned that despite a reasonable, balanced original plan of use for these properties, there has now been a decision to propose closing them to all recreational use.</p> <p>Keeping all of these properties open to the uses proposed in Scenario B makes sense for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historical agricultural use included pedestrian and equestrian access - Passive recreation is very unlikely to cause any harm to the properties, and would significantly increase the value of having them as Open Space holdings - Allowing passive recreation would not require building any infrastructure such as parking lots or trailheads - These properties are key links in regional trail networks that would not otherwise be possible <p>I strongly support the original Scenario B proposal, and would like to request passive access to the Northern Tier properties for pedestrian and equestrian users.</p>
Email Author	Claire Johnson
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	3/1/2016
Email Detail	<p>I would like to recommend that as a part of the North TSA process you make the "northern tier" agricultural properties open for public access. Although these properties are leased for agricultural purposes, there is no reason that the public cannot also have access. The public can certainly open and close gates to protect livestock, and can avoid disturbing crops. Some of these properties could provide key trail links, while others would serve to allow access to a wider range of properties, reducing the density of use overall.</p>
Email Author	Ray Bovet
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	3/1/2016

Email Detail	<p>Hello-</p> <p>I live and farm in the area of the Northern Properties of your TSA study area. I am an avid equestrian and I love to hike with my dog. I think it is inappropriate to open the historic agricultural properties for public use.</p> <p>Historic agriculturally leased properties should NOT be open to the public. It is not compatible to have recreation in our agricultural area. I don't believe leased agricultural properties should be open to the public. Recreation and agriculture do not mix.</p> <p>I do agree with the latest scenario that only the Johnson and Schooley properties are open for public use.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.</p>
Email Author	<p>Sabrina Gerringer</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	<p>2/25/2016</p>
Email Detail	<p>Why has OSMP staff suddenly and without public disclosure and/or comment, changed its recommendation to keep northern tier properties in NTSA open, and now recommends they be permanently closed?? How can we ever hope to have regional connector trails if the door is slammed shut now, in secret? Regional connectors were touted as highly desired at the start of NTSA and they continue to be a high priority for the recreation community!</p> <p>Why cannot all northern tier properties remain open but undeveloped, allowing low levels of passive recreation on them and leaving time for future acquisitions and planning with multiple land managers for possible regional trail routes?</p> <p>Please stop making last-minute recommendations that change what you've been saying for almost a year, with no explanation or even rationalization.</p>
Email Author	<p>M.J. Post</p>
Staff Response	<p>Dear M.J.,</p> <p>Thank you for emailing the Boulder City Council regarding the North Trail Study Area (TSA) Plan and recommendations related to the city's northern open space properties. While you may hear directly from one or more council members, the following information provided by city staff may also be helpful. It is a</p>

staff response and may or may not represent the opinions of individual council members.

The various proposals regarding public access to North TSA northern properties has changed through the ongoing revision of scenarios being considered for the North TSA Draft Plan. Public comment and Open Space Board of Trustees' feedback about the scenarios have significantly contributed to the revision of recommendations. There has been diverse public feedback around which northern properties should be opened or closed to public access. Regardless of whether a northern property is recommended to be opened or closed, these more isolated properties will be evaluated in the context of regional trail planning processes.

Recommendations to close northern properties are typically linked with a property having sensitive natural resources or agricultural operations. Additionally, some of the properties recommended as closed are shaped by being adjacent to property managed by Boulder County Parks and Open Space where the focus to protect natural resources is best achieved through coordinated property management.

The Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) approved having two properties opened at its February meeting. Those recommendations will be included in a draft plan presented to the OSBT on Wednesday night. The OSBT asked staff to seek additional public feedback on the northern properties to help inform the discussion of the draft plan. Comments submitted, along with your input, will be considered by the OSBT as they prepare to make their recommendation of a North TSA Plan to City Council.

If you have any additional questions, please contact me at 720-564-2059.

Steve Armstead

Steve

Steve Armstead

North TSA Plan Project Lead

City of Boulder

Open Space and Mountain Parks

armsteads@bouldercolorado.gov

**Email
Date**

2/24/2016

<p>Email Detail</p>	<p>OSMP Staff & OSBT,</p> <p>I support the most recent scenario recommendations for the North TSA northern properties that only the Schooley and Johnson properties are open to the public. I believe all other northern properties should be closed to the public. At the Feb. 10 meeting, Steve Armstead emphasized that most of the Northern Properties have either agriculture or sensitive resource value, making them less compatible or appropriate to be open to the public. I agree with this point, leased historically agricultural properties and properties with sensitive resources are not appropriate for public use. OSMP staff has researched and reviewed all the available properties and determined that Johnson & Schooley were the two properties least likely to have implications for agriculture or sensitive resources. I am familiar with many of these properties and in my opinion, it is a good recommendation - only Johnson and Schooley should be open to the public.</p> <p>I have lived in Boulder County for over 35 years. We farm 100+ acres of private property across the street from some of your Northern Properties. Farming is not easy work. It takes a lot of time and a lot of effort to raise a good product. I know several of your agricultural lessees. They are hard working, long time, lifetime farmers whose livelihood is farming or ranching. You collect money from them to use the City Open Space, you do not subsidize their operations. These are not huge parcels. Most, except perhaps Bennett & Stratton, are under 75 acres. There are no trails on these properties and I believe it should stay that way. It is not appropriate or compatible for the public to 'wander' through these fields on foot, on horses or with dogs - especially when a pasture is being flood irrigated or hay is growing - it can cause crop damage. I also do not think it is appropriate or safe to let the public do any of these activities among cows with calves or bulls. I am a neighbor to several of these properties and I would never think it is acceptable to walk, ride my horse or take my dog on someone else's leased agricultural property. As a neighbor, I would never view it as restrictive that these properties are closed - I view it as respectful of the farmer, of the lease and of the product being produced that they are closed to public use. Lack of any appropriate parking, as well as liability and many safety issues are other good reasons to leave these properties closed to the public.</p> <p>The North TSA Plan Inventory & Assessment Report says it well - "Agriculture has been the cornerstone of the North Boulder Valley for the last 150 years. The preservation of agricultural lands and uses - and ensuring on-going agricultural production in Boulder Valley - is a well established function and charter purpose for OSMP." "Visitor activities have the potential for adverse impacts to agricultural operations." (pages 194 & 195) These historically agricultural properties, as well as the properties with sensitive natural resources should not be open to the public.</p> <p>Much like these other farmers, I find great reward from producing a quality product from the land, whether it be hay or natural grass fed Boulder beef. I chose to live in Colorado because of the lifestyle - I love to be outdoors - hiking, cycling, riding my horses, or walking my dog. The trail system and Open Space options that currently exist in Boulder County are extensive and with the addition of the North TSA trail, whether it be on the east or west side of US 36, as well as Joder Ranch, there are plenty of wonderful recreational options.</p>
<p>Email Author</p>	<p>Paula Shuler</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	2/23/2016
Email Detail	<p>Thanks for moving forward with bike access west of Highway 36 and for re-routing and the addition of bike trails in the Boulder Valley Ranch property.</p> <p>I hope that I will still be mountain biking by the time the trails are built!</p>
Email Author	C. Schweiger
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	2/22/2016
Email Detail	<p>Greetings,</p> <p>I have lived in Boulder County for more than 40 years. I am an equestrian, a dog owner and a user of Boulder County open space. I am writing to give input on the North TSA proposals, specifically public access to agricultural properties.</p> <p>I fully support the updated revised scenario in which only the Schooley and Johnson properties allow public access. I do not support public access on any other agricultural parcels, especially those that are leased to farmers and ranchers. These lands represent the livelihoods of families either through agricultural production or livestock. Public access to these properties, for which the farmers and ranchers pay a lease fee, would create potential serious harm to the activities there, e.g. interference with irrigation, maintenance of crops and cattle; damage to sensitive crops and native plants (dog feces in bales of hay!); spooking or releasing cattle, to name a few.</p> <p>Public access is a misnomer – there is no true access to these properties other than what was intended for their agricultural use. No parking, no bathroom facilities, no trails. The prime, increasingly rare, agricultural parcels that have are being carefully managed by Boulder County’s long time farmers and ranchers are not suitable places for hiking, dog walking, or horseback riding. Allowing access to these properties is clearly inconsistent with OSMP’s charter to “conserve agricultural resources”. There is a serious conflict of interest there.</p> <p>Please focus your planning efforts on the Schooley and Johnson properties and allow Boulder County’s dwindling farmers and ranchers to do their work with your support and without conflict. I do not need additional places to ride my horse or walk my dog. Nor do my friends. The existing OSMP trail system offers many fine, suitable options.</p>

Email Author	Carole Fitzpatrick
Staff Response	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	2/22/2016
Email Detail	I agree with the OSMP staff recommendation to have only the Johnson and Schooley properties in the North TSA open to the public. All other Northern Properties in the North TSA plan should remain closed to the public. I live in the Northern Properties and we grow grass hay on our property. The majority of Northern Properties parcels are active leased agricultural properties. The public should not be able to access a farmer's irrigated hay field while he is trying to grow his crop or walk, ride their horse or train their dog among his cows, calves and bulls. Potentially it is a safety and liability issue waiting to happen, not to mention the conflict it may cause. I am an equestrian, like to hike, and have a dog but I do not think that it is appropriate to do any of those activities on a leased agricultural property where a farmer/rancher grows hay or other crops, or raises cows for their income. There are plenty of existing trails around Boulder County for the public to use for their recreational activities, agricultural properties should be closed to the public.
Email Author	Jennifer Knapp
Staff Response	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	2/22/2016
Email Detail	To Whom It May Concern, Please keep the historically agricultural Northern Properties closed to the public. Properties with agricultural operations and sensitive resources are not appropriate or compatible parcels for people to hike, walk their dog, or ride their horse. We have a dog in our family and I love to hike but I use the trail system and I think the Northern Properties should remain closed to the public.
Email Author	Julie Daniels
Staff Response	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	2/22/2016
Email Detail	<p>Please keep the historically agricultural Northern Properties closed to the public. I believe that properties with agricultural operations and sensitive resources are not appropriate or compatible parcels for people to hike, walk their dog, or ride their horse.</p> <p>We have a dog in our family and I love to hike but I use the trail system and I think the Northern Properties should remain closed to the public.</p>
Email Author	Ingrid H. DiPaula
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	2/22/2016
Email Detail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I have emailed feedback regarding the Northern Properties throughout the North TSA process but from the Trustees comments at the Feb. 10 meeting it sounds like the trustees may have not received any of it. As we are getting into the home stretch, I wanted to make sure my feedback is received.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that leased agricultural properties should not be open to the public at any time. As a farmer I feel that is is ridiculous that you would consider allowing someone to ride a horse, hike or walk a dog through a crop field or a cow/calf operation. There are no trails on these properties, nor should there be. I do not think it is fair to the lessee that you collect rent and then would have the property open to the public.</p> <p>I am fine with the Johnson and Schooley properties being open but all other Northern Properties should remain closed to the public.</p> <p>I think a trail system on the west side of US 36 will be outstanding.</p>
Email Author	Joel Schaap
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	2/22/2016

Email Detail	Regarding public access to the northern properties in the North TSA, I support keeping the properties closed. Most are agricultural, and I know from experience that visitors do not always respect gates, fences, machinery, and irrigation dams on ag operations. The properties are also wildlife corridors, and access limited to farm leases is appropriate for these areas.
Email Author	Mary Vavrina
Staff Response	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	2/22/2016
Email Detail	<p>Steve,</p> <p>Just spent many hours watching the Channel 8 video of the OSBT meeting on Feb 10.</p> <p>I want to know if the previous public feedback that was sent to northtsa@bouldercolorado.gov was shared with the OSBT. I have provided feedback several times, my husband and neighbors have written also. We have all used the link or website address that we were asked to use to provide feedback. Is the feedback shared with the trustees or not? Please let me know.</p> <p>I did not come to the meeting on Feb. 10 - I thought that the two scenarios being presented at the meeting were pretty much in their final stages and that the OSBT would select A or B with perhaps minor revisions. I am very satisfied with the latest versions regarding the Northern Properties, only Schooley and Johnson properties open to the public. As you said, those two properties have the least implications for agriculture or sensitive resources. I do not think any additional Northern Properties should be open to the public - as I have said several times before - leased irrigated agricultural property, without a dedicated trail, should not be open to the public. I'm not advocating for trails, I'm advocating that agricultural property remain solely for agricultural use, as it has been historically, and stay closed to the public, without conflict, safety and liability concerns. I did not come to the meeting to defend it because I thought staff made the correct recommendation. Little did I know, I should have attended.</p> <p>The chairperson made the statement during the meeting that they have not heard a lot of public comment or information pushing them one way or the other. Another trustee remarked at the beginning of the Northern Properties discussion that they have not heard any comments about having their favorite trail closed (which isn't surprising, since there aren't any trails in the Northern Properties - how come they do not even know that?! I'm wondering how much information they are given with regard to public feedback? My feedback has always concentrated on the Northern Properties. Was I supposed to email them directly? I am extremely disappointed that our previous feedback did not get to the Trustees. I have feedback and will send it, since the can of worms has been opened - again - and I now will use all available addresses to get my point across.</p> <p>Additionally, in my opinion, it was frustrating to watch the discussion regarding the Northern Properties and extremely obvious that the OSBT is extremely unfamiliar with Northern Boulder County.</p> <p>At one point one of the trustees referred to the Northern Properties as "out there". This is where I live,</p>

	<p>"out there". Is that like the outback? This is where I grow hay and raise cattle on 125 acres (lucky for me it is private property) and respect and treasure what agricultural remains in Boulder County. "Out there" is where there are undisturbed plots of irrigated agricultural land with no trails - people grow hay, raise cattle, or manage organic farms. "Out there" you have long time, lifetime farmers that hold the leases to your properties. Farming is their livelihood. The Northern Properties provide a great green buffer and only add to the beautiful landscape of Northern Boulder County - which has always been agricultural. The Left Hand Ditch Company formed was in 1866, other ditch companies were soon to follow. There has been irrigated farming going on in this area since before that time. My point is that this is a historically agricultural area. Opening any of these properties to the public will negatively affect the dynamics of the area much more than leaving them closed. Your agricultural lessees do not need or deserve the public having the option to wander through their irrigated crops or cows. I do not think the OSBT understands that, I do not think they are familiar enough with the Northern properties and have not taken or had the time to educate themselves - yet they have the power to vote on whether these properties are open or closed to the public. I was completely taken back when they started reading the names of the properties, thinking that they had to go back to a previous scenario. They don't even know what Bruning, Abbott or Oasis properties are or what resources they contain - how can they vote on that? I'm also curious whose responsibility is it to educate the OSBT? I would be happy to show them around Northern Boulder County.</p> <p>I realize your trail issues are the most important issues and take the most time and effort. But, you have included the Northern Properties in the North TSA vote and you are potentially going to change the dynamic of agricultural North Boulder County. It deserves some time and education from the OSBT before they can make a judgement. I am a farmer but also an equestrian, cyclist and a dog owner and I think you should leave the agricultural properties and properties with sensitive resources closed to the public.</p>
Email Author	Paula Shuler
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	2/21/2016
Email Detail	I think it is high time to devote some attention to the North Boulder trail system.
Email Author	Karen Brown
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	2/19/2016

Date	
Email Detail	The North Trail Study Area decisions should give maximum importance to species and eco-system preservation. Recreation uses should be a secondary consideration. Our grasslands and foothills ecosystems are under threat from of development, and should be passed on to next generations with minimum damage from human intrusion and pressure.
Email Author	Erik Johnson
Staff Response	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	2/19/2016
Email Detail	What kind of access is under discussion? And can you post a map giving the exact location of these properties? Thank you!
Email Author	Lillian Valenzuela
Staff Response	Hi Lillian, Thanks for your interest in the Northern Properties. Here is a map that shows the entire North TSA including the properties which are part of the Northern Properties subarea. Open Space and Mountain Parks' proposed North Trail Study Area Plan recommendations to close many northern properties in the North TSA do not preclude public access if future regional connections become possible. We're continuing to seek community input regarding public access to city-managed northern properties in the North TSA. In the most recent scenario recommendations, both the Schooley and Johnson properties are proposed as open to public access. If there are additional northern properties where public access is desired, please share your suggestions about which properties and why. Share your comments. Kind regards, Juliet Bonnell North TSA Associate Planner City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks
Email Date	2/19/2016
Email Detail	All "Open Space" properties should be accessible to the public who pays for them! Otherwise it's "Closed Space"!!!!
Email	Andy Malkiel

Author	
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	2/19/2016
Email Detail	I am guessing it is way late in the game for this comment, but I would love to see leashed dogs allowed on the Dakota ridge trail!!
Email Author	Debbie Lerch
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	2/18/2016
Email Detail	<p>Hello POSAC,</p> <p>First, let me apologize for the long email. I do think it will be worth the read, however.</p> <p>I write to you today as a participant in the North Trail Study Area (NTSA) of the City of Boulder's Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) department, as a passionate advocate for responsible mountain biking, as a former member of POSAC (served 2007-2010), and as a career environmentalist (working as a consultant at Abt Associates on climate change issues for 8 years).</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT POLITICIZE THE NTSA.</p> <p>I understand that a couple members of POSAC are worried about the outcome of the NTSA. I can certainly sympathize. The outcome of the West TSA was zero mountain biking access, which was very disappointing to me as a trail advocate and steward. But I did not think attacking, undermining, or politicizing the process would have been a good response. It would only have made mountain bikers seem irresponsible, and it would have led to a backlash. Sometimes the community comes to a conclusion, that any one of us may not like, and we need to accept that the will of the public has been expressed. In the WTSA, the will of the public was no trail access for mountain biking near town. I did not like this outcome, but I have accepted it as the will of the public. The will of the public in the NTSA seems to be shaping up in support of a regional trail connector from Boulder to Lyons across the West Beech property. While you may not like this outcome, I think POSAC should not intervene in this city-led planning process for several reasons. Please consider the following facts:</p> <p>1) Regional trail connectivity has been a stated priority of both City and County open space departments as well as the Boulder City Council and County Commissioners. Thank you for this support! A trail along the West Beech property would serve this purpose and connect to proposed trails in Heil 2 - providing a way for people, but particularly mountain bikers to recreate without the use of a CO2 polluting car. This is</p>

a really significant and important cross-agency initiative. Awesome!!!

2) The City's Open Space Charter ***HAS NOT BEEN VIOLATED***. The Open Space Charter was set as a "sideboard" for the NTSA. This means that any action considered by OSMP staff needed to be consistent with the Charter. City staff has determined that every single action contemplated in the NTSA, including a trail on West Beech, met this standard before it was presented to the public.

3) A "Habitat Conservation Area" designation (or "HCA"), which is the designation for both the West Beech and Joder properties, does not preclude building a trail on city open space. The Visitor Master Plan explicitly allows for trail development on HCAs and the city has already built a new trail in an HCA - the High Plains Trail in the Southern Grasslands area. New trail is also proposed in the Joder Ranch HCA as part of the NTSA. An HCA does, however, have other requirements, such as limited off trail use, which are intended to reduce the impacts of recreation. This is very different from the county model, where large tracts of open space are entirely closed to all human access for wildlife habitat. When thinking of HCAs, please make sure you understand you are comparing apples and oranges when you think about how the county manages its open space. And a trail is perfectly acceptable according to the city's Visitor Master Plan which defines HCAs.

4) City staff are professionals. Just like county staff, city open space staff are credentialed professionals - most of them ecologists, wildlife biologists, and other areas of expertise related to protecting the natural environment. This staff has been struggling with a difficult issue - how to protect the environment and provide regional trail connectivity. Please do not assume that city staff are anything but just as competent as the Boulder County staff that you all know well.

5) There has been a year and a half long process around the NTSA. City staff has been put through the ringer by everybody, and unfairly so in my opinion. They have worked hard over 1.5 years to solicit feedback through the city's inspireBoulder web portal, through multiple rounds of collaborative open houses and work sessions with the public, and through an extensive public feedback process that has included multiple presentations to the Open Space Board of Trustees (the POSAC equivalent for the City). This public process has been fraught with contention and it is fair to say that nobody is happy with what is shaping up as the final staff recommendation - which is pretty much exactly how every other city open space process turns out. In trying to find a middle ground, compromise leads to everybody getting a little less than they were hoping for. But we should respect this lengthy and involved process.

6) Nature is not being destroyed. Almost 2/3 of the proposed trail on West Beech already exists as an old railroad grade. This area has been used for decades by hikers, dog walkers, and trail runners. But not by bikes - who were not allowed. There is about 1/3 of the proposed trail that would need to be built, but it abuts an industrial park next to U.S. Highway 36. This is not even close to a "wilderness quality" land parcel, and it has a much lower habitat value than areas that were preserved in the West TSA and elsewhere. There are two species of critically imperiled butterflies that are dependent upon xeric tall grass prairie remnants, but as long as the trail avoids that habitat, which staff says can be done, then those butterfly species will not be impacted by the trail. City staff has developed an almost 200 page resource inventory report. It is extensive and maps all of the natural resources in the area. There is no doubt that building a trail will have some environmental impact - at a minimum removing vegetation in a 36" swath next to a fenced industrial park. But staff has proposed a number of ways to minimize that damage, including building bridges over riparian areas, routing the trail in ways that may not provide the desired visitor experience but avoids sensitive habitat, and providing ZERO off trail access in that area.

	<p>7) The county has a long history of working collaboratively with neighboring land management agencies. The agreement between the city and county over management of the West Beech property may have expired a year ago, but the city has been managing this land - quite successfully - for over 20 years. The city has a property interest in many parcels that are under county management as well. When I was on POSAC, we worked very hard to maintain good relationships with our neighboring land management agencies. Respecting the long-term management of this land by the city is important.</p> <p>8) Don't let the county be seen as anti recreation. The NTSA process really has only one "win" for the recreation community. And that is a regional trail connector from Boulder to Heil Valley Ranch. To try and shut down this one "give" to recreation interests through this planning process is heavy handed and will be seen by recreation interests as an anti-recreation power grab. The last time Boulder County put up an open space tax - Boulder County Ballot Issue 1B in 2010 - it passed by less than 500 votes. That win was largely the result of heavy involvement by the Boulder Mountainbike Alliance who advocated for our members and other recreation interests to support the county's open space program (if you do not trust me on this, ask former county commissioner Will Toor - he was there). The one thing we asked for in return at that time was for the county to support regional trail connectivity. This is that chance! The county is about to put another open space ballot issue up. Please do not allow the county to get sucked into the "recreation" versus "preservation" political quagmire that the city open space program faces. The county program is seen by those of us in the know as progressive and welcoming to recreation while also setting hard lines about where and when resource protection needs to trump recreation. We are supportive of the county open space program. Do not risk this wonderful relationship by weighing in and unnecessarily politicizing the NTSA.</p>
Email Author	Jason Vogel
No Staff Response	Email sent to POSAC
Email Date	2/18/2016
Email Detail	<p>Dear Open Space Board of Trustees,</p> <p>Herein is what I hope you will find as important feedback about the voice and sight program -important enough that you will make prudent and immediate changes to the existing voice/tag program for dogs in Boulder.</p> <p>In the last four months I have been either the victim or a witness to the following serious infractions that would prompt a wise governing body toward remedial action:</p> <p>All of these incidents occurred at Coot Lake, most of them on Thursdays around 1 pm over a 4 month period.</p> <p>1. I am walking along the reservoir and see a woman and man and a dog sitting about 25 feet away. As to not intrude on their privacy, I veer as close to the water as possible to respect their space. I cannot get any further away from them without being in the water. The dog begins barking/growling, running directly at me with hair standing up on its back. I ask the woman to please get her dog. She makes no move to get the dog, calls to it. It does not respond at the first few calls and is within a few feet of me still barking. I plead with the woman to get her dog. She says to me "just keep walking"</p>

I finished my walk that day as she was leaving the parking lot. I got her license plate and reported the violation

2. I am walking about 50-100 YARDS from the reservoir edge. A blond headed woman with two smaller dogs, one white with spots, terrier like breed begins to run straight at me barking. The woman calls to the dog numerous times AS she begins to walk in the opposite direction I and now her dog are going. It appeared her strategy was that the dog would see her going the other way and follow, which he did not. I have to yell now, as she is getting further away and her dog is still coming at me, and asking her to please come get her dog. I stand still and it comes up and puts its nose on me, then turns around and runs to the still walking away owner. I do not know which parking lot she is at, and she loops around so I cannot follow her to turn to get the information to report the violation.

3. I have just returned to the parking lot right in front of Coot Lake and about to get in my car. 2 dogs run by, no sign of the owner, and run across the street to Tom Watson Park. I begin to hear the owner calling loudly for them and he appears rounding the corner near the Coot lake restroom. One dog runs back across the street and he leashes that one. When the second one runs across, a driver has to stop to avoid hitting it and her car is rammed from behind by a second car. I was asked to write down a witness report of how the dogs caused the accident which I turned into Animal Control. Ironically there was a beautiful husky in the back of the car that was hit and he was quite shaken.

4. Today, February 16, 2016: I was walking along the reservoir edge and saw a cute white terrier that was running in circles around a stand of trees as a man and a woman were sitting next to the trees with a second dog which appeared to be leashed. Just as I was thinking how cute the terrier was as it ran in circles, it saw me, started barking at me and ran right at me and I screamed as it was such a surprise in its behavior change. I asked the people to come get their dog, they did not get up, they made no move toward their dog. I though I heard one say "keep walking". About that time, the dog came back to them and I asked them what they said - they replied "have a good day mam". It sounded sarcastic to me, but I let that go and asked them if the dog was licensed. The man's reply was "Yes, ARE YOU?". I am ashamed to say that my answer to him was quite angry, but please note that in all of these incidents, my heart was racing - stress and fear pumping through my body. I told them I was going to report them and continued on my walk.

I went all the way to the far parking lot on the West side of Coot lake and got this number (there was only one car there) A green subaru sedan (license plate 457 NTQ). The couple, again, waited until I was out of sight, and though they were the only ones heading back toward that lot, I cannot be sure they got in that car.

I met Officer Barnes one time at Coot Lake and had told him about my concerns with the voice/tag program and his suggestion was I take my phone with me to document the infractions. When I went to report this incident today, he answered and remembered me. Since I did not see the couple get into the only car in the lot, he said it was not possible to run the plate and see if the owners had a white dog. Instead of focusing on the aggression of the dog, he reprimanded me for not taking my phone with me to take pictures of the dog and instead of helping me feel better said his job was not to address the sarcastic attitude of the dog owner in asking me if I was licensed when I was shaking with fear. I can understand that fact, but not Barne's tone of voice. Officer Barnes had just come from Coot issuing tickets and may have been harried himself, but his lack of compassion for me and unbraiding for not taking my phone was very disappointing.

Please, please change the voice/tag regulations. That these 4 incidents can happen over such a short time should clearly suggest a change is needed.

I understand that there was a 5 year study before this program was implemented.

I understand that there is a strong, passionate persuasion from the group called FIDO that helped shape this program. It appears there was not a calm voice of dissension to point out limitations and severe problems with the existing regulations.

It is not my desire to become that voice, but I think given I have been a dog lover and owner most of my life, that I grew up on a ranch around animals, and though now have none of my own, I am sympathetic to the need of dogs to run free. My home is Boulder and I have lived here since 1978. I had a dog once who could climb a 7 foot fence and I know the challenges of sharing Why have these incidents happened all to me - I am not afraid of dogs but I do have the time to address such an issue to assure the rights of animals and people and I see people not being protected. When I reported this last incident, the question was "did anyone get bitten"? No, but I am 68 and each time I have encountered an aggressive, barking dog running at me, my health is compromised with fear. Instead of relaxing and enjoying the beautiful scenery of Coot Lake, I am afraid of a heart attack. I also do not think the onus should be on me to take pictures of violations. I walk to be away from phones, etc.

Please don't wait until someone gets bitten. Putting more work on Animal Control officers is not the answer, as they obviously cannot be there to stop a dog attack.

It is nonsense to license a dog each year and never actually evaluate the dog. No one is allowed to drive a car through a "good faith system" We have to take a test. So should dogs and owners who apply for the voice/sight privileges.

Here is my final suggestion and I'm sure you all have deeper insights to add on:

The owner gets the tag after officials meet and evaluate their dog on site - Coot Lake is a good place to start.

Once they are approved, its more of a LIFETIME licensing, rather than a trust-based yearly license, better for the owners too.

All dogs should be on leashes a certain distance from parking lots.

ONE infraction (if there is one, think about how numerous infractions could be since most people do not have the time or energy to report and validate the infraction), and the license is forfeited.

I also frequently hike in Sainitas Valley and have never had an aggressive dog incident, but please note that right where dogs can be unleashed, on the East side of Sanitas Valley Trail, is a truck load of dog poop - you smell it before you even see it.

Thank you so very much for the entire Boulder Open Space Board reading this rather lengthy report. I hope to see a change in the immediate future to remedy this serious situation. If I do not, I would not dismiss considering what ever legal action is available to encourage those responsible to amend the current Voice/sight regulations so we can all enjoy our inspiring environment.

Thank you also for all your efforts in maintaining and guarding the gifts of open space.

**Email
Author**

LouAnn Harlow

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	<p>2/15/2016</p>
Email Detail	<p>Dear City Council Members and Mr. Phillip Yates (OSMP),</p> <p>The Daily Camera article on flood “recovery still underway” (9/14/2015) did not mention repairs needed at the Fourmile Creek Trail just south of the trailhead parking lot on Lee Hill. The Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) website lists projects that will soon be completed and others that will be completed at a later date. Fourmile Creek repairs have not been listed on any posted agenda on that website in the 2 years and 5 months since the flood caused damage to the trail. The focus now seems to be Marshall, Chapman, and Boulder Falls. Two of those are primarily mountain-bike access trails. The Fourmile Creek Trail is a heavily used year-round multi-mode community trail accessed by thousands of residents, athletes, families, commuters, and visitors.</p> <p>The information provided below from the Phillip Yates at the OSMP office is not "a lot of information" as claimed. It is now over 9 months since I received this response and I have seen no signs of "a safer, temporary creek crossing". In the meantime, there have been more accidents along this trail directly caused by the unsafe access. A prolonged trail closure as we have seen in other areas is not desirable. The process of reclamation has already been prolonged by 2 1/2 years. A plan of action that can be expedited is what is we are asking for. What is needed is a pedestrian/bike/dog/stroller bridge. We are lucky to have many challenging natural hiking and biking trails in our community but this area in particular should be made accessible to more of the resident population. I recommend extending this bridge/walkway from the original bridge still in place, spanning the old and the two new creek beds, such that in subsequent floods the water would have these three divergent flow patterns to choose from, recognizing, of course that water may choose a totally different line of flow. The grade of the slope has defined these three creek beds as optimal channels such that a flow pattern might be estimable at this point in time. The bridges could be elevated slightly to accommodate even the most dramatic flow. During the flood the water level maxed out at 5' in this field. Last spring it was up to approximately 18" which is not easily traversed by the general public, and certainly not a dry access.</p> <p>I think it is important to recognize how quickly the North Boulder neighborhoods are growing. The city imposes density in North Boulder that is causing a rapid increase in residents here. This trail serves a large and diverse community and is imperative to connectivity to trails north, south and east, all the way to the Boulder Reservoir and beyond. The city encourages bikes as a mode of transportation and yet this trail,</p>

which can be used to access downtown, bypassing Broadway auto traffic, remains in in disrepair.

I have spent considerable time exploring the trail systems located in and around the town of Superior. These trails are well maintained, often paved (though that is not necessarily desirable) and connected by many footbridges over multiple swales and run-off creeks. These are often landscaped so that they recede into their surroundings and are often not visible from a distance. I am not asking for landscaping, only access. I suspect that development in Superior contributed substantially to these trail systems. There is much development in North Boulder and I am curious what contributions the OSMP department receives from these projects. We hear mostly of their required contributions to the affordable housing program. I have not researched what portion of our taxes are allotted to OSMP but some of the 25% increase in our property taxes should be showing up in the maintenance of amenities to our immediate community. Over the past decades we have voted for considerable amounts of funds toward the acquisition and maintenance of open space and I have been told that OSMP is one of the better funded city departments. The acquisitions are often lauded but maintenance is often neglected.

We are entering the **third** spring run-off season since the 2013 flood. The trail will be completely severed for approximately 6 to 12 weeks. I look forward to **SEEING A PLAN OF ACTION ON THE OSMP WEBSITE SOON** as to what neighbors, visitors and the public at large can expect at the Four Mile Creek location.

I also request a personal response with answers versus excuses - something that can be forwarded to the neighboring community that is meaningful. Many community members expressed their concerns about this area during the open comment period of **The North Trail Study Area (TSA) Plan**. I heard from several neighbors who said that their concerns about existing trails were overshadowed by the desire to expand, rather than maintain, what we have. I look forward to having positive feedback and a pro-active plan to present to neighbors through our local social media stream.

So that my request is clear, the question is: **WHAT DOES THE CITY PROPOSE FOR MITIGATION OF THE IMPACTS OF THE 2013 FLOOD AT THE AREA OF THE FOUR MILE CREEK TRAIL IMMEDIATELY SOUTH OF THE FOUR MILE CREEK TRAIL HEAD PARKING LOT AT LEE HILL ROAD AND WHEN CAN THE COMMUNITY EXPECT IMPLEMENTATION OF AN ACCEPTABLE PLAN?**

Email Author	Karie KP Koplak
Staff Response	Pending
Email Date	2/14/2016

Email Detail	<p>Steve, FIDOS would like to partner with OSMP staff in setting the on-leash section of the Joder Interim Trail - from both the existing trailhead and also the newer northern trailhead. In working together, we could hopefully prevent a lot of back and forth about this boundary at future meetings. Would this work for you and your staff? Is there a staff member's name you could provide who we could contact? Thanks for your help!</p>
Email Author	<p>Eileen Monyok - FIDOS Board Member</p>
Staff Response	<p>Hi Eileen,</p> <p>I am the best person to contact regarding the on-leash section (trailhead leash area) recommendation for the Joder Interim Trail and the proposed northern trailhead access trail. If you have feedback about what you think is important to factor into the consideration for the extent of trail that is on leash, please share your thoughts as soon as possible. As you are well aware, we are under very tight timelines to prepare the draft plan.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Steve</p> <p>Steve Armstead North TSA Plan Project Lead City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks armsteads@bouldercolorado.gov</p>
Email Follow-up	<p>Hi Steve, Would you have some time to meet tomorrow to look at maps together and discuss the trailhead leashing boundary for both the current parking lot area and also the northern access trail? It might be most efficient if we discussed it together briefly - either at your office or even on site at the Joder trailhead. Hopefully it wouldn't take any more than 20 minutes. Eileen</p>

<p>Staff Response</p>	<p>Hi Eileen,</p> <p>I appreciate your interest in providing input to the trailhead leashing boundaries for both proposed Joder trailheads. It is important to me and staff that we listen to ideas from community members that address and serve community interests. As I stated before, if you have specific thoughts about what would work best for those boundaries, we welcome input and providing this information via email is the most expedient. If it works best that you show me your ideas on a map, I can see about finding a time that works. I am very mindful about honoring broad community involvement in the planning process, so while we're open to listening to ideas, any conversations about the trailhead leash boundaries should not be construed as to be determining the boundaries for the draft plan.</p> <p>Thanks for your interest in this topic.</p> <p>Steve Steve Armstead North TSA Plan Project Lead City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks armsteads@bouldercolorado.gov</p>
<p>Email Follow-up</p>	<p>Hi Steve,</p> <p>Since there is currently no access to the new proposed northern trailhead at Joder, it is obviously difficult for me to give you any feedback on the leashing boundary here. It would be helpful to meet and look at maps or to meet at Joder to discuss this leashing boundary here.</p> <p>Regarding a leashing boundary for the current Joder trailhead -- Right out of the parking area, there is a barbed wire fence on both sides of the trail, which is in addition to the on corridor designation. (See attached picture.) The fence, in fact, is about 8-10 feet on either side of the trail. So having a 20-30 yard on leash distance on the Interim Trail, from the parking area, to clear people from any congestion in the parking area should be plenty to reduce potential "conflict."</p> <p>Since you didn't answer my question about meeting today, where we could possibly discuss the northern trailhead leashing boundary, it sounds like you probably don't have time today. So please let me know if there's a time that works for you.</p> <p>Eileen</p>

<p>Email Follow-up</p>	<p>Hi Steve, There's no doubt that you are busy with the North TSA revisions. It sounds like you may not want to meet to discuss the leashing boundary on the Joder Interim Trail. On FIDOS, we were hoping to avoid the back and forth, and the possibility of even further future revisions, that can happen if we don't sit down and discuss the issues together on the leashing boundary. We were recalling similar joint discussions that happened when setting leashing boundaries in the West TSA. Even if you could share your thoughts and concerns on the leashing boundary by email, and have an email discussion that would be helpful. Otherwise, it seems that you would not like to work together on this issue, and would rather just surprise us when the draft plan is released. Please share your thoughts on either an email discussion or a meeting with myself and possibly another FIDOS board member. Thanks! Eileen</p>
<p>Staff Response</p>	<p>Hi Eileen,</p> <p>We are indeed extremely busy pulling together the draft plan. Below are some of the issues/concerns that are important to consider regarding assessing the extent of the trailhead leash for both of the proposed trailheads serving the Joder property. I've included an image below which indicates two of the locations discussed. The circle to the north of the Joder Reservoir and the Lefthand Water District property shows the two residences that are situated very close to the access road/proposed trail connection out of the Dagle trailhead location. The circle south of the reservoir indicates approximately where the Joder connector trail could junction with the interim trail and also is approximately the west end of the Lefthand Water District property.</p> <p>On the Joder Interim Trailhead side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping dogs off of Lefthand Water District lands and away from drinking water reservoir (being a good neighbor and minimizing potential issues that could jeopardize our ability to retain a revocable lease for property that is part of the interim trailhead) • Consistency in regulations , link to where the connector trail comes in • Reduce conflict through the trailhead area <p>On the Dagle/Wright side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping dogs off of Lefthand Water District lands and away from drinking water reservoir (being a good neighbor and minimizing potential issues that could jeopardize our ability to retain a revocable lease for property that is part of the interim trailhead) • Reduce conflict through the trailhead area • Keeping dogs away from two residential houses very close to access road/trail • Keeping dogs out of grazing pasture <p>Thanks for sharing your thoughts.</p> <p>Steve Steve Armstead North TSA Plan Project Lead City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks</p>

	armsteads@bouldercolorado.gov
Email Follow-up	<p>Hi Steve,</p> <p>Your concerns about being a good neighbor to Lefthand Water District lands are understandable, although there is already a barbed wire fence protecting the land. Your concern about a possible need for leashing where a trail joins in, however, is inconsistent with other areas in the North TSA and on other OSMP lands. For example, there are numerous trail junctions at Boulder Valley Ranch where no leashing is currently required. Even where the Eagle Trail at BVR comes steeply down the mesa, and bikes come racing down quite quickly, there is no leashing of dogs required where the Eagle Trail joins the loop. In addition, bikes are required to yield to pedestrians, including children and dogs. So bikes should be yielding to pedestrians, children, dogs, etc. at the junction of the West Beech Trail with the Joder Interim Trail, without the need for the leashing of dogs, or even children for that matter.</p> <p>Therefore, it seems that the on-leash boundary for the Interim Trail being located at the western border of the Lefthand Water District property is reasonable. The distance between the trailhead and this boundary is probably about 200 or so yards, which should not be overly cumbersome for bikers, equestrians, skiers, etc. who would like to primarily enjoy a Voice & Sight experience with their dogs.</p> <p>Regarding the on leash boundary from the Dagle side, the houses certainly are close to the road/trail. I'm not sure whether the property line is within the 20 foot V&S corridor. Making the on leash boundary just past these houses would also be reasonable.</p> <p>Please let me know about any further thoughts that you may have on this.</p> <p>Eileen FIDOS Board Member</p>
Staff Response	<p>Hi Eileen,</p> <p>Thanks for your follow up response.</p> <p>Just to clarify, our thought regarding keeping regulations consistent to the Joder connector junction with the interim Joder trail leash extent was so that guardians hiking from the trailhead to the connector wouldn't have an on-leash to voice and sight on corridor to on-leash stretch...it would remain consistently on-leash. West of the junction, guardians would have voice and sight on corridor option. The junction is likely to be very close to where the Lefthand Water District property boundary is.</p> <p>Thanks for your feedback.</p> <p>Steve</p> <p>Steve Armstead North TSA Plan Project Lead City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks armsteads@bouldercolorado.gov</p>

Email Follow-up	<p>Hi Steve, Thanks for explaining the reasoning of why you would want the on-leash boundary on the Joder Interim Trail to extend to the junction with the West Beech connector trail. As long as the Lefthand Water District property boundary and the West Beech connector trail junction are very close to each other, the trail junction point should be fine for setting the on-leash boundary. It sounds like you expect the West Beech connector trail to run along the east side of the (previous) Joder house.</p> <p>I would suspect that more people who park at the Joder Ranch parking lot to hike with their dogs would take the V&S option and continue on the Joder Interim Trail rather than turn on the connector trail. But there will likely be a few hikers with dogs who choose to go south on the connector trail who will then avoid the on-leash, V&S, then back on-leash transition.</p> <p>Eileen</p>
Email Date	<p>2/12/2016</p>
Email Detail	<p>Dear Mr Amstead, Ms. Winfree and to whom else it may concern,</p> <p>As an avid participant in/on the vast and varied open space lands Boulder has been able to protect, I am writing regarding the development of the North Boulder Trail and particularly the connector scenarios. I love the idea of connecting to Lyons via Heil ranch. At the same time, I am deeply concerned about Scenario B, which as I understand it traverses a Habitat Conservation Area as it connects to the Joder property. In addition to the many drainages in that section of the trail that would need bridges, it puts at risk the wetlands areas it crosses. Wetlands in general provide wildlife habitat, sustain biological diversity, contribute to flood attenuation and contribute to ground water recharge. They need to be protected. In addition to the ecological damage the new trail would cause, it would also appear to be a much more expensive undertaking. I would prefer my tax dollars to be used more economically.</p> <p>Scenario A, in contrast, offers an easy and reasonable option with much less impact environmentally as well as economically.</p> <p>In reviewing the two options and examining the mission statement of OSMP that says it "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," it seems that Scenario B places recreation and access above "preserving and protecting the natural environment" and above "sustaining the natural values of the land." It also deviates from the intention of the original members who started the open space program and developed the charter, which was to preserve the lands and waters for their inherent value as natural areas. While recreation and enjoyment of these lands was assumed, the major objective was to preserve them for their unspoiled beauty and the solace and tranquility that provides. We can't have everything, and if we want to protect these lands for future generations we have to be thoughtful about and limit access, especially when it threatens the mission of OSMP as well as the intention of the founders.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
Email Author	<p>Polly Donald</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	2/10/2016
Email Detail	<p>You are being asked to make recommendations about two competing proposals for the North TSA. As a former OSMP board member, I remember us discussing whether it made sense to build a trail on the old railroad grade. Even then (before the enormous growth in popularity of mountain biking) it was clear that any kind of trail would impact an array of important ecological values in this part of open space. There had not yet been a proposal for an alternative trail but now there is.</p> <p>I recognize the pressure you are under to make open space lands more accessible for recreational purposes. It is hard to resist that pressure when the values you are being asked to protect are primarily environmental. But in this case I hope you will make that choice, keep an important remaining area of open space with high ecological values more or less intact and ask those wanting to use open space for exercise to do so in places that are not so sensitive.</p> <p>Thanks for your work. We have a remarkable asset for the community that deserves the very best of care.</p>
Email Author	Larry MacDonnell
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	2/10/2016
Email Detail	<p>This email is sent in favor of Scenario A that the Open Space Board of Trustees is considering for the North TSA. I do not support Scenario B for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It will require the construction of up to 11 bridges which will permanently alter the natural look of the property. 2. It will cross at least 11 riparian drainages that are important for wildlife in the area. 3. The area is home to some of the last native grasslands, and several threatened plants and species. Bike trails on the west side of the highway will introduce invasive plants and weeds. 4. Bikers already have access to many trails, and Scenario A would add even more. Bikers force hikers off trails. They are not compatible uses. Bikers have already forced hikers off many Open Space

trails. They are not entitled to have bike trails wherever they want. The North TSA is not just terrain for a thrill ride; it is an important ecosystem we have to protect.

5. The natural environment trumps special interests. The Board's job is to speak for the natural environment, not roll over to the latest recreational fad.

6. Scenario A provides a north south corridor for bikers but avoids sensitive habitat and mostly uses existing trails. It is a reasonable compromise.

Thanks

Email Author	Mike Browning
No Staff Response	Email sent to OSBT
Email Date	2/10/2016

<p>Email Detail</p>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I apologize for not making it to the meeting tonight, I had another meeting with a professor that went much longer than expected.</p> <p>I have attached a letter expressing my opinion on the North TSA plan.</p> <p>I am writing today to show my support for Scenario A, carrying out the trail system east of North Foothills highway in the North TSA.</p> <p>My name is Ryan Walters and I am a senior environmental design student here at CU. This is my fourth year living in Boulder and I have fallen in love with this city for all it has to offer as a close-knit community but more notably for leading by example to the rest of the world how to grow efficiently and sustainably. For example, when it wasn't considered anywhere else in the United States at the time, Boulders great citizens had the vision to tax themselves to protect the beautiful natural surrounding land and wildlife. Boulder's bicycle to car ratio is outstanding compared to other cities. Boulder was the first city to permit a bag fee law that reduced bag use by 68% its first year, and, and so many other great achievements.</p> <p>My reasons for supporting scenario A are as followed; In order to sustain native wildlife ecologies thriving here in Boulder, completing the trail East of foothills highway is the obvious solution for the North TSA. This plan will bypass the butterfly, snake, and other wildlife communities that live West of North Foothills highway. Second, the majority of the trail is already complete on the East; trails including the Foothills Trail, Degge Trail, Cobalt Trail, Left Hand Trail, and Beech Trail are all essentially existing infrastructure for Scenario A. And third the difference between 3 miles and 4.3 miles may seem miniscule to anyone considering traveling that distance. Putting in a trail that would disturb ecosystems that are hundreds of years old is irresponsible, especially seeing the existing infrastructure in place. I truly don't see where considering a plan that has so much potential to harm this lands natural ecologies ever lies along this cities future.</p>
<p>Email Author</p>	<p>Ryan Walters</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>
<p>Email Date</p>	<p>2/10/2016</p>

<p>Email Detail</p>	<p>I've reviewed the two alternative scenarios currently being considered by the Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) for the North Trail Study Area.</p> <p>I understand the OSBT will indicate its preferred scenario to be used as the basis for the North Trail Study Area Plan and will eventually make a recommendation to City Council regarding the plan.</p> <p>I'm writing to express my strong support for Scenario A because it clearly avoids the impacts to wetlands associated with Scenario B. I urge the OSBT to select Scenario A, considering the board's responsibility to advocate for the preservation and protection of the natural environment and land for its inherent value as natural resources and habitat. Where these lands and resources have additional values (e.g., recreational use value), I believe the OSBT should only advocate other uses that don't compromise the inherent value.</p> <p>It seems obvious that Scenario B will likely compromise the inherent value of the wetlands within the Habitat Conservation Area as habitat for wetland dependent species and the role of wetlands in supporting biodiversity. Scenario A will avoid the impacts.</p> <p>A choice by the OSBT of Scenario A would, in my view, most clearly meet the mission of the City of Boulder's Open Space and Mountain Parks Department to preserve and protect natural environment and land resources that characterize Boulder. I understand this to mean protect the natural environment and land resources for their inherent value as natural, unspoiled areas. I view it as the responsibility of the OSBT to advocate for these resources first whenever there are competing interests, i.e, to avoid impacts if alternatives are available. In the case of the North Trail Study Area, Scenario A is a viable alternative that better preserves the land and resources for their inherent value and beauty as a natural area.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my opinion.</p>
<p>Email Author</p>	<p>Bonnie Lavelle</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>
<p>Email Date</p>	<p>2/8/2016</p>
<p>Email Detail</p>	<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>
<p>Email Author</p>	<p>Chris Echelmeier</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 Email	<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>Best regards, Chris</p>
Staff Response	<p>Mr. Echelmeier,</p> <p>Thank you for emailing the City Council and the Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) regarding this week's OSBT meeting, which included board consideration of revisions to the North Trail Study Area (TSA) Plan scenarios. While you may hear directly from one or more council and board members, the following information provided by city staff may also be helpful. It is a staff response and may or may not represent the opinions of individual council and board members.</p> <p>The revisions presented at Wednesday's meeting were based on board and community feedback discussed at the January OSBT study session. OSBT members provide feedback and guidance at study sessions, but do not actually vote or provide formal recommendations to staff and council. This type of</p>

formal action occurs during a meeting with a public hearing.

Throughout the North Trail Study Area Plan process, Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) staff has worked to ensure a collaborative community planning effort with substantial opportunities for public input. At the same time, we've been working hard to fulfill our committed plan timeline, which means bringing the draft plan to the OSBT in March.

After the OSBT January study session, it became clear to staff that it would be beneficial for the OSBT and the public:

1. To see the updated scenarios based on the board's January study session deliberation;
2. To hold a public hearing; and
3. To take formal action to approve changes.

Additionally, there was interest in a more formal vote to determine upon which scenario staff should base the draft plan. We took these additional steps to provide board members with the opportunity to be as clear and transparent as possible in developing a plan recommendation for the Boulder City Council.

We are sorry that you were unable to attend the Feb. 10 OSBT meeting (North TSA discussion begins at 1:37:01), and appreciate the thoughts you have shared and your concerns about the process. Please contact me at 720-564-2059 if you have any questions.

Steve Armstead
North TSA Plan Project Lead
City of Boulder
Open Space and Mountain Parks

**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? 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>
<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>

<p>Follow-up Staff Response</p>	<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>
<p>Follow-up Email</p>	<p>Hi Juliet, Thanks for the pointer to the scenarios.</p> <p>I've spoken with Todd before, and he has explained that water rights are complicated. Does he make the decision about our proposal?</p> <p>My question is more for you directly as North TSA planner - is the North Trail Study going to take any action on our proposal? We have sent comments now on 2 different occasions to raise this issue. Aren't public hearings the opportunity for public input? If our input is considered and rejected, that's the way it goes. If it is ignored, that would be bad.</p> <p>Appreciate any guidance here. Thanks. Don</p>
<p>Follow-up Email</p>	<p>Juliet, By the way, after looking at the revised scenarios, I want you to know that we understand that the primary issues for the Study are around competing uses of the trails, and the condition of the trails. Our proposal specifically seems likely to increase use of Degge and Pleasant Valley trails and take some pressure off the more popular trails. Thus, the proposal seems directly relevant, and so it would be good to know if it was seriously considered, or considered at all.</p> <p>Thanks. Don</p>

**Follow-up
Staff
Response**

Hi Don,

I apologize for the delay in responding to your questions and proposal about Silver Lake Ditch (SLD) and its relevance to the North TSA Plan. Your input is important. Todd Doherty has the appropriate knowledge, expertise and role in the OSMP department to provide feedback on your proposal.

Todd touched base with the Silver Lake Ditch Company to get their perspective and thoughts on the matter. The information he obtained is shared below. I would encourage you to reach out to Todd directly for any additional information.

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

Todd was able to talk to Jim Snow, the ditch board president, and he was aware of the Friends of the SLD and appreciates their support. In regards to the open ditch or piped through the armory, he said the company is somewhat ambivalent on the issue. If they ensure that the pipe has appropriate clean-out openings and it's maintained by the new development, they are okay with that option. With that said, Jim stated a preference for an open channel ditch as it's easier to clean and maintain.

Adding more flow to the ditch for aesthetics may be difficult. Irrigation ditches divert water from the river when in priority and carrying water rights for the shareholders' use. The SLD ditch does supply water for OSMP's Mesa Reservoir which is the end terminus of the ditch. But, once Mesa Reservoir is full, OSMP has no ability to call for more water. Since the armory is near the end of the system (to Todd's knowledge no additional water rights aside from Mesa Reservoir), there will be times when this reach of the ditch is dry or has little water.

There was also a suggestion of using the SLD to augment flows in Four Mile Canyon Creek. Diverting was from Boulder Creek and spilling it into the Four Mile Canyon Creek would not be allowed by the water commissioner as it would be diverting water for non-decreed uses and would take water away from other water rights along Boulder Creek. Also, SLD is a relatively junior water right and is heavily dependent upon their storage. Todd thought that the company would be very reluctant to release their stored water for uses other than those of its shareholders.

Hopefully this helps answer your questions. Todd is happy to discuss further if you wish. Todd's contact information is provided below.

Todd Doherty
City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks
Water Resources Administrator
Office: 303-413-7641
dohertyt@bouldercolorado.gov

<p>Follow-up Email</p>	<p>Thanks Steve, Very much appreciate the follow up.</p> <p>I have met Todd and I think I understand what you have passed along. I may follow up with Todd on some of the water rights issues, because he hasn't quite addressed the underlying issue there.</p> <p>Water rights aside, one question more to you as the lead for this Trails work. My basic premise is that having more water through lesser used trails may have a positive impact on their use, taking pressure off some of the busier trails.</p> <p>Is that the kind of issue that is even in scope for the North TSA Study? (that seems much more about refereeing between bikers, hikers, dog owners et al, and i'm sure that's hard enough.) I just thought since there's a window open about the future of the North Trails, I should see if that's the venue and the timing to raise the idea. Whether it's feasible per Todd's points is a separate issue.</p> <p>Thanks for any further quick answer on that narrow point.</p> <p>Don</p>
<p>Follow-up Staff Response</p>	<p>Hi Don,</p> <p>I'm sorry I didn't respond in a more timely manner to your follow up question. The interface between water resources and how visitor access can be managed in ways that improve visitor experiences or reduce natural resource impacts or impacts to water infrastructure are relevant topics for a Trail Study Area Plan. Your comment about the benefit of having more water in a ditch as a way for improving the visitor experience and possibly dispersing visitor use is relevant. The challenge as previously discussed, is that more water cannot be carried through the ditch than can fill Mesa Reservoir.</p> <p>Thanks for raising this interesting point.</p> <p>Steve Armstead North TSA Plan Project Lead City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks armsteads@bouldercolorado.gov</p>